

Delegation meeting 30 September 2025

Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

Date: 30 September 2025Time: 11am to 12:30pmMeeting held: via Teams

Attendees: Martin Smart (Chair of Planning Committee), Jane Rodens (Team Leader), Charlotte Spencer (Principal Planning Officer), Nick Yager (Principal Planning Officer), Charlotte Peet (Senior Planning Officer) Cllr Bick.

Apologies: - NA

Minutes approved by date: TBC

25/02643/FUL – Castle End Mission, 5 Pound Hill

Demolition of a metal-clad single-storey building on Pound Hill, erection of a new extension of broadly similar appearance in its place to create new community entrance and office/ meeting spaces, extension at First Floor (FF) over existing Gym Room at the southwest over the same footprint as Ground Floor (GF), extension at FF only to partially cover existing car park on northwest side of kitchen/WC block, install new accessible ramped and stepped access from Pound Hill.

Reason for Inclusion

5 or more objections- officer led

Statement from Cllr Cheney Payne read out.

Discussion

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

There are heritage concerns on the application and the harm that would be caused by the proposal, there has been no comments received from the conservation officer at



the time of the meeting. There are concerns raised about the design of the proposal and how it would impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

There are policy concerns over the material planning considerations that have been raised and they may not be able to be overcome with conditions, as there are comments still outstanding from consultees.

3. The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development.

This is considered to be a complex application that has many different elements that have raised concern from the neighbouring properties and the ward Cllr.

4. Planning history.

None

5. Degree of public involvement.

There are multiple comments on the application from the surrounding properties that have raised concerns that cannot be overcome with conditions.

In conclusion it is considered that the application is to be brought to planning committee in light of the comments made above.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee

25/03078/FUL – Land adjacent to 49 New Square Cambridge

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



Reason for Inclusion

5 or more objections- officer led

Cllr Bick – commented on the application

Discussion

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

There are concerns on the heritage impact of the proposal and the impact that the development would have on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

There are none

3. The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development.

This is considered to be a complex application that has many different elements that have raised concern from the neighbouring properties and the ward Cllr.

4. Planning history.

None

5. Degree of public involvement.

There are multiple comments on the application from the surrounding properties that have raised concerns that cannot be overcome with conditions.

In conclusion it is considered that the application is to be brought to planning committee in light of the comments made above.



Decision

Refer to Planning Committee

25/02644/FUL – St Andrews House St Andrews Road Cambridge

Erection of an external escape staircase, provision of a waste storage area, installation of plant enclosures, erection of a substation, reconfiguration of the front car and cycle parking area, installation of rooftop plant enclosures and flues.

Reason for Inclusion

5 or more objections- officer led

Discussion

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

None

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

None

3. The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development.

There are different elements that are being undertaken as part of this proposal. The works are all considered to be minimal and not highly visible.

4. Planning history.

There is no planning history on this site that would impact on the recommendation of the application.



5. Degree of public involvement.

There is some public involvement in the application and the comments that have been made can be overcome by a condition that has been suggested by the Environmental Health Officers.

Decision

Delegated decision