

City Delegation meeting 4 August 2026

Agenda

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

Attendees: Katie Porrer (Chair of Planning Committee), Michael Hammond (Team Leader), Laise Facada, Karen Pell-Coggins, Laurence Moore

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

26/01664/FUL – 17 Adams Road Newnham

Demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of 1 No. self/custom build dwellinghouse.

Reason for Inclusion

Number of objections

Discussion

The case officer presented the application and summarised the nature of the representations made.

Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns

The application does not raise significant impacts beyond the immediate locality and is not of a nature to warrant consideration by planning committee. Walnut tree staying/dealt with by condition. No policy that can resist demolition on sustainability grounds.

Significant implications for adopted policy

The proposal did not seek to challenge whether any of the policies in the local plan were up-to-date. The scheme did not trigger a wide array of policies or create any doubt as to which policies were engaged for decision making purposes. The planning concerns, including the scheme's compatibility with adopted policy, were not considered significant and did not warrant referral.

The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development

The proposal represents a minor form of development and is neither of a scale or complexity to warrant referral to planning committee.

Planning history

No relevant planning history.

Degree of public involvement

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

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

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

.....

Development

26/01905/FUL – 18 Carlton Way West Chesterton

Conversion of Existing Dwelling (C3) to 11 Bedroom 11 Person HMO (Sui Generis) with single storey rear extension

Reason for Inclusion

Ward member requested – Cllr Dalzell

1. The New Scheme Does Not Substantively Differ from the Previously Refused Application
2. The Permitted Development Claim for the Loft Extension is Not Credible
3. Over-Concentration — Assessment is Too Narrow
4. Cycle Parking — Live Unresolved Objection
5. Loss of Family Housing
6. Management Statement — Adequacy

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

The application does not raise significant impacts beyond the immediate locality and is not of a nature to warrant consideration by planning committee.

Significant implications for adopted policy

The application gives rises to a complex consideration of policies concerning the HMO policy, particularly given the introduction of the limited weight that can now be attributed to the Emerging Local Plan. The scheme's compatibility with adopted policy is of wider interest and warrants referral.

The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development

Given the planning history and no. of proposed future occupants (11no.) there are complexities with this application including HMO amenity standards and the management of the site that warrant referral.

Planning history

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

Previous application for loft conversion and HMO conversion that was previously refused. The site has a complex planning history and includes retrospective works that are now alleged to be permitted development. As per above, this warrants referral in combination with the nature, scale and complexity of the project.

Degree of public involvement

The proposal itself did not appear to have resulted in representations from a significant wider populace. 3no. third party representation and one councillor call in. The degree of public involvement did not warrant referral.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee

.....

Development

26/02504/FUL – 37 Tenison Road Petersfield

Change of use and conversion of an existing single dwelling (Class C3) to a large 6 bedroom up to 9 person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Sui generis).

Reason for Inclusion

Ward member requested – Cllr Fisher

1. Over-concentration of such a use in the local area

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 Fisher.

Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns

The application does not raise significant impacts beyond the immediate locality and is not of a nature to warrant consideration by planning committee.

Significant implications for adopted policy

The application gives rises to a complex consideration of policies concerning the HMO policy, particularly given the introduction of the limited weight that can now be attributed to the Emerging Local Plan. The scheme's compatibility with adopted policy is of wider interest and warrants referral.

The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development

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

The internal arrangement of the HMO and change of use does not in of itself raise complex planning issues. However, no management plan is provided with the application and given the nature of the use there is no certainty at this time that this could be managed in principle and/or dealt with by condition. No details of cycle parking have been presented at this time either. Given the lack of detail and uncertainty regarding these matters it is considered that this warrants referral.

Planning history

1994 permission for change of use from student house to dwelling house. However significant time has elapsed since then so not of significance.

Degree of public involvement

No third party reps at time of writing but noted there is still one week left on the public consultation so this could change in future.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee