



Cambridge City Council Planning

Date: Wednesday, 3 December 2025

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ [access the building via Peashill entrance]

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457000

Agenda

1 Order of Agenda

The Planning Committee operates as a single committee meeting but is organised with a three part agenda and will be considered in the following order:

- **Part One**
Minor/Other Planning Applications
- **Part Two**
General and Enforcement Items
- **Part Three**
Pre-application Developer Briefing

There will be a forty-five minute lunch break some time between 12noon and 2pm. With possible short breaks between agenda items subject to the Chair's discretion.

If the meeting should last to 6.00pm, the Committee will vote whether or not the meeting will be adjourned.

2 Apologies

3 Declarations of Interest

4 Minutes (Pages 5 - 20)

Part 1: Minor/Other Planning Applications

5 25/03078/FUL Land Adjacent to 49 New Square (Pages 21 - 42)

- 6 25/03079/LBC Land Adjacent to 49 New Square (Pages 43 - 54)
- 7 25/02831/FUL Land at Bateman Street, Cambridge (Pages 55 - 70)

Part 2: General and Enforcement Items

- 8 Appeals Information (Pages 71 - 82)

Part 3: Pre-application Developer Briefing

- 9 East Road
DFD masterplan
Applicant: Anglia Ruskin University

Planning Members: Smart (Chair), Thornburrow (Vice-Chair), Dryden, Flaubert, Griffin, Howard, Illingworth and Todd-Jones

Alternates: Ashton, Bennett, Lokhmotova and Porrer

Emergency Evacuation Procedure

In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front St Mary's Church. The duty Officer will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the duty Officer is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair.

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public.

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

Cambridge City Council is committed to being transparent and open when the Council and its members are involved in taking decisions. The Council will endeavour to live stream/record the Planning Committee. Public speakers are reminded that by speaking/appearing in this meeting you are giving consent to being recorded. The livestream can be watched online as the meeting happens or the recording can be watched after the meeting via the Council's YouTube page [<https://www.youtube.com/@camcitco/streams>]. On some occasions this may not be possible, due to a technical fault with the equipment. Whilst this is frustrating it is important to note that there is no legal requirement to record or livestream meetings. The meeting may proceed in person only should there be an ICT failure on the day.

Those wishing to address the meeting will be able to do so virtually via Microsoft Teams, or by attending to speak in person. You must contact Democratic Services democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

Information for Councillors

After the publication of the agenda, if any committee members have any questions, they should be sent to officers up to 12 noon 2 days in advance of the meeting – these will be responded to as part of officer presentation (together with any queries raised by Members at the committee site visit).

The site visit protocol and public speaking scheme can be found at the below link.

[Planning Committee guidance](#)

PLANNING

1 October 2025
10.05 - 11.30 am

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Bennett, Dryden, Flaubert, Griffin, Illingworth and Thornburrow (Vice-Chair)

Also present Councillor: Gawthrope Wood

Officers:

Area Development Manager: Jane Rodens

Principal Planner: Aaron Coe

Principal Planner: Amy Stocks

Planning Officer: Helen Newman

Legal Adviser: Richard Pitt

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Sarah Michael

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/81/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Todd-Jones and Howard, (Councillor Bennett attended as his Alternate).

Councillor Bennett proposed and Councillor Griffin seconded Councillor Thornburrow as Vice Chair for this committee meeting. This was **unanimously agreed**.

25/82/Plan Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

25/83/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 5 June and 23 July 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

25/84/Plan 25/00174/FUL 80 - 82 Lovell Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a self-build dwelling, alterations to existing access and alterations to 80 and 82 Lovell Road.

A local resident addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Mr Durrant (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Gawthrope Wood (Cambridge City Councillor) addressed the Committee as a Ward Councillor speaking in objection to the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report.

25/85/Plan 25/02452/FUL 137-143 Histon Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for conversion of the approved Plot 42 (under application reference 25/01354/FUL) into a sales office and marketing suite for a temporary 3 year period and the installation of 3 temporary car parking spaces to the rear of the sales suite which will include a disabled parking bay, EV chargers, bollard lighting and soft landscaping. Cycle parking to be provided by the front entrance of the sales office.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer

(with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted).

25/86/Plan 25/02803/LBC 4-6 Short Street

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent for external and internal repairs to numbers 4-6 Short Street, Cambridge.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for Listed Building Consent in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted).

25/87/Plan Appeals Information

The Committee noted the appeals list.

The meeting ended at 11.30 am

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack

Planning	Plan/1	Wednesday, 29 October 2025
----------	--------	----------------------------

PLANNING

29 October 2025
10.00 am - 4.55 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Thornburrow (Vice-Chair), Dryden, Flaubert, Howard, Illingworth and Todd-Jones

Also present Councillors: Bennett, Bick, Clough, Smith and Swift

Officers:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams
Principal Conservation Officer: Paul Robertshaw
Principal Environmental Health Officer: Greg Kearney
Principal Planner: Nick Yager
Principal Planner: Alice Young
Senior Planner: Dominic Bush
Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet
Senior Planner: Karen Pell-Coggins
Urban Design Officer: Egle Packauskaite
Legal Adviser: Vanessa Blane
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Sarah Michael // Matthew Hussey

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/88/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Griffin. Councillor Thornburrow said she would leave at 3pm due to another commitment.

Post meeting note: Councillor Flaubert said she was unable to join the committee at the start (10am) due to a medical issue.

25/89/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Todd-Jones	25/93/Plan 25/02161/FUL	Personal: Was a Chartered Librarian.

	Christs College	
Councillor Todd-Jones	25/95/Plan 25/03201/FUL Crossways House	Personal and prejudicial: Recused himself from this item as the Cabinet Member for Safety, Wellbeing and Tackling Homelessness. Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.
Councillor Smart	25/97/Plan 25/03078/FUL Land Adjacent to 49 New Square	Personal: Knew people who lived in the property being discussed but discretion unfettered.

25/90/Plan Minutes

No minutes were presented for review by the Committee.

25/91/Plan Committee Recording

The Committee minutes list public speakers at Committee. Please view the recording of the meeting on [Cambridge City Council - YouTube](#) to see/hear more detail about statements from public speakers and Ward Councillors.

25/92/Plan 24/04859/FUL The Paddocks, 347 Cherry Hinton Road

The Committee received a hybrid planning application comprising:

- a. Full application for Phase 1, to include the demolition of existing buildings and structures, and erection of building (Use Class E(g)) with associated site infrastructure, landscaping, car and cycle parking provision and access, including changes to the existing access road off Cherry Hinton Road.
- b. Outline application for Phases 2a, 2b, 3, 4 and 5 (with all matters reserved), to include the demolition of existing buildings and structures, and erection of buildings (Use Class E(g)).

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to the amendment sheet:

- i. Further information relating to the technical details.

- ii. Text amendments.
- iii. Pre-Committee amendments to recommendation:

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

Condition updated as follows:

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.

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)."

Howard Redhouse (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Anna Smith (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (3 votes to 3 – and on the Chair’s casting vote) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer’s report (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), subject to:

- i. the Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement which includes the Heads of Terms (HoT’s) as set out in the report with minor amendments to the Heads of Terms as set out delegated to officers;
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer’s report and amendment sheet.

25/93/Plan 25/02161/FUL Christs College, St Andrews St

Councillor Flaubert joined the Committee after the Senior Planner had started his introduction. Councillor Flaubert withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of 1970’s library and replacement with new library and social and study spaces and including re-provision of bridge to the Bodley Library. Alterations to kitchen, Upper Hall and adjacent areas including new plant, access improvements and alterations to WC provision in the SE range of Second Court. Re-landscaping of Bath Court and ancillary works. Installation of temporary kitchen and dining facility in Second Court for the duration of the works.

The Senior Planner updated the plans pack by showing a revised planning balance in his presentation. The points within the planning balance were flipped from ‘refusal’ to ‘approval’ to correct a typographical error.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet.

- i. Further representations that had been received.
- ii. Amendments to text.
- iii. Amended wording of Condition 11, 12, 15 and 16.

- iv. Approval subject to the deletion of Conditions 6, 28 and 32 and their replacement with the following condition:

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.

It shall include / adhere to the following:

- a) A phasing programme.
- 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.
- c) Control of dust, mud and debris on the highway.
- 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 accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation.
- 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.
- f) Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits and hours.
- g) Dust management and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of IAQM, 2016 and 2018;
- h) Use of concrete crushers and mitigation measures;
- i) Site artificial lighting during construction and demolition including hours of operation, position and impact on neighbouring properties.

- j) Screening and hoarding details.
- k) Consideration of sensitive receptors.
- l) A Community Liaison Plan to inform the community in respect of: - the construction required to facilitate the development - contractor point of contact, complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.
- m) Membership of the Considerate Contractor's Scheme. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed plan.

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).

Roger Hephher (HGH Consulting on behalf of the Christ's Lane Action Group (CLAG)) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Lord Simon McDonald (Applicant - Master of Christ's College) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Hugh Clough (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Naomi Bennett (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Tim Bick (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 2) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the revisions on the amendment sheet.

25/94/Plan 25/02162/LBC Christs College, St Andrews St

Councillor Flaubert joined the Committee before this item was considered.

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent for the demolition of the existing library and its replacement with a contemporary library including social and study space. Further internal and external alterations are proposed including a replacement bridge between the Bodley Library and a temporary kitchen dining facility during the duration of works.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to text amendments on the amendment sheet.

Professor Suchitra Sebastian addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Lord Simon McDonald (Applicant - Master of Christ's College) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to grant the application for Listed Building Consent in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted).

25/95/Plan 25/03201/FUL Crossways House, 176 Chesterton Road

Councillor Todd-Jones withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a temporary change of use of Crossways House from student accommodation to sheltered accommodation for people experiencing homelessness.

The Principal Planner updated her report by referring to the amendment sheet:

- i. Further representations that had been received.
- ii. Amendments to text.

Leszek Jakubowski (Chairman of Sandy Lane Residents' Association) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Chris Jenkin (Chair of It Takes A City, in his capacity as part applicant and the future management provider) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Swift (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to condition 3 (management plan) to include consultation with other specialist officers.

The Principal Planner suggested the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, Housing Officers and the Police.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the amendment to Condition 3 which would be reworded to include provision for security and consultation with appropriate consultees including Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, Housing Officers, and the Police, as well as community engagement with surrounding residents.

25/96/Plan 25/02147/FUL Cambridge Rugby Union Club, Grantchester Road

Councillors Thornburrow and Dryden withdrew from the meeting before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application was for construction of 5 floodlit padel tennis courts with canopy, club hut and landscaping.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to text amendments on the amendment sheet.

A local resident and the Chair South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Mark Batchelor (Agent) and two local residents addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Hugh Clough (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 2) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report.

25/97/Plan 25/03078/FUL Land Adjacent to 49 New Square

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey dwelling with garden and off-street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.

Kate Wood (on behalf of Willow Walk residents) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Dr Carrie Herbert MBE (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Tim Bick (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

Councillor Todd-Jones proposed and Councillor Illingworth seconded deferring the application to seek information on why the Conservation Officer thought the application would harm the setting of number 49.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to defer the application.

25/98/Plan 25/03079/LBC Land Adjacent to 49 New Square

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent.

The application sought approval for a single storey dwelling with garden and off street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.

Councillor Todd-Jones proposed and Councillor Illingworth seconded deferring the application to seek information on why the Conservation Officer thought the application would harm the setting of number 49.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to defer the application.

25/99/Plan Appeals Information

The Committee noted the appeals list.

25/100/Plan Compliance Report

The Committee noted the compliance report.

The meeting ended at 4.55 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank



25/03078/FUL – Land Adjacent To 49 New Square Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1EZ

Application details

Report to: Planning Committee

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Ward: Market

Proposal: Single storey dwelling with garden and off-street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.

Applicant: Dr Carrie Herbert MBE

Presenting officer: Charlotte Peet

Reason presented to committee: The application was heard at Delegation Panel due to the number of third-party representations received. Following a review of the application against the criteria for referral, it was decided that Planning Committee should determine the application.

Member site visit date: N/A

Key issues:

1. Principle of Development
2. Heritage Assets
3. Character and Appearance
4. Residential Amenity
5. Trees
6. Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design
7. Biodiversity

8. Water Management and Flood Risk
9. Highway Safety and Transport Impacts
10. Car and Cycle Provision
11. Third Party Representations
12. Other Matters

Recommendation: Refuse

Report contents

Document section	Document heading
1	Executive summary
2	Site description and context
3	The proposal
4	Relevant site history
5	Policy
6	Consultations
7	Third party representations
9	Local groups / petition
10	Planning background
11	Assessment
12	Principle of development
13	Design, layout, scale and landscaping
14	Trees
15	Heritage assets
16	Carbon reduction and sustainable design
17	Biodiversity
18	Water management and flood risk
19	Highway safety and transport
20	Cycle and car parking provision
21	Amenity
22	Third party representations
23	Open space and recreation
24	Other matters
25	Planning balance
26	Recommendation

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 The application seeks permission for a single storey dwelling within the garden and off street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.
- 1.2 The report explains that the proposal would significantly adversely impact the garden of No. 49 through the imposition of a new dwelling in an area which forms a unique and positive aspect of the locality, Conservation

Area, and the setting of the Listed Buildings at No. 49 and No. 2-71 Willow Walk.

It is recommended that the application is **refused**.

Table 2 Consultee summary

Consultee	Object / No objection / No comment	Paragraph Reference
Conservation Officer	Objection due to significant harm to listed building and failure to preserve character and appearance of Conservation Area.	12.0-12.11
Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions.	21.5-21.7
Tree Officer	No objection.	14.1-14.2
Ecology Officer	No objection subject to conditions.	16.1-16.3
Drainage Officer	No objection subject to conditions.	17.1-17.2
County Transport Team	No objection subject to conditions.	18.2-18.3
Third Party Representations (32)	12 comments have been submitted in support and 14 in objection, these are addressed in the relevant sections in the report.	Throughout relevant report sections.

2. Site description and context

- 2.1 The application site is located centrally within the City, it fronts onto New Square protected open space and is a short walk from primary shopping routes including Fitzroy and Burleigh Street.
- 2.2 As existing the site hosts No. 49 New Square which is a single residential dwelling and surrounding garden land. The host dwelling is a three storey, grade II listed building that sits as a prominent building on the corner of New Square and Short Street.
- 2.3 It is accessed by an existing vehicular access from Willow Walk and there is pedestrian access from New Square.
- 2.4 The application falls with the Kite Conservation Area. The application is within the setting of the No. 49 New Square (grade II listed). The site is in close proximity to Nos 1-48 New Square, Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk and Wesley Church (grade II listed).
- 2.5 The proposal is within the city centre and protected parking area.

3. The proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks planning permission for single storey dwelling with garden and off-street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.

4. Relevant site history

Reference	Description	Outcome
25/03079/LBC	Single storey dwelling with garden and off street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.	Pending consideration

Table 1 Relevant site history

- 4.1 The host dwelling has had little alteration in recent years.
- 4.2 There is a listed building application which accompanies this application, this will also be heard at planning committee today (ref. 25/03079/LBC).

5. Policy

5.1 National policy and legislation

National Planning Policy Framework 2024

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2021

Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

EIA Directives and Regulations - European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the UK's planning regime remains unchanged despite it leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development

Policy 8: Setting of the city

Policy 10: The City Centre

Policy 11: Development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area

Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use

Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation

Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle

Policy 32: Flood risk

Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration

Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust

Policy 50: Residential space standards

Policy 51: Accessible Homes

Policy 52: Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots

Policy 55: Responding to context

Policy 56: Creating successful places
Policy 57: Designing new buildings
Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings
Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm
Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge
Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
Policy 71: Trees
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development
Policy 82: Parking management

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

5.4 Other guidance

Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2024 to 2029

Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (2001).

Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)

Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.5 Area Guidelines

Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2017)

6. Consultations

Publicity

Neighbour letters – Y

Site Notice – Y

Press Notice – Y

Conservation Officer – Objection

- 6.1 The proposal will harm the setting of No 49 New Square and fails to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. The proposal would not comply with local plan policies 57 and 61.
- 6.2 In terms of the NPPF and the impact on the heritage asset the proposal would result in substantial harm. Paragraphs 207,212,213 and 214.
- 6.3 2nd Comments
- 6.4 The 2020 pre-application was for a single storey house not two storeys as stated. The anecdotal evidence that the garden to No 48 may have been bigger does not change the garden as it is now and its contribution to the setting of No49.
- 6.5 Early list descriptions are notoriously short and lack detail and rarely include references to setting. Not being included in a list description does not mean that a feature is not of significance. Setting of heritage assets is acknowledged as an important part of an asset's significance.
- 6.6 The comments about the development at No 48 were not a subtle justification of that approval just a statement of facts.

Environmental Health - No Objection

- 6.7 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition(s)/informative outlined below:
- Construction hours
 - Piling

Tree Officer - No Objection

- 6.8 The application is accompanied by an AIA. I have no objections to the proposed removals but would question whether the retention of T3 is feasible. I have no overriding objections to the proposed development.

Ecology Officer- No Objection

- 6.9 Due to the heavily managed nature of the site, it is unlikely to be able to support protected species, and no survey work is required.

- 6.10 The small sites metric which has been provided shows the scheme to result in a net loss in habitat units of 32.22%. The metric summary report states that the units to reach the required 10% net gain will be purchased from an off-site provider. This is acceptable as the site lacks opportunity for habitat creation.

Drainage Officer - No Objection

- 6.11 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition(s) outlined below:
- Foul water
 - Surface water

County Highways Development Management - No Objection

- 6.12 Following a review of the documents provided to the Highway Authority as part of the above planning application, the effect of the proposed development upon the Public Highway should be mitigated if the following conditions form part of any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal:
- Falls and levels
 - Residents permits

7. Third party representations

- 7.1 26 representations have been received, 12 in support, 14 in objection.

- 7.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

- Character, appearance and scale
- Density and overdevelopment
- Heritage impacts including conservation area and listed building
- Residential amenity impact (impacts on daylight, sunlight, enclosure, privacy, noise and disturbance, light pollution)
- Highway safety
- Car parking
- Cycle parking provision
- Loss of biodiversity
- Impact on and loss of trees
- Red line
- Certificate

- 7.3 Those in support have given the following reasons:

- Design, scale
- Character and appearance of the area
- Conservation impact
- Sustainability
- Parking
- Landscape and Trees
- Accessibility

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

8. Local Groups / Petition

8.1 The Christ's Lane Action Group (CLAG) has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Consultation
- Heritage assets
- Biodiversity and trees

8.2 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

9. Planning background

9.1 The host dwelling has had little alteration since the addition of the Conservatory. There is a listed building application which accompanies this application, this will also be heard at planning committee today (ref. 25/03079/LBC).

10. Assessment

10.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from an inspection of the site and the surroundings, the key issues are:

- Principle of development
- Design, layout, scale and landscaping
- Trees
- Heritage assets
- Carbon reduction and sustainable design
- Biodiversity
- Water management and flood risk
- Highway safety and transport impacts

- Car and cycle parking
- Amenity
- Third party representations
- Other matters
- Planning balance
- Recommendation
- Planning conditions

11. Principle of Development

- 11.1 Policy 3 seeks to focus residential development in and around the urban area of Cambridge, creating strong, sustainable, cohesive and inclusive mixed-use communities.
- 11.2 Policy 10 seeks to protect the viability of the town centre and ensure development would not adversely impact the town centres heritage or design quality.
- 11.3 Policy 52 allows for the subdivision of existing dwelling plots where the criteria in the policy would be met.
- 11.4 The application seeks to subdivide the garden land at No. 49 New Square to erect a new single storey dwelling. The new dwelling would be sited in a sustainable location, however, would fail to preserve heritage assets and deliver a high-quality public realm. The proposed dwelling is not considered to be appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and character of the area and would result in the loss of an important garden space. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policies 10 and 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and is unacceptable in principle.

12. Heritage assets

- 12.1 The application falls within the Kite Conservation Area. The application is within the setting of the No. 49 New Square (grade II listed). The site is in close proximity to the Nos 1-48 New Square, Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk and Wesley Church (grade II listed).
- 12.2 The Conservation Officer has been formally consulted on the application and objects to the application on the basis that the proposal would result in significant harm to the setting of No. 49 New Square and would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer has also raised outside of their formal comments that the proposal would adversely impact the setting of the Willow Walk listed buildings.

- 12.3 The application has received a large number of representations, some in support and some in objection. Those in support suggest the building would respect the Conservation Area, those in objection raise concerns about the adverse impacts to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the listed buildings at No. 49 and Willow Walk.
- 12.4 No 49 New Square was built in 1845, it is a grade II listed building that comprises a three storey gault brick house within a prominent corner plot between New Square, Short Street and Willow Walk. The property is unusual for its height, orientation and the spacious garden around it compared to the two storey terrace properties which are generally hard on the pavement or have small front gardens. It is noted within the Kite Conservation Area Appraisal (2014) as an exception to the two storey uniform terraces.
- 12.5 The garden forms an essential and unique part of the setting and makes a significant positive contribution to the listed building at No. 49 and Willow Walk and the surrounding Conservation Area. The representations received highlight the positive nature of this garden, it not only provides greening to built up areas but also provides a visible break from New Square allowing the listed buildings on Willow Walk to be visible. The proposal would negatively impact this important characteristic through the siting of the large, single storey dwelling in this location. This would remove the open aspect across the garden and create a continuation of modern, built form with the new development in the garden of No. 48. The effect would be to compromise the garden space and introduce incongruous levels of modern built form as to undermine the historic significance of the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 12.6 The Heritage Statement attempts to justify the approach, through the applicants description of a former car parking space adjacent to the Conservatory. Officers agree with the Conservation Officer, that this is not a convincing justification for the imposition of a dwelling in this location.
- 12.7 The current situation on the site is well landscaped garden, there is no building in this location nor has it been demonstrated that a building has ever been sited here. The proposed dwelling would completely enclose the space next to the dwelling, the new dwelling appears overly cramped, and is only 1 metre from the conservatory. As such, the relationship of No. 49 with its garden land and setting would be compromised, as would the outlook of this structure which supports the use of the building as a dwellinghouse.

- 12.8 It is outlined in the application detail that the building takes design cues from No. 48, the modern appearance with zinc cladding is considered to be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not preserve its special aspects.
- 12.9 The Conservation Officer suggests that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the listed building and Conservation Area. The proposal would also lead to less-than-substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings along Willow Walk. The NPPF (2024) sets out that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and that any harm should require clear and convincing justification, substantial harm should be exceptional.
- 12.10 The proposal results in harm to the setting of the listed building and character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This is not justified by the information submitted with the application. It is noted that the application sets out that the proposal would result in one accessible, sustainable dwelling but this is not considered to outweigh the great weight given the harm that would result from the proposal.
- 12.11 It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its siting, design, scale and massing, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings without justification. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the NPPF and policy 61 of the Local Plan.

13. Design, layout, scale and landscaping

- 13.1 The proposed development seeks to erect a single storey dwelling with garden and off streetcar parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.
- 13.2 As existing, the proposal site forms a positive part of the locality owing to its heritage significance and positive character features such as the open, verdant nature of the garden which is unique in this location. The host dwelling was a later addition in this location; the 19th century terrace properties were erected to line the green space in uniform and formal frontage. The host dwelling followed in later years to provide a unique punctuation to the properties at the northern edge of New Square. The property is unique due its form, three bays wide and three storeys high, and its garden space which other dwellings in this location do not benefit from.

- 13.3 The proposed has received representations that raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on the built environment and character and appearance of the area.
- 13.4 The proposal is considered to detrimentally impact the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling. The proposal would insert a large, single storey dwelling into the existing open garden area, destroying the open nature of this space and over dominating the garden area and enclosing the host dwelling.
- 13.5 The proposal would extend above the existing boundary wall and so be visible from both New Square and Willow Walk. This is shown within the views and elevations submitted with the application. From public views, it would read as a large, modern imposition that would cramp and detrimentally impact the unique character of No. 49 New Square. Whilst the Design and Access statement sets out that the new dwelling has been designed in two volumes to reduce the apparent massing, the form, size and appearance of the dwelling would be highly visible and dominating from public viewpoints. The single storey height, as supported in representations, is noted, however this does not mitigate the substantial impact.
- 13.6 The Design and Access places the building in the context of the modern building at No. 48 New Square, and seeks to echo the design approach of this building through the use of brick cladding and grey standing seam zinc. This approach is reductive and does not give appropriate reflection to the historic context and character of No. 49 as a unique part of the locality. In this case, the appearance emphasises the modern, uncharacteristic nature of the building within this plot and does not result in high quality design.
- 13.7 The approach to replicate the outbuilding style dwellings at No. 48 is not considered to be successful, the representations outline how the proposed dwelling would not sit as a subservient outbuilding in the same way. They suggest that the proposed dwelling has a significantly larger footprint than the original dwelling and would have domestic openings visible from outside the site to clearly read as an independent dwelling. Officers agree that this is unsuccessful due to the size and scale and fenestration detailing of the new dwelling.
- 13.8 In addition, the site did not feature any building in this location as the adjacent site did, so the site context is not the same within each plot. The representations have raised this and suggest that a dwelling in this location is not justified. Officers agree and suggest the building would sit in a manner that is unsympathetic to the existing building and open nature of the site.

- 13.9 It is acknowledged that some of the representations received support infilling in this location and the design approach to this, however the proposal would adversely impact the existing high quality character of this part of the locality.
- 13.10 One representation has suggested that delivery and postal access is not clear. The proposal has access from both New Square and Willow Walk and has sufficient space to provide a postal box in a clearly accessible location.
- 13.11 Overall, the proposed development does not respond positively to the local character and landscape and would adversely impact the townscape. The proposal is contrary to policies 55,56,57,59 of the Local Plan and the NPPF (2024).

14. Trees

- 14.1 The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment which has been considered by the Council's Tree Officer. They have no objection on request clarity on the retention of T3, having reviewed the submitted information and clarified with the applicant T3 has been marked as being retained. The trees are an attractive part of the street scene, third party representations support their retention.
- 14.2 Subject to conditions to secure compliance with the submitted information, the proposal would accord with policies 59 and 71 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

15. Carbon reduction and sustainable design

- 15.1 The application is submitted with a Sustainability Statement at part 7.0 of the Design and Access Statement. This outlines that the proposal would comprise a green roof, SuDS compliant design and include the use of an air source heat and low carbon materials. It is noted that the third party representations support the sustainability credentials of the approach.
- 15.2 The approach is considered to be acceptable in relation to carbon reduction technologies and water efficiency, however as the details have not been submitted for demonstrate compliance with policies 28 and 29 this would be required by condition in the event the application were supportable.

- 15.3 The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and is compliant with policies 28 and 29 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

16. Biodiversity

- 16.1 In accordance with policy and circular 06/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation', the application is accompanied by a small sites metric and summary which sets out that as the proposal would result in a habitat unit loss of 32.22%, units will need to be purchased from an off-site provider to meet the required 10% net gain. A third party representation has suggested that off-site demonstrates that the site is cramped. The application has followed the BNG hierarchy, and off-site is considered a reasonable way to address the net gain required.
- 16.2 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, who raises no objection to the proposal and recommends conditions regarding statutory BNG and enhancement which are reasonable to ensure the protection of species and the estimated biodiversity net gain is delivered.
- 16.3 In consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, officers are satisfied that the proposed development could comply with policy 70 of the Local Plan, the Biodiversity SPD 2022, the requirements of the Environment Act 2021 and 06/2005 Circular advice.

17. Water management and flood risk

- 17.1 The site is considered to have a very low risk of flooding. The Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer has advised that subject to conditions foul and surface water can be managed by condition. To ensure these matters are suitably addressed in light of flood risk and environmental pollution, these conditions are considered reasonable.
- 17.2 The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk in accordance with policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan and NPPF advice.

18. Highway safety and transport impacts

- 18.1 The application would create a new vehicular access to the rear from Willow Walk of the site to allow for one car parking space. It would also provide pedestrian access at the front of the site from Willow Walk.
- 18.2 The application has been subject to formal consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highways Authority, who raise no objection to the proposal subject to conditions. The recommended condition seeks to ensure that water would not drain onto the adopted highway and is reasonable for addition as to not disrupt the function of the highway.
- 18.3 Third party representations have raised concerns about the proposed vehicular access, suggesting that there would be difficulty manoeuvring into the driveway. The applicant has provided tracking for the driveway, and this demonstrates a car can enter the driveway area. Given that the driveway is for a single dwelling, vehicular and pedestrian splays are not required. The representations raise concerns about the potential conflict with other driveways along the road, however the proposal information shows that a car could enter and exit the driveway without conflicting with the existing gates driveways.
- 18.4 The proposal accords with the objectives of Policies 80 and 81 of the Local Plan and is compliant with NPPF advice.

19. Car and cycle provision

- 19.1 The application shows that one car parking space is to be provided on a new driveway accessed from Willow Walk, and this does not exceed the maximum parking levels set out within Appendix L. An EV charging point is to be provided within the new driveway. The Design and Access Statement outlines that cycle parking is to be provided on site, however the details of the secure and covered storage facility have not been provided. Third party representations have been received to raise concerns about the lack of this information. To ensure the proposal would have adequate cycle parking a condition could be attached if the scheme were otherwise supportable.
- 19.2 The proposal could accord with policies 36 and 81 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

20. Amenity

21. Neighbouring properties

- 21.1 The proposed dwelling would be located in the garden of No. 49 and adjacent to No. 48A. No. 48B and No. 48 also sit in close proximity. The Willow Walk properties are located across the private road to the north of the property.
- 21.2 The proposal would sit adjacent to the side elevation No. 48A, as this is a blank elevation and the dwelling would sit at a similar height to the existing building, it would not adversely impact the occupiers of this dwelling. Similarly, as the proposal is single storey, it would not adversely impact light or privacy or result in overbearing impacts to No. 48B and No. 48.
- 21.3 The dwelling would be visible from the properties at Willow Walk as the proposal does extend above the existing boundary wall, however the proposal is low in height and has been designed with a sloping roof at the roof to reduce the apparent mass and any potential for light impacts. Third party representations have been received to raise concerns about the potential light impacts to the properties on Willow Walk. The application is supported by a shadow study which shows that the proposal would have negligible impacts on surrounding occupiers and would not impact light to properties close to or adjacent to the site.
- 21.4 **Environmental Impacts**
- 21.5 The Environmental Health Officer raises no objection to the application on environmental impacts. They note the air source heat pump proposed and suggest that if it should fall under MCS standards then this should ensure that noise levels are kept to a reasonable levels at neighbouring premises. The applicant has confirmed the ASHP would meet MCS standards. As such, despite the third party concerns, the proposed air source heat pump is not considered to lead to unacceptable noise levels that would impact amenity.
- 21.6 One representation has suggested that excessive external lighting could be erected and therefore cause lighting pollution. In this case, the proposal is for a single domestic dwelling in a central location and therefore it is unlikely that external domestic lighting would cause excessive nuisance. It is considered overly onerous to add a condition to control lighting given the nature and scale of the development proposed.

- 21.7 Given the location, size, and design of the proposal it is unlikely to give rise to any significant amenity impacts in terms of overlooking, loss of daylight, enclosure or other environmental impacts. The proposal is compliant with policies 35, 50, 52, 53 and 58 of the Local Plan.

Future occupants

- 21.8 The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below. The proposal exceeds the minimum space standards.

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	2	2	1	70	103	+33

Table 2 Table showing size of residential units in comparison with the policy requirement

Garden size

- 21.9 The proposal includes space around the dwelling for a private garden, the garden space provides space for sitting out and is considered to be sufficient for the size of the dwelling. The garden, especially the sitting area outside the living room, would be partially overlooked by the existing dwelling at a close distance. Whilst this is unfortunate, there is space by the front door that would benefit from screening from the dwelling and be at a far greater angle that would not be overlooked. It is considered that given the size of the garden and the availability of some private space this is not substantial to warrant refusal.
- 21.10 The host dwelling would retain more than sufficient private garden space for day-to-day living.

Accessible design

- 21.11 The Design and Access Statement submitted states the proposal would comply with Building Regulations requirement part M4(2) and therefore, Officers consider that the layout and configuration enables inclusive access and future proofing. It is noted that third party representations support the inclusive design of the dwelling.
- 21.12 The development would comply with the requirements of Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations and would therefore comply with policy 51 of the Local Plan.

Construction and environmental health impacts

- 21.13 The Council's Environmental Health Team have assessed the application and recommended a condition relating to construction hours and piling. Given the close proximity to neighbouring occupiers, in the event that the application was supportable, these would be considered reasonable for addition.

Summary

- 21.14 The proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours and of future occupants. Subject to conditions, the proposal (in respect of residential amenity) is compliant with policies 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 of the Local plan.

22. Third party representations

- 22.1 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third party comment	Officer response
Red line incorrect	A third party representation has raised that the application red line is not correct as it does not reach the highway. The red line submitted is sufficient to provide access to the development site and therefore is not considered to be incorrect.
Invalid certificate	The certificate appears to be correct for the application submitted, and no evidence has been submitted to the council to suggest otherwise.
Consultation	<p>Third party representations have suggested the additional properties in the surroundings should have been consulted by the LPA on the application. The consultation carried out has exceed the statutory requirements and is considered sufficient.</p> <p>In addition concerns have been raised that additional reconsutlation was not undertaken on the additional documents provided by the application 15th September. This information comprises a response letter to Conservation Officer and a plan to show the former parking area which was already detailed in the Design and Access Statement. As well as some additional 3D indicative views, adding to those already on the file. There is no change to the</p>

	proposal, as such it is not considered to issue an additional consultation period.
Site History	The representations have referenced a pre-application in 2014 which was submitted by the application for a new dwelling. Whilst this does not form a material consideration in the consideration of the application, it is noted by Officers.
Substation	Representations have raised that the proximity to the substation may breach legislation, this is not a matter within planning legislation and therefore cannot be considered as part of the application.
Precedent	Representations have raised that the raise that the site could form a precedent for future development, each application is determined on its own merits so this is not a consideration.
Right to light	A right to light is a civil matter between different landowners and a planning permission would not interfere with a right of light. The local planning authority has no jurisdiction in checking or enforcing a right to light. This is not a material planning consideration.

Table 3 Officer response to third party representations

23. Other matters

- 23.1 A bin store is proposed adjacent to the pedestrian access gate, this is considered to be a reasonable approach to address refuse storage.

24. Planning balance

- 24.1 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).
- 24.2 Summary of benefits
- 24.3 The application seeks to erect a single story dwelling within the garden of No. 49 New Square. The proposal would provide an additional residential unit in the city centre. The dwelling is in a sustainable location, and benefits from sustainability features such as an air source heat pump. The dwelling is designed to support the applicant as they age and is compliant with M4(2) as required by Local Plan policy (2018).

24.4 Summary of harm

24.5 The proposal, however, would have substantial detrimental impacts on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the listed buildings at No. 49 and Willow Walk and the Kite Conservation Area due to the imposition of a large building in a highly positive, open space. The siting, scale, design and appearance of the building is not considered to be appropriate within this location and would result in an overly cramped and incongruous development that is out of keeping with the existing positive character. The proposal results in substantial harm to No. 49 New Square and Conservation Area and the less-than-substantial to Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk.

24.6 Any harm to heritage assets must be given great weight (NPPF 2024), and the Local Planning Authority must have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and give special attention to preserving the character and appearance of the Conservation Area Planning (LBCA) Act 1990.

24.7 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for **REFUSAL**.

25. Recommendation

25.1 **Refuse** for the following reasons:

1. The existing site makes a distinct and positive contribution to the character and appearance of the locality due to its open and undeveloped nature. By virtue of the proposed dwelling's siting, size, design and appearance, it would diminish these positive qualities and adversely impact the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is contrary to Policies 52, 55, 56, 57 and 59 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which seek to ensure that development responds appropriately to its context, is of a high quality, that reflects or successfully contrasts with existing building forms and materials.
2. The proposal site is located within the setting of No. 49 New Square, Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk and within the Kite Conservation Area. The garden of No. 49 New Square makes an essential and unique

contribution to the setting of the listed buildings and Kite conservation area. The proposed built form would remove the open aspect of the garden, remove and truncate the walls and result in an overly oppressive and cramped form adjacent to the listed building at No. 49 New Square. The proposal is contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which seeks to preserve heritage assets and their setting and paragraphs 207, 212, 213 and 214 of the NPPF (2024).

Background papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- Cambridge Local Plan 2018
- Cambridge Local Development Framework SPDs/ Guidance



25/03079/LBC– Land Adjacent To 49 New Square Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1EZ

Application details

Report to: Planning Committee

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Ward: Market

Proposal: Single storey dwelling with garden and off street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.

Applicant: Dr Carrie Herbert MBE

Presenting officer: Charlotte Peet

Reason presented to committee: The application was heard at Delegation Panel due to the number of third-party representations received. Following a review of the application against the criteria for referral, it was decided that Planning Committee should determine the application.

Member site visit date: N/A

Key issues:

1. Heritage Assets
2. Third Party Representations
3. Other Matters

Recommendation: Refuse

Report contents

Document section	Document heading
1	Executive summary
2	Site description and context
3	The proposal
4	Relevant site history
5	Policy
6	Consultations
7	Third party representations
9	Local groups / petition
10	Planning background
11	Assessment
15	Heritage assets
22	Third party representations
24	Other matters
25	Planning balance
26	Recommendation

Table 1 Contents of report

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 The application seeks consent for a single storey dwelling with garden and off street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.
- 1.2 Listed building is required due to the impact to the curtilage listed walls that enclose and extend through the site.
- 1.3 The report explains that the proposal would result in substantial harm to No. 49 New Square (grade II listed building) and the Kite Conservation Area and less-than-substantial harm No. 2-71 Willow Walk (grade II listed buildings) due to the imposition of a large, modern building with the garden setting of No 49 New Square.
- 1.4 It is recommended that the application is **refused**.

Consultee	Object / No objection / No comment	Paragraph Reference
Conservation Officer	Objection due to significant harm to listed building and failure to preserve character and	11.0-11.17

	appearance of Conservation Area.	
Third Party Representations	2 comments have been submitted in support and 5 in objection, these are addressed in the relevant sections in the report.	Throughout relevant report sections.

Table 2 Consultee summary

2. Site description and context

- 2.1 The application site is located centrally within the city, it fronts onto New Square protected open space and is a short walk from primary shopping routes including Fitzroy and Burleigh Street.
- 2.2 As existing the site hosts No. 49 New Square which is a single residential dwelling and surrounding garden land. The host dwelling is a three storey, grade II listed building that sits as a prominent building on the corner of New Square and Short Street.
- 2.3 It is accessed by an existing vehicular access from Willow Walk and there is pedestrian access from New Square.
- 2.4 The application falls within the Kite Conservation Area. The application is within the setting of the No. 49 New Square (grade II listed). The site is in close proximity to the Nos 1-48 New Square, Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk and Wesley Church (grade II listed).

3. The proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks listed building consent for a single storey dwelling with garden and off street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.
- 3.2 Listed building consent is required as the proposal impacts the curtilage listed walls which bound and extend through the site.

4. Relevant site history

Reference	Description	Outcome
25/03078/FUL	Single storey dwelling with garden and off street car parking, on the land adjacent to No. 49 New Square.	Pending consideration

Table 2 Relevant site history

- 4.1 The host dwelling has had little alteration in recent years.
- 4.2 There is a full application which accompanies this application, this will also be heard at planning committee today (ref. 25/03078/FUL).

5. Policy

5.1 National policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2024

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2021

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

5.4 Area Guidelines

Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2017)

6. Consultations

Publicity

Neighbour letters – Y

Site Notice – Y

Press Notice – Y

Conservation Officer – Objection

- 6.1 The proposal will harm the setting of No 49 New Square and fails to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. The proposal would not comply with local plan policies 57 and 61.

- 6.2 In terms of the NPPF and the impact on the heritage asset the proposal would result in substantial harm. Paragraphs 207,212,213 and 214.

7. Third party representations

- 7.1 26 representations have been received, 2 in support, 5 in objection.

- 7.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

- Character, appearance and scale
- Density and overdevelopment
- Heritage impacts including conservation area and listed building
- Residential amenity impact (impacts on daylight, sunlight, enclosure, privacy, noise and disturbance, light pollution)
- Highway safety/ access
- Car parking
- Loss of biodiversity
- Drainage and flooding
- Impact on and loss of trees
- Certificate

- 7.3 Those in support have given the following reasons:

- Design, scale
- Character and appearance of the area
- Sustainability
- Parking

- 7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

8. Local Groups / Petition

- 8.1 The Christ's Lane Action Group (CLAG) has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Consultation
- Heritage assets
- Biodiversity and trees

- 8.2 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

9. Planning background

- 9.1 The host dwelling has had little alteration since the addition of the Conservatory. There is a planning application which accompanies this application, this will also be heard at planning committee today (ref. 25/03078/FUL).

10. Assessment

- 10.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from an inspection of the site and the surroundings, the key issues are:
- Heritage assets
 - Third party representations
 - Other matters
 - Planning balance
 - Recommendation
 - Planning conditions

11. Heritage assets

- 11.1 The application falls within the Kite Conservation Area. The application is within the setting of the No. 49 New Square (grade II listed). The site is in close proximity to the Nos 1-48 New Square, Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk and Wesley Church (grade II listed).
- 11.2 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. (Delete if necessary)
- 11.3 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 11.4 Para. 212 of the NPPF set out that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. Para. 213 states that 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification...'

- 11.5 Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) aligns with the statutory provisions and NPPF advice.
- 11.6 The Conservation Officer has been formally consulted on the application and objects to the application on the basis that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the setting of No. 49 New Square and would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer has also raised that the proposal would adversely impact the setting of the Willow Walk listed buildings.
- 11.7 The application has received several representations, some in support and some in objection. Those in objection raise concerns about the adverse impacts to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the listed buildings at No. 49 and Willow Walk, those in support suggest the building will be cohesive with the built environment.
- 11.8 No 49 New Square was built in 1845, it is a grade II listed building that comprises a three storey gault brick house within a prominent corner plot between New Square, Short Street and Willow Walk. The property is unusual for its height, orientation and the spacious garden around it compared to the two storey terrace properties which generally hard on the pavement or have small front gardens. It is noted within the Kite Conservation Area Appraisal (2014) as an exception to the two storey uniform terraces.
- 11.9 The garden forms an essential and unique part of the setting and makes a significant positive contribution to the listed building at No. 49 and Willow Walk and the surrounding Conservation Area. The representations received highlight the positive nature of this garden, it not only provides greening to built up areas but also provide a visible break from New Square allowing the listed buildings on Willow Walk to be visible. The proposal would negatively impact this important characteristic through the siting of the large, single storey dwelling in this location. This would remove the open aspect across the garden and create a continuation of modern, built form with the new development in the garden of No. 48. The effect would be to totally compromise the garden space and introduce incongruous levels of modern built form as to undermine the historic significance of the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 11.10 The objective comments suggest the proposal would result in a sprawling, two-wing dwelling with significant footprint. Officers agree with this, the

footprint is far from subservient to the main dwelling and would be excessively large in relation to the main house.

- 11.11 The Heritage Statement attempts to justify this approach, through the applicants description of a former car parking space adjacent to the Conservatory. Officers agree with the Conservation Officer, that this is not a convincing justification for the imposition of a dwelling in this location.
- 11.12 The current situation on the site is well landscaped garden, there is no building in this location nor has it been demonstrated that a building has ever been sited here. The proposed dwelling would completely enclose the space next to the dwelling, the new dwelling appears overly cramped, and is only 1 metre from the conservatory. In addition, the building would adversely impact the curtilage listed walls which current enclose and extend through the garden and help to inform the setting of No. 49 and its garden. The wall at the rear would be truncated to create an opening for parking, removing this aspect of enclosure. The walls attach to the property and this forms part of its presence, particularly to Willow Walk, and so to remove these walls adversely impacts the setting of the building. In the garden, the wall would be totally removed to make way for the property, which removes the enclosure and impacts the layout of the garden. As such, the relationship of No. 49 with its garden land and setting would be compromised, as would the outlook of the Conservatory which supports the use of the building as a dwellinghouse.
- 11.13 It is outlined in the application detail that the building takes design cues from No. 48, the modern appearance with zinc cladding is considered to be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not preserve its special aspects. The Conservation Area Appraisal notes key positive features of New Square, including the uniformity of house designs and the common use of Gault brick and slate roofs.
- 11.14 The Conservation Officer suggests that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the listed building and Conservation Area. The proposal would also lead to less-than-substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings along Willow Walk. The NPPF (2024) sets out that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and that any harm should require clear and convincing justification, substantial harm should be exceptional.
- 11.15 The proposal results in harm to the setting of the listed building and character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This is not justified by the information submitted with the application. It is noted that the

application inform sets out that the proposal would result in one accessible, sustainable dwelling but this is not considered to outweigh the great weight given the harm that would result from the proposal.

- 11.16 It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its siting, design, scale and massing, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings without justification. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the NPPF and policy 61 of the Local Plan.

12. Third party representations

- 12.1 Some of the representations received relate to matters which fall outside the scope of the listed building application. The planning application report addresses materials considerations and the topics raised are largely covered within this report (ref. 25/03078/FUL).
- 12.2 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third party comment	Officer response
Red line incorrect	A third party representation has raised that the application red line is not correct as it does not reach the highway. The red line submitted is sufficient to provide access to the development site and therefore is not considered to be incorrect.
Invalid certificate	The certificate appears to be correct for the application submitted, and no evidence has been submitted to the council to suggest otherwise.
Consultation	<p>Third party representations have suggested the additional properties in the surroundings should have been consulted by the LPA on the application. The consultation carried out has exceed the statutory requirements and is considered sufficient.</p> <p>In addition concerns have been raised that additional consultation was not undertaken on the additional documents provided by the application 15th September. This information comprises a response letter to Conservation Officer and a plan to show the former parking area which was already detailed in the Design and Access Statement. As well as some additional 3D indicative views, adding to those already on the file. There is no change to the proposal, as such it is not considered to issue an additional consultation period.</p>

Table 3 Officer response to third party representations

13. Planning balance

- 13.1 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).
- 13.2 Summary of harm
- 13.3 The proposal would have substantial detrimental impacts on the character and appearance of the Kite Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings at No. 49 and Willow Walk due to the imposition of a large building in a highly positive, open space. The siting, scale, design and appearance of the building is not considered to be appropriate within this location and would result in an overly cramped and incongruous development that is out of keeping with the existing positive character. The proposal results in substantial harm to No. 49 New Square and Conservation Area and the less-than-substantial to No. Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk.
- 13.4 Any harm to heritage assets must be given great weight (NPPF 2024), and the Local Planning Authority must have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and give special attention to preserving the character and appearance of the Conservation Area Planning (LBCA) Act 1990.
- 13.5 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for **REFUSAL**.

14. Recommendation

- 14.1 **Refuse** for the following reasons:
1. The proposal site is located within the setting of No. 49 New Square, Nos 2- 17 Willow Walk and within the Kite Conservation Area. The garden of No. 49 New Square makes an essential and unique contribution to the setting of the listed buildings and Kite conservation area. The proposed built form would remove the open aspect of the garden, remove and truncate the walls and result in an overly oppressive and cramped form adjacent to the listed building at No. 49 New Square. The proposal is contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge

Local Plan (2018) which seeks to preserve heritage assets and their setting and paragraphs 207, 212, 213 and 214 of the NPPF (2024).

Background papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- Cambridge Local Plan 2018
- Cambridge Local Development Framework SPDs/Guidance

This page is intentionally left blank



25/02831/FUL– Land at Bateman Street, Cambridge

Application details

Report to: Cambridge City Council Planning Committee

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Ward: Petersfield

1. **Proposal:** The application seeks planning permission for alterations to the existing access including improvements to the roadway by installing an impermeable surface, the introduction of an infiltration trench to provide drainage for the new impermeable surfaces, the removal of an existing hedgerow and replacement with planting, the provision of additional cycle parking for users of the Plant Growth Laboratory, and the resurfacing of St Marys Access road with a delineation of kerb line for the pedestrian route.

Applicant: Chancellor, Masters and Scholars, University of Cambridge

Presenting officer: John McAteer

Reason presented to committee: Called in by the delegation panel

Member site visit date: N/A

Key issues: 1. Design, Layout, Scale and Landscaping

2. Tree Protection

3. Biodiversity

Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions

Report contents

Document section	Document heading
1	Executive summary
2	Site description and context
3	The proposal
4	Relevant site history
5	Policy
6	Consultations
7	Principle of Development
8	Assessment
9	Design, layout, scale and landscaping
10	Trees
11	Heritage assets
12	Biodiversity
13	Water management and flood risk
14	Highway safety and transport
15	Amenity
16	Recommendation
17	Planning conditions

Table 1 Contents of report

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for alterations to the existing access including improvements to the roadway by installing an impermeable surface, the introduction of an infiltration trench to provide drainage for the new impermeable surfaces, the removal of an existing hedgerow and replacement with planting, the provision of additional cycle parking for users of the Plant Growth Laboratory, and the resurfacing of St Marys Access road with a delineation of kerb line for the pedestrian route.
- 1.2 In particular, the proposal includes the removal of a large portion of an existing Yew hedge that runs along the northern edge of the access road and is approximately 140m in length, running from the rear of St Mary's Convent to just past the rear of number 3 Bateman Mews. The hedge has been estimated to be in the region of 10 years old and is in good health.
- 1.3 The applicants state that the proposal has come about following an earlier withdrawn application in the context of the following:
- 1.4 *'A previous application (24/03297/FUL) was submitted for alterations to the existing access, which included a segregated pedestrian and cycle access. Following comments received from highways who raised concerns over the Dutch kerbed and comments received the Landscape*

Officer about lack of Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, the application was withdrawn. Comments were also received that no additional trees were proposed following the removal of those in the hedgerow and further information was needed on the proposed planting. Since the withdrawal of the previous application amendments have been made to remove the Dutch kerbed, remove the segregated cycle and pedestrian access, which now keeps the access in the existing location and provides additional space for planting along the boundary. The application is now accompanied by a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment ...'

1.5 Further the applicants set out that:

1.6 *'The hedge along the boundary with the properties on Bateman Mews will be removed to allow for the construction of the infiltration trench, which will enable the construction and longevity of the impermeable surfacing of the roadway. An assessment to whether the hedge could be retained was undertaken however due to the need for the infiltration trench and constraint of the utilities within the roadway this was not possible. This loss in vegetation will be replaced with an area of meaningful, biodiverse and ecologically high value planting which will be specified by the University of Cambridge's appointed landscape architect and ecologist.'*

1.7 Members should note that in assessing this application, there is already a roadway in situ and the overall use will remain the same. However, the proposal will improve the access for all users by providing clear and coherent design as well provide a smooth roadway which will be accessible for all users. Officers accept the need for the replacement road design and the revised landscaping proposals that arise from it and recommend that the Planning Committee **approve** the proposal.

Consultee	Object / No objection / No comment
Conservation Officer	No Objection
Local Highways Authority	No Objection

Table 2

Ecology Officer	No Objection
Environmental Health	No Objection
Landscape Officer	No Objection
Tree Officer	No Objection
Drainage	No Objection
Third Party Representations (32)	20 Objections

Consultee summary

2. Site description and context

- 2.1 The existing site comprises the access road to the Botanical Gardens, Sainsbury Lab and Plant Growth Lab and lies within the Central Conservation Area of the City of Cambridge. The Grounds of the Botanical Gardens are classified as part of the City Historic Parks and Gardens.
- 2.2 The site has residential terrace properties located on Bateman Street and Norwich Street to the North, the Botanical Gardens to the South, and residential and commercial areas to the East and West.

3. The proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks planning permission for alterations to the existing access including improvements to the roadway by installing an impermeable surface, the introduction of an infiltration trench to provide drainage for the new impermeable surfaces, the removal of an existing hedgerow and replacement with planting, the provision of additional cycle parking for users of the Plant Growth Laboratory, and the resurfacing of St Marys Access road with a delineation of kerb line for the pedestrian route.
- 3.2 The application has been amended to address representations; the landscape design plan has been revised several times, removing trees from the proposed replacement hedge to address neighbour objections, and additional plans have been added to provide clarity for interested parties. Revised Flood Risk Assessment Calculations have been provided

to address Drainage concerns, and likewise revised BNG Metrics and Assessment have been submitted to address concerns raised by Ecology.

- 3.3 A similar application was submitted in 2024 under planning reference 24/03297/FUL. However, this received objections from the Landscape and Highways Teams and Officers recommended that the application be withdrawn.

4. Relevant site history

Reference	Description	Outcome
24/03297/FUL	Alterations to the existing access road due to issues with current drainage scheme. The main changes proposed are: improvements to the roadway by installing a more robust impermeable surface, segregating pedestrian and cyclist facilities from vehicle traffic, introduction of an infiltration trench to provide positive drainage for the new impermeable surfaces, removal of an existing hedgerow and replacement with greater value planting, provision of additional cycle parking for users of the Plant Growth Laboratory.	Withdrawn

Table 2 Relevant site history

5. Policy

5.1 National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2024

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2019

Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

EIA Directives and Regulations - European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the UK's planning regime remains unchanged despite it leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle

Policy 32: Flood risk

Policy 55: Responding to context

Policy 56: Creating successful places

Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm

Policy 61: Heritage

Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance

Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats

Policy 71: Trees

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

Development affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted 2009

Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010

Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009

Developments (2010)

5.4 Area Guidelines

Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

6. Consultations

Conservation Officer- No Objection

- 6.1 No Objection was received from the Conservation Officer. The application was assessed and it was considered that the proposal would not give rise to any harm to heritage assets.

Ecology Officer- No Objection

- 6.2 The Ecology officer originally placed a holding objection on the proposal subject to further ecology information. Revised BNG calculations were provided, and the holding objection was removed, subject to conditions for statutory BNG provision, ecological measures, and ecology enhancement.

Environmental Health- No Objection

- 6.3 No objection was received from the Environmental Health Officer subject to conditions for construction/demolition hours, and demolition / construction collections/deliveries.

Drainage Officer- No Objection

- 6.4 The Drainage Officer originally placed a holding objection on the proposal subject to further information. Revised drainage calculations were provided and the officer confirmed that their objection could be removed.

Landscape Officer- No Objection

- 6.5 Informal consultations brought no objections from the Landscape Officer. The loss of the existing hedge was noted, but the necessity of the works and the ecological diversity of the replacement hedge was appreciated.

Trees Officer- No Objection

- 6.6 No objection was received from the trees officer. They advised that the risk to trees on site is low, given that the excavation will not extend below the depth of existing surfacing. They confirmed that there were no arboricultural reasons why the development could not proceed.

Local Highways Officer – No Objection

- 6.7 No objection was received from the Local Highways Officer. No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway was found to result from the proposal should it gain the benefit of planning permission.

7. Third party representations

- 7.1 20 representations have been received, all in objection.
- 7.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:
- Loss of hedging
 - New trees impacted neighbouring properties
 - Irrigation and drainage concerns
 - Loss of biodiversity in the area
- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

8. Assessment

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from an inspection of the site and the surroundings, the key issues are:
- Principle of development
 - Design, layout, scale and landscaping
 - Trees
 - Heritage assets
 - Biodiversity
 - Highway safety and transport impacts
 - Car and cycle parking
 - Amenity
 - Third party representations

9. Principle of Development

- 9.1 The proposed development seeks to make alterations to the existing access road on site, creating a more robust and impermeable surface and a new infiltration trench and additional cycle parking. Officers consider that the proposed works are necessary for the continuing effectiveness of the access road, which serves the Sainsbury Lab, Plant Growth Lab and the rear of the Botanical Gardens.
- 9.2 The principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with the Local Plan.

Design, layout, scale and landscaping

- 9.3 The proposed alterations to the access would have a very limited impact upon the surrounding area, aside from the removal of the hedgerow which will be discussed below. Landscaping Officers have been consulted on the proposal, and whilst the loss of the hedge still forms part of the proposal, the requirement for its loss is deemed necessary and justifies the works. The changes are considered to be necessary, minor in scale, and justifiable under current legislative criteria. To ensure that the local residents are not impacted by lighting pollution, the applicants advise that no lighting which has tall columns is proposed, with downward facing lighting bollards proposed to reduce indirect light pollution. The new asphalt surface will be finished in a buff colour, which is acceptable.
- 9.4 Overall, the proposed development is a high-quality design that would contribute positively to its surroundings and be appropriately landscaped. The proposal is compliant with policies 55, 56 and 59 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

10. Trees

- 10.1 The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement, and Tree Protection Plan which have all been reviewed by the Trees Officer.
- 10.2 As per the advice of the Trees Officer, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable. The details laid out in the three tree protection documents are deemed sufficient to address any potential harm to protected trees in the area.
- 10.3 The removal of the hedge has been justified by the requirement for a traditional filter drain along the northern edge of the site to service the new asphalt surface of the road, precisely where the current hedge is located. The proposed replacement hedge would be planted just north of the existing at 1.5 metres in height and maintained at 1.8 metres height. These dimensions are considered sufficient to replicate the appearance and noise attenuation properties of the existing hedge as soon as planting is complete. In addition, the proposed hedge would comprise a variety of species which would improve the biodiversity of the local area, in comparison with the existing mono-species Yew hedge.
- 10.4 The Trees Officer has advised that by its nature the current hedge is not protected by a TPO or its location within the Conservation Area. Whilst

officers acknowledge the loss of the hedge, there is no legislative reason why its removal should not be permitted, and the proposed replacement hedge would serve the same form and function for residents in the area.

- 10.5 Subject to conditions as appropriate, the proposal would accord with policies 59 and 71 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

11. Heritage assets

- 11.0 The Cambridge University Botanic Garden is a Grade II* Park and Garden and the site is also within the Cambridge Central Conservation Area, also known as New Town and Glisson Road Common Conservation Area.
- 11.1 The Conservation officer has reviewed the proposal and has not objected stating that no heritage harm would arise from the proposal. The changes to the access would have very limited impact upon the Conservation Area or Botanic Gardens.
- 11.2 The proposal would not give rise to any harmful impact on the identified heritage assets and is compliant with the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the NPPF and policy 61 of the Local Plan.

12. Biodiversity and Ecology

- 12.1 In accordance with policy and circular 06/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation', the application is accompanied by a preliminary ecological appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment which sets out that the proposed development will result in a net gain in habit biodiversity of +10.06%, and a net gain in hedgerow biodiversity of +122.08%.
- 12.2 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer. They advise that the site does not lie within any impact risk zones for statutory protected sites however the site lies within Botanic Garden City Wildlife Site, designated for its invertebrate population. Local species records show the presence of species such as bats, badger, hedgehog, great crested newt, water vole, birds, flowering plants, and invertebrates.
- 12.3 The site consists of sealed surface, unvegetated unsealed surface, sparsely vegetated land, shrubs, scattered tree, and a hedgerow with trees. Much of the works on site are to the unsealed surface to replace this with a sealed surface. The hedgerow and underlying sparsely vegetated land is to be replaced with a grassland and new hedgerow of a

higher biodiversity value. No habitats of value, or of contribution to the CWS designation, are impacted. As such, although the development lies within the CWS boundary, the works are acceptable in regards to CWS impact. No objection is raised to the proposal. Several conditions to ensure the protection of species and the estimated biodiversity net gain is delivered are recommended.

- 12.4 Officers are satisfied that the proposed development complies with the Biodiversity SPD 2022, the requirements of the Environment Act 2021 and 06/2005 Circular advice.

13. Water management and flood risk

- 13.1 The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered at low surface water flood risk. The applicants state that the proposed replacement of the road's surface will provide a long-term solution to a current failing road surface. In practice, the prior design of a permeable surface to help reduce surface water runoff typically, is a more sustainable practice than standard asphalt. However, in its current state and with the regular need for maintenance, any benefits it may have had are no longer being realised. The scheme is designed in line with the SUDs Manual and Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.
- 13.2 The applicants have submitted Drainage calculations in support of the proposal and upon review the Drainage Officer has advised that they are acceptable and no further information is required.
- 13.3 It is therefore considered that the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and subject to conditions the proposal is in accordance with policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan and NPPF advice.

14. Highway safety and transport impacts

- 14.1 The applicants set out that the access from Bateman Street will be improved, not only for the Botanic Garden roadway but also the access for St Marys School. Due to the restricted width along the school's land to the gate of the Botanic Gardens, caused by existing parking, a provisional area for pedestrians will be provided along the western edge giving a clear and direct route to the entrance. Flush set granite kerbs shall be used in the existing corridor to delineate this separation from vehicles.

Additional cycle parking for the users of the Plant Growth Laboratory will be provided. 10 additional cycle parking spaces will be introduced in the form of a sheltered unit. The proposal is accompanied by vehicular tracking plans.

- 14.2 The application has been subject to formal consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highways Authority and Transport Assessment Team, who raise no objection to the proposal.
- 14.3 It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with the objectives of the Local Plan and is compliant with NPPF advice.

15. Amenity

Neighbouring properties

- 15.1 A number of neighbour objections concerned the trees to be planted within the replacement hedge along the Northern boundary of the site, impacting the amenity of properties along Bateman Mews with windows facing South. However, these trees have subsequently been removed from the proposal, and the proposed replacement hedge will be maintained at no more than 1.8 metres in height. It is thought that no other part of the proposal will impact amenity issues aside from the construction process itself; as a result, the Environmental Health officer has requested conditions pertaining to hours available for construction/demolition, and collections and deliveries.
- 15.2 Given the adjacent context, location, size, and design of the proposal it is unlikely to give rise to any significant amenity impacts in terms of overlooking, loss of daylight, enclosure or other environmental impacts. The proposal is compliant with policies 35, 50, 52, 53 and 58 of the Local Plan.

Summary

- 15.3 The proposed alterations to the access would ensure its viability for the foreseeable future for the Botanical Gardens, Sainsbury Lab and Plant Growth Lab. In addition, the proposed replacement hedge would improve the biodiversity of the area. The revised access arrangements have arisen from stakeholder engagement and the plans have been amended to address neighbour concerns.
- 15.4 No heritage or ecological harm arises from the revised proposal and the proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours. Subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with policies 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61

and 71 of the Local Plan. The associated construction and environmental impacts would be acceptable in accordance with policies 33, 34, 35 and 36 of the Local Plan.

- 15.5 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval.

16. Recommendation

- 16.1 **Approve** subject to:

-The planning conditions as set out below with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers.

17. Planning conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. The proposed new hedge shall be regularly managed during the course of any one year at a retained height of no more 1.8m from ground level. All new lighting shall be in the form of downward facing lighting bollards no higher than 1.5m from ground level.

Reason: In order to safeguard residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 55, 56, 59)

4. All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained within the Ecological Walkover (Nicholsons, May 2025).

Reason: In order to protect ecology (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 59 and 70)

5. All approved landscaping shall be fully carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the first planting season following the removal of the existing hedge or in accordance with an alternative phasing plan for provision.

Reason: In order to ensure appropriate and timely re-provision of landscaping (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 59)

6. No construction or demolition work shall be carried out and no plant or power operated machinery operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless alternative hours are otherwise previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

7. Statutory BNG condition

Informatives:

1. Nesting birds - The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.
2. Bats - Works should proceed with caution and in the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from one of the following: a bat consultant, the UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300228, Natural England: 0300 0603900, or the Cambridgeshire Bat Group www.cambsbatgroup.org.uk

Background papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Appendix 1: Decisions Notified By The Secretary of State

REFERENCE	SITE ADDRESS	DETAILS	DECISION	DECISION DATE	PLANNING DECISION
25/00919/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3371125)	Land To The Rear Of 142 Chesterton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 1DA	Conversion of the existing garage into a one-bed dwelling following subdivision of the residential plot, together with associated alterations - part-retrospective	Appeal Dismissed	03/11/2025	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)

25/02505/ADV (APP/Q0505/Z/25/3372900)	Pavement Outside 58 Regent Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1DP	Installation of 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit	Appeal Dismissed	10/11/2025	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)
25/02504/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3372899)	Pavement Outside 58 Regent Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1DP	Installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.	Appeal Dismissed	10/11/2025	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)

Appendix 2: Appeals received

REFERENCE	SITE ADDRESS	DETAILS	DATE LODGED
25/01683/FUL (6001322)	33 Coleridge Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PH	Erection of detached self-build dwelling together with access, cycle parking and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing dwelling.	28/10/2025

25/01431/FUL (6001460)	28 Carlyle Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3DN	Retention of use as a self-contained 1 bed flat in basement (use class C3) and a large 8 bed 8 person House in Multiple Occupation at ground, first and second floors (sui generis use) (retrospective application) and erection of cycle stores.	05/11/2025
---------------------------	---	--	------------

Appendix 3a: Local Inquiry dates scheduled

NO RESULTS

Appendix 3b: Informal Hearing dates scheduled

NO RESULTS

Appendix 4: Appeals Awaiting Decision from Inspectorate

REFERENCE	SITE ADDRESS	DETAILS	REASON
23/00566/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/23/3324785)	Pavement Outside Y59 Grafton Centre Cambridge CB1 1PS	Installation of a modern, multifunction Hub unit featuring an integral advertisement display and defibrillator	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)
23/00567/ADV (APP/Q0505/Z/23/3324786)	Pavement Outside Y59 Grafton Centre Cambridge CB1 1PS	Installation of 1no 86 inch LCD screen capable of showing illuminated static displays in sequence.	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)

<p>23/03204/OUT (PCU/RTI/Q0505/3360365)</p>	<p>Beehive Centre Coldhams Lane Cambridge CB1 3ET Cambridgeshire</p>	<p>Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site for a new local centre (E (a-f), F1(b-f), F2(b,d)), open space and employment (office and laboratory) floorspace (E(g)(i)(ii) to the ground floor and employment floorspace (office and laboratory) (E(g)(i)(ii) to the upper floors, along with supporting infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle routes, vehicular access, car and cycle parking, servicing areas, landscaping and utilities. (The Development is the subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment)</p>	<p>(Committee Decision (Area/Main))</p>
---	--	---	---

24/01244/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3361632)	Anstey Hall Maris Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 9LG	Construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation (Class C2) comprising 87 two-bedroom apartments with associated hard and soft landscaping, bin storage, cycle and car parking. Provision of new vehicular access onto Maris Lane and reconfiguration of wall with new entrance gates. New pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road.	Refusal of planning permission (Committee Decision (Area/Main))
--	--	---	---

24/01588/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3365274)	16 - 17 Sidney Street, 18 - 19 Sidney Street, And 21 Hobson Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 3HG	Demolition of existing buildings except for 16 and 17, 18 - 19 Sidney Street facades, 16 and 17 street facing roof aspect and chimneys, provision of: Replacement retail units totalling 882m2 (use class E (a) (b) (c) & (e)), 4,107m2 of office space (use class E (g) (i), (ii)), and 349m2 of community space (use classes F1 and F2), new shopfront to 16 and 17 Sidney Street and alterations to roof and northern chimney, and public realm enhancement works.	Refusal of planning permission (Committee Decision (Area/Main))
EN/00096/25 (APP/Q0505/C/25/3364436)	179 Coleridge Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PW	Without Planning Permission the construction of a detached one bed studio apartment	Appeal against enforcement notice

EN/00044/24 BOC (APP/Q0505/C/25/3370670)	139 Arbury Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 2JD	The authorised use of the property is as a single dwelling (4 beds) with a self-contained annexe (1 living/bed). I visited the site for a pre-application enquiry for the change of use of the dwelling to a guesthouse (6 beds some studios) and a separate holiday unit (2 beds) on 18 Jan 2024. The internal works had already been carried out and I then found them both on Booking.com. Related Planning Reference: Date breach occurred: 18/01/2024	Appeal against enforcement notice
25/02499/ADV (APP/Q0505/Z/25/3372766)	Pavement Outside 18 - 19 The Broadway Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AH	Installation of 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)

25/02498/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3372765)	Pavement Outside 18 - 19 The Broadway Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AH	Installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)
25/02496/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3372767)	Pavement O/S 90 Hills Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1LN	Installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)
25/02497/ADV (APP/Q0505/Z/25/3372768)	Pavement O/S 90 Hills Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1LN	Installation of 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)

25/02500/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3372838)	Pavement Outside Unit 1, 11 - 13 Rectory Terrace High Street Cherry Hinton Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 9HU	Installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)
25/02501/ADV (APP/Q0505/Z/25/3372839)	Pavement Outside Unit 1, 11 - 13 Rectory Terrace High Street Cherry Hinton Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 9HU	Installation of 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)
25/02502/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3372896)	Pavement Outside Burleigh Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1DG	Installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)

25/02503/ADV (APP/Q0505/Z/25/3372897)	Pavement Outside Burleigh Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1DG	Installation of 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)
24/04266/FUL (APP/Q0505/W/25/3373568)	122 Malvern Road Cambridge CB1 9LH	Change of use from a 6 person house in multiple occupation (C4 use) to a 9 person house in multiple occupation (sui generis)	Refusal of planning permission (Delegated Decision)

Appendix 5: Appeals Pending Statement from the Local Planning Authority

REFERENCE	SITE ADDRESS	DETAILS	STATEMENT DUE
25/01683/FUL (6001322)	33 Coleridge Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3PH	Erection of detached self-build dwelling together with access, cycle parking and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing dwelling.	16/12/2025

25/01431/FUL (6001460)	28 Carlyle Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3DN	Retention of use as a self-contained 1 bed flat in basement (use class C3) and a large 8 bed 8 person House in Multiple Occupation at ground, first and second floors (sui generis use) (retrospective application) and erection of cycle stores.	17/12/2025
---------------------------	---	--	------------