

Public Document Pack

Planning	Plan/1	Wednesday, 25 June 2025
----------	--------	-------------------------

PLANNING

25 June 2025
10.15 am - 7.15 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Dryden, Flaubert, Howard, Illingworth, Porrer, Thornburrow and Bennett

Also present Councillors: Clough, Davey, Tong, Glasberg and Robertson

Officers:

Area Development Manager: Jane Rodens
Historic Environment Team Leader: Christian Brady
Principal Planner: Tom Gray
Senior Planner: Beth Clark
Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet
Senior Planner: Amy Stocks
Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies
Scientific Officer: Elizabeth Bruce
Planning Officer: Laise Facada
Legal Adviser: Richard Pitt
Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/61/Plan Apologies

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

25/62/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Thornburrow	25/63/Plan	Personal: Used to be a Director of Cambridge Architect Research. The independent

		structural engineer mentioned in the Officer's report worked for this organisation. Councillor Thornburrow had undertaken no work for Cambridge Architect Research since becoming a Councillor.
Councillor Porrer	25/67/Plan, 25/68/Plan, 25/69/Plan	Personal: Was a Ward Councillor for Market. Had been copied into email correspondence about the application but her discretion was unfettered.
Councillor Ashton	25/67/Plan, 25/68/Plan	Personal: Called items into Committee for decision but had not recommended support or objection of the applications.
Councillor Bennett	25/67/Plan, 25/68/Plan	Personal: Sat on Planning Committee when these applications were previously considered. Took different positions when voting so was not predisposed towards a decision.
Councillor Bennett	25/69/Plan	Personal: Sat on Planning Committee when this application was previously considered. Was not predisposed towards a decision.
Councillor Smart	25/69/Plan	Personal: Lived in the area near the application. Discretion unfettered.

25/63/Plan 25/0432/TTPO Sturton Street

The Committee received an application to remove (fell) to ground level and treat stumps to prevent regrowth London Plane trees located within the grounds of St Matthews Centre opposite 193 Sturton Street.

The Arboricultural Officer updated her report by referring to additional applicant and objector representations on the amendment sheet.

Four local residents addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Councillors Davey, Tong, Glasberg* and Robertson (Cambridge City Ward Councillors) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application and concluded by asking the Committee to refuse the tree removal. (*Introduced herself as Ward Councillor and Spokesperson for Environment on the Green Group.)

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that paragraph 32 should be amended to say "alleged damage".

This amendment was **carried nem con**.

The Committee:

As the Officer report included options, but not recommendations on page 14, Councillor Thornburrow proposed and Councillor Howard seconded refusing consent for tree works.

Unanimously resolved to reject the tree work.

25/64/Plan 23/04380/FUL Land At Ditton Walk

Councillor Howard left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

Councillor Bennett was present as a Ward Councillor for the duration of this item but did not take part in the debate or decision making.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 12 dwellings, including 3 affordable dwellings, and associated works including alterations to access to the site and creation of second access.

The Senior Planner updated her report correcting a typographical error: The date of the plans pack was 26 June 2025 not 2024. Updated visuals were shown as part of the Senior Planner's presentation to committee.

James Stone (Applicant's Agent) and Dave Clarke (SRL Noise Consultant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillors Tong and Bennett (Cambridge City Ward Councillors) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application and concluded by asking the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Ashton proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a reference about protection of trees.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0.**

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a reference that the site was not accessible.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0.**

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a reference that cycle parking arrangements were unsatisfactory and should not be at the front of properties.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0.**

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report and amended above (with delegated authority to Officers to make amendments to the reasons in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes).

Draft reasons for refusal on application 23/04380/FUL (Ditton Walk):

1. Policy 27 refers to site specific development opportunities. The policy states that proposals shall be supported at these sites subject to any issues of flooding or contamination are addressed, design considerations, satisfactory access and other infrastructure and other requirements where policy dictates are provided. Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan dictates developments will not lead to significant adverse effects and impacts on health and quality of life/amenity from noise and vibration. The proposal fails to appropriately address noise impact issues from the operation of the existing neighbouring oil depot on the future occupants of the proposed dwellings and is therefore contrary to policy 35. As the proposal fails to adhere to other requirements where other policy dictates, the proposal fails to accord with policy 27. Therefore, the principle of the development is unacceptable and is contrary to policy 27 of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018).
2. There has been insufficient information submitted regarding the potential harm to the future occupants of the dwellings in relation to the neighbouring oil depot. In the absence of a robust BS4142 assessment it is not possible to establish if the package of noise mitigation proposed is satisfactory in mitigating the potential adverse noise impacts for future occupants both externally and internally. The proposal would fail to integrate into the area where existing businesses (Certas Oil depot) operate. From the lack of a robust assessment and suitable mitigation measures to address the existing noise levels from the oil depot, future occupants would likely experience adverse levels of noise from the operation of the existing business which will likely result in complaints which the local authority have a duty to act upon. This action could result in unreasonable restrictions being placed on the operation of the depot.

The proposal is contrary to policies 27 and 35 of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018), paragraphs 125 c), 135. f), 187. e), 198. a) and 200 of the NPPF (2024), and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design & Construction SPD (2020).

3. The proposed development sees the removal of trees on site that are protected (TPO). Although the proposal sees the retention of a group of trees known as 'G1' (located along the boundary between the site and neighbouring oil depot) three other protected trees are being removed (Trees T1, T2 and T3). The layout of the proposal fails to respect the value of these trees and ultimately fails to respond to their retention. The application is therefore contrary to policies 59, 71 of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018).
4. The proposal fails to provide adequate pedestrian walkways and footpaths throughout the site, resulting in pedestrians and vehicular traffic sharing an access. The lack of pedestrian walkways would not allow for safe manoeuvring around the site and poses an issue to those who are visually impaired as there would be no discernible difference in the paving proposed to those who may use an aid such as a cane when walking. The application fails to incorporate inclusive access and is therefore contrary to policies 56, 59 of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018) and paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
5. The proposal fails to provide adequate cycle storage in accordance with local policy and guidance. Plot 12 sees cycle parking provided exclusively to the front, cycle parking on all other plots are provided via a split arrangement with cycle storage to the front and rear of the plots. As per Appendix L of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018), cycle parking should be located at the front of the house and should be as convenient as car parking. The split store arrangement does not accord with this requirement as the spaces to the rear of the dwellings are not to be considered as convenient as car parking. The plans provided show cycle storage would not be of a size that would be of an appropriate size to accommodate the number of cycles required. As the proposal fails to provide adequate cycle parking arrangements on site the proposal is

contrary to policies 57, 82 and Appendix L of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018) and the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010).

25/65/Plan 22/02066/CONDF Owlstone Croft AQDMP

Councillor Bennett joined the Committee as Councillor Howard's Alternate before this item was considered.

The Committee received an application that sought approval for submitted details required by condition 8 (Air Quality and Dust Management Plan) of planning permission 22/02066/FUL.

A representative of the Governors of Newnham Croft Primary School addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Councillor Clough (Cambridge City Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed and Councillor Baigent seconded deferring the application to seek further information.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to defer the application.

25/66/Plan 24/04582/FUL Innisfree, 1B South Green Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing building and erection of a replacement two storey dwelling with a basement and single storey rear wing (Self-Build) at 1B South Green Road.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to additional representations in objection and support on the amendment sheet.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring in her committee presentation to updated condition 18 wording regarding replacement planting.

A resident of South Green Road addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Professor McCorquodale (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillors Clough and Glasberg (Cambridge City Ward Councillors) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions) 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 18 regarding the replacement planting.

25/67/Plan 25/00516/FUL Varsity Hotel

Councillor Flaubert left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

Councillor Porrer joined the Committee as Councillor Flaubert's Alternate before this item was considered.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of a pergola with retractable canopy and associated works.

Will Davies (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee Manager read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Bick (Cambridge City Ward Councillor) about this application and the following one. Councillor Bick raised objections to the applications.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 3) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report.

25/68/Plan 25/00411/FUL Varsity Hotel

Councillor Thornburrow left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to continue debating planning applications after the 6pm guillotine.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for installation of a new all-weather, stepped in, retractable roof canopy with independently supported tensile roof fabric and associated works.

Will Davies (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report.

25/69/Plan 25/01440/FUL 22 Grafton Street

Councillors Ashton and Dryden left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use of Grafton House to a seven bed seven person HMO (houses in multiple occupancy) and one bed studio.

A resident of Grafton Street addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Matthew White (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee Manager read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Bick (Cambridge City Ward Councillor) about this application.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative requesting the wisteria (plant) be kept in place.

This amendment was **carried nem con.**

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a condition that the one-bedroom flat remained one bedroom occupancy.

This amendment was **carried nem con.**

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0) 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 planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- ii. delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional condition:
 - a. the one bedroom flat remained one bedroom occupancy;
- iii. an informative included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. requesting the wisteria (plant) be kept in place.

25/70/Plan Appeals Information

The Committee noted the appeals list.

The meeting ended at 7.15 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank