

Delegation Meeting Minutes 6 Jan 2026

Delegation Panel meeting – Minutes

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

Attendees: Martin Smart (Chair of Planning Committee), Toby Williams (Delivery Manager), Karen Pell-Coggins.

Apologies: Cllr Thornburrow

Minutes approved by date: 17 Jan 2026

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

25/04315/FUL – 24 DeFreville Avenue West Chesterton

Creation of 1 No. self-contained dwelling by adapting and upgrading the existing two-storey side extension, together with a single-storey front extension

Reason for Inclusion

Number of objections: 5 objections including concerns relating to parking pressure and conservation area impacts.

Written representation from Cllr Dalzell supporting the application going to Planning Committee, on the following grounds:

1. Significant local concern and material planning issues

The application has generated multiple objections from residents across De Freville Avenue raising substantive planning matters, not simply opposition in principle. The core issues, parking displacement in a Conservation Area and impact on the character of the De Freville Estate, engage competing policy considerations that would benefit from member scrutiny.

2. Conservation Area character

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

Objectors have cited specific passages from the De Freville Estate Conservation Area Appraisal, including its recognition that few front gardens have been converted to parking, which contributes to the area's visual quality. The proposal to create front garden parking directly before a bay window, and the use of materials potentially inconsistent with local character, raises questions under Policy GP/HA that merit broader consideration.

3. Demonstrable impact on parking capacity

Residents have provided a clear analysis suggesting that the new crossover would reduce available on-street parking from four spaces to two in practical terms. Given the acknowledged parking pressure on the street (including for terraced properties with no off-street provision) I believe this is a material consideration that warrants transparent debate.

4. Accessibility and equality considerations

Confidential representations have been made regarding impact on a disabled resident. The Public Sector Equality Duty requires due regard to such matters, and Committee determination would provide appropriate oversight of how this has been weighed.

Discussion

The case officer presented the application and summarised the nature of the representations made, including those reasons for Committee's consideration given by Cllr Dalzell.

Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns and implications for adopted policy

No significant issues of policy arise. The principle of developing a new dwelling in this location is broadly uncontested. Car parking standards expressed in the adopted LP are as maximums. There is no obvious conflict with adopted policy in terms of the quantum of car parking spaces retained. The number of spaces could be reduced without planning permission.

Issues have been raised regarding the new crossover reducing available on-street parking. It is acknowledged that there is on-street parking pressure but permitted development fall-back provisions available to the applicant to create an additional access and parking space in the location proposed i.e. without the need for planning permission, neutralise planning arguments regarding the merits of their creation that may have otherwise weighed more significantly against the proposal. This factor limits the potential scope of consideration that is sought of Planning Committee.

Likewise, the permitted development fall-back, notwithstanding that the scheme is contained within the De Freville Estate Conservation Area Appraisal, means that the weight that could be afforded to this issue by the Planning Committee would be

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

limited. In coming to this conclusion, officers recognised that it is not desirable for front gardens to be converted to parking in this area. This aspect of the scheme would be inconsistent with the local character but a broader view on its acceptability in light of permitted development provisions would not be available to the Planning Committee. In summary, the planning concerns, including the scheme's compatibility with adopted policy, are not considered significant and do not warrant referral.

The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development

The proposal is for the creation of 1 No. self-contained dwelling by adapting and upgrading an existing two-storey side extension, together with a single-storey front extension. It represents a minor form of development, the physical envelope of which is largely built. Matters of scale are largely irrelevant and neither was the scheme considered to be complex or of a nature to warrant referral.

Planning History

There is no complex history on this site which indicates committee's consideration is necessary. The consented extension built on the site means that, to a very real extent, matters of character and appearance and suitability of the built form are agreeable.

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.

Other Matters

Impacts on disabled residents and implications of the Public Sector Equality Duty is not a matter outside of scope for delegated authority and can be considered by the planning officer as part of any recommendation.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee