

City Delegation Meeting Minutes 20th January 2026

Agenda

- Time: 11am to 12:30pm
- Meeting held: via Teams

Attendees: Martin Smart (Chair of Planning Committee), Katie Thornburrow (Vice-Chair of Planning Committee, Toby Williams (Delivery Manager), Tom Chenery, Lydia Green

Main issues to consider:

- Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns
- Significant implications for adopted policy
- The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development
- Planning history
- Degree of public involvement

Development

25/02764/FUL – 10-2 Montreal Square Romsey

Erection of 4 affordable dwellings following demolition of existing dwellings and garages

Reason for Inclusion

5 Objections – parking, loss of green space, trees, biodiversity

Discussion

The case officer presented the application and summarised the nature of the representations made. The objections included concerns regarding trees, highways, green space, parking pressures, impact on the highway and loss of garages. Pictures of the site were shared. No objection from the tree officer had been raised.

All the houses would be owned by a housing association and would be likely to be affordable rent and shared ownership. No statutory highway objections. Amenity considerations arise in relation to new footprints and privacy.

Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns

No material considerations arise of any significance to warrant Committee's consideration. The garages themselves are not fit for purpose for vehicular storage, and the scheme would accord with adopted standards re car parking provision.

Significant implications for adopted policy

The scheme represents a redevelopment of an existing site to provide more modern fit-for-purpose housing. No significant issues of policy arise.

The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development

The proposal is relatively simple in layout. The scheme includes standard housing types of similar scale to surrounding properties. There is no complexity integral to the proposal

Planning history

There is no complex planning or appeal history on this site which indicates committee's consideration is necessary

Degree of public involvement

Whilst the number of objections received has triggered consideration by the Delegation Panel, the proposal itself does not appear to have resulted in representations from a significant wider populace. The degree of public involvement does not warrant referral.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

Development

25/04326/FUL – 10 Ross Street Romsey

Conversion of existing dwelling to 6-bedroom, 6-persons HMO, including single storey rear extension

Reason for Inclusion

Councillor call in and over 5 objections - parking, refuse, overconcentration of HMO's in the area, harm to conservation area.

Cllr Beth Gardiner-Smith, Cllr Dinah Pounds, Cllr Dave Baigent have all made representations.

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Discussion

The case officer presented the application and summarised the nature of the representations made, including those reasons for Committee's consideration given by Cllrs. The case officer advised that the operation of a 6 bed, 6 person HMO does not in itself require planning permission, but that the extension in this case would facilitate the conversion.

Concerns had been raised from approximately 30 x third parties in relation to parking, overconcentration of HMO's, harm to residential amenity, harm to the conservation area, loss of privacy, overdevelopment, party wall, and BNG net gain. The proposal is made in the context of a similar HMO application on the same street. The Conservation Officer has raised no objection. Immediate neighbours object.

Whilst neither relevant material planning considerations, policy implications, the nature, scale and complexity of the application or its planning history were significant factors in favour of call-in, the degree of public involvement / interest in the application (more than very local in nature, including three local Cllrs), in combination with a similar application on the same street (66 Ross Street), mean that it would be in the interests of transparent and accountable decision making that Planning Committee consider the item.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee

Development

25/04322/FUL – 66 Ross Street Romsey

Conversion of existing dwelling to 6-bedroom, 6-persons HMO, including single storey rear extension

Reason for Inclusion

Councillor call in and over 5 objections - parking, refuse, overconcentration of HMO's in the area, harm to conservation area

Cllr Beth Gardiner-Smith, Cllr Dinah Pounds, Cllr Dave Baigent

Discussion

The case officer presented the application and summarised the nature of the representations made, including those reasons for Committee's consideration given by Cllrs. The case officer advised that the operation of a 6 bed, 6 person HMO does

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

not in itself require planning permission, but that the extension in this case would facilitate the conversion.

Concerns had been raised from just shy of 30 x third parties in relation to parking, overconcentration of HMO's, harm to residential amenity, harm to the conservation area, loss of privacy, overdevelopment, party wall, and BNG net gain. The proposal is made in the context of a similar HMO application on the same street. The Conservation Officer has raised no objection. Immediate neighbours object.

Whilst neither relevant material planning considerations, policy implications, the nature, scale and complexity of the application or its planning history were significant factors in favour of call-in, the degree of public involvement / interest in the application (more than very local in nature, including three local Cllrs), in combination with a similar application on the same street (10 Ross Street), mean that it would be in the interests of transparent and accountable decision making that Planning Committee consider the item.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee