

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

23 April 2025
10.00 am - 2.45 pm

Present: Councillors S. Smith (Chair), Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Flaubert, Porrer, Smart, Thornburrow, Cahn, Fane, Hawkins, R.Williams and Garvie

Councillor Bradnam did not take part in item 25/17/JDCC but was present in the Chamber.

Councillor R. Williams left after the vote on item 25/17/JDCC

Officers Present:

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly
Principal Planner: John Shuttlewood
Principal Planner: Janine Richardson
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe
Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

Developer Representatives:

University of Cambridge: Matthew Johnson (Head of Development for Northwest Cambridge)
Hawkins\ Brown: Darryl Chen (Partner, Urba Design Sector Lead)
Hawkins Brown: Diego Grinberg (Associate)
Grant Associates: Clare Hobart (Senior Associate, Landscape Architect)
KMC Transport Planning: Elliot Page (Director)
The Crown Estate: Lizzie Sears (Development Manager)
Studio Egret West: Caitlin Simcock (Project Architect)
Montagu Evans: Ashley Collins (Partner, Commercial Planning)
3PM: Thomas Primavesi (Senior Project Manager)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/14/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Stobart (Councillor Garvie attended as an alternate) and Councillor Baigent for whom no alternate attended.

Councillor Hawkins and Councillor Bradnam provided apologies for lateness.

As the JDCC Chair (Councillor S Smith) was to recuse himself from item 25/17/JDCC and the Vice-Chair (Councillor Bradnam) was not present at the beginning of the meeting a Chair and Vice Chair was elected for the consideration of item 25/17/JDCC.

Councillor Smart proposed and Councillor Porrer seconded Councillor Thornburrow to preside as Chair for item 25/17/JDCC. Committee, then upon the proposal of Councillor Fane seconded by Councillor R. Williams, approved that Councillor Cahn should act as Vice Chair. The Councillor elections to these roles (required for the consideration of item 25/17/JDCC only) was agreed nem con.

25/15/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
25/17/JDCC	R. Williams	Personal: A colleague lives in Howes Place. Discretion unfettered
25/18/JDCC	R. Williams	Personal: Applicant for the pre-application developer briefing is the University of Cambridge who is his employer.
25/17/JDCC	S. Smith	Stood down as Chair of JDCC for this item and spoke as Ward Councillor.

25/16/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 26 February 2025 and 19 March 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The Chair, Cllr Simon Smith handed proceedings over to Cllr Thornburrow who took the Chair for item 25/17/JDCC. Cllr Smith moved to the Ward Member's seating in the Chamber.

25/17/JDCC 23/04643/OUT - Former National Institute of Agricultural Botany (NIAB), Huntingdon Road, Cambridge, CB3 0LE

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission.

The application sought approval for Outline application for the demolition of all site buildings and structures other than Chapter House and erection of buildings for a laboratory/office campus (Class E (g(i)) and (g(ii))) and associated facilities, cafe (class E(b)), access, car and cycle parking, revised access, car and cycle parking and refuse storage for the retained Chapter House with some matters reserved except for access, layout and scale.

The Principal Planner verbally updated their report with the following:

- Having read the report, the applicant would like the following to be matters confirmed/clarified:

Para 4.4

That the amendments include the stepping back of the upper storeys to Blocks B, C and D to address comments provided by residents of Howes Place.

Para 8.2 – Second bullet point

This should include the comment from residents of Howes Place that the proposed reduction in scale and massing of Block A is welcomed when compared to the consented apart hotel building.

Para 8.4

This should include reference to support from Cambridge Past, Present and Future who note “support for this revised application for the redevelopment of the site in that it proposes buildings which are lower and provide more space to adjacent neighbours than the extant permission”

The comment was submitted by Cambridge Past Present and Future on 27 Dec 2023 and is the last comment on page 2 of the planning file.

Para 13.24

We would suggest that it could be noted here that the separation distance between Building D and the northern boundary has increased on average 1.7m further from the boundary compared with the extant

consent. These dimensions can be checked against the submitted PDF plans.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from residents of Howes Place.

Paul Harney (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee Manager read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Payne (Castle Ward Councillor) expressing support for the redevelopment of the NIAB site but strongly supported the proposed conditions put forward by the residents of Howes Place.

Councillor S Smith (Castle Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee on behalf of the residents of Howes Place and Darwin Green.

The Committee were informed the applicant had chosen not to enter into a planning performance agreement with the Council nor made a pre- application presentation to the Committee. This had provided limited opportunities for Officers and the Committee to promote positive planning with the applicant, which would have led to better development. It was in this context that Councillor S Smith addressed positive planning proposals for the Committee's consideration if minded to approve the application.

Following Members questions and debate Councillor Hawkins proposed, second by Councillor R Williams to defer the application due to the ambiguity of the proposal outlined in the submission.

Cognisant of the Members' debate and the deferral proposal, the Strategic Sites Manager offered the following reasons to defer the application:

- i. to explore the agreement of a series of parameter plans on key structuring and placemaking components - access, scale and layout - together with urban design principles - graphically annotated by plans and diagrams - which would set out a framework for the reserved matters stages; and
- ii. to explore the potential for addressing the Howes Place access arrangements as set out by the residents with a view to securing this as an additional planning condition

The Committee:

The deferral of the application was carried by 6 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

25/18/JDCC Land between Huntingdon Road, Madingley Road, and the M11, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied and comments from Officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the Council as the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

- i. Who would be responsible for the maintenance of the shared gardens shown in the presentation if residents neglected them?
- ii. What would be the shade implications on the shared gardens from the surrounding housing and apartments?
- iii. What was the intention for traffic management - was there an intention to exclude traffic on site and where would this exclusion operate?
- iv. Was it correct that the taller massing was at the highest point of the site?
- v. Could there be more explanation in terms of the 'public ownership' regarding the apartments on Cartright Avenue as referenced in the presentation?
- vi. Parking per dwelling had been reduced from 1.1 (ratio for Phase one) to 0.43, why was this so and what evidence had this reduction been based upon. Was this for the same type of housing that was on Phase one or was this different?
- vii. What provision had been made for visitor parking?
- viii. Was there plans to improve the access from the Madingley park and ride site to Eddington?
- ix. Would there be plans for a car club on site and specific parking allocated to it?
- x. Could the reasoning for the reduction of landscaping from thirty metres to twenty meters between buildings be explained.
- xi. Could a breakdown of affordable housing be provided?
- xii. Would co-operative housing type structures be considered?
- xiii. Suggested that proactive advertising should be used to encourage residents outside of Eddington to access and use the site?
- xiv. Had been informed that 95% of apartments would be four to six storeys, what was the makeup of the remaining 5% percent?

- xv. Had the walking trails been planned 'in plan' or how residents would walk round the site. It was important the trails worked visually when people walked around and not just as an architect would plan it on paper.
- xvi. Would there be planning for irrigation on site to help maintain the greenery and gardens?
- xvii. Questioned if Dutch style cycle ways were suitable; there was a different culture in Holland to cycling as there was in the UK.
- xviii. Would be beneficial to see some elevational treatments in the design which dealt with overheating, particularly for single aspect homes?
- xix. It was also beneficial to consider the use of materials and other issues which could make a property cold. Important to ensure that the temperatures could be controlled?
- xx. How close was the application to using a water recycling system on site?
- xxi. Would it be possible to use the mothballed carpark on Phase one should there be a demand?
- xxii. Allotments on Phase one had still not been delivered, when would this be completed?
- xxiii. Was the application within the current Local Plan?
- xxiv. Housing for older people should be distributed across the site rather than in a block.
- xxv. Health and wellbeing of residents was very important and would like to know more about this; lessons learnt from the pandemic, open spaces, pausing places, quiet and safe spaces were needed. How had they have been incorporated into the design?
- xxvi. Welcomed the varied frontage.
- xxvii. Would strongly recommend a nursery on site which would also benefit the surrounding area.
- xxviii. A critical mass of spaces would be required for a car club and should be considered.
- xxix. Would there be segregated cycleways?
- xxx. Would be a positive to have early landscaping on site.
- xxxi. The use of apprenticeships should be encouraged by the applicant.
- xxxii. It was important to think about spaces for teenagers as this group were often overlooked, would welcome all ages play.
- xxxiii. Would hope the student housing would be year-round and not for a limited time with the rest of the year rented out on Airbnb.
- xxxiv. Extremely useful to have this exemplar pre-application briefing in the public domain which could be viewed by other developers, architects,

- designers, planning officers etc. to view examples of co-living, sustainability and street furniture.
- xxxv. Pleased that Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) were being carried out from an early stage and not at the reserved matters stages which tended to be the case.
 - xxxvi. When looking at the taller buildings in the western sector at the edge of the application it was important that the long-term landscape impacts were being contemplated, such as considering Madingley Hill (as referenced in the presentation) and the American Cemetery.
 - xxxvii. The height and roofscapes of buildings were of concern. Having different tiers of buildings was important; features in the upper storeys of buildings could have a major impact from a great distance.
 - xxxviii. The internal street scene was important and should be considered.
 - xxxix. What access would there be from the northern quarter to the green open spaces at the southern end of the site, and the open spaces of Girton and towards the American Cemetery?
 - xl. What noise mitigation methods were being put in place to reduce the noise from the M11, particularly for those properties directly facing the motorway?
 - xli. In the presentation reference was made to slip roads and negotiating with Highways England, where would these connections be and how would they impact on through traffic going through Eddington?
 - xlii. When looking at the reduction of landscaping the major roads and hierarchy of roads should be considered, the side streets and the sequence of spaces. What was experienced is what was important rather than a blanket reduction across the application?
 - xliii. Would recommend returning to the Committee for a final briefing prior to submission, including to enable members to understand the heads of terms put forward for the Section106 agreement.

25/19/JDCC Cambridge Business Park - Pilot project

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, and comments from Officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

- i. Why was the life of the building fifteen years, and would there be a plan for the building after this time?
- ii. What was the definition of an 'urban farm' referenced in the presentation?

- iii. Would recommend the inclusion of a changing place toilet, or at the least, a disabled accessible toilet.
- iv. Would encourage providing more than two spaces for cargo bike parking.
- v. Would have liked to have seen views of the module height in the surrounding areas.
- vi. How many storey's high would the lab be?
- vii. Would recommend future proofing and allowing flexibility of the use, such as Cambridge University's Hub space in West Cambridge, to allow the expansion of public amenity space if required?
- viii. Important to look at how people would be living and travelling in fifteen years' time.
- ix. There were a significant number of electric bike users who didn't have anywhere to charge them other than in small space such as corridors at home. It would be useful if employers could ensure somewhere safe for electric bikes to charge.
- x. In the presentation a reference was made to a 'lab hotel', what was this?
- xi. Noted that the Master Plan would be brought to Committee as a forthcoming briefing topic.
- xii. Should consider what the innovate water containers would look like from the road and would they be considered exemplar of their type.
- xiii. As the application was on the northern boundary of the shared cycling and pedestrian path to and from Cambridge North Station, would recommend considering the navigation through the business park to the premises.
- xiv. Should consider the potential risk of pedestrians and cyclists on the western access of the building; access was on a slope, so safety needed to be thought about.
- xv. Cycle parking had been proposed next to the shared use cycle parking on Milton Road, it was important to think about the possible conflict between cycles stopping, parking and pedestrian access.
- xvi. Should consider parking for electric bikes and scooters.
- xvii. It was important to think about the parking when hosting events on site

The meeting ended at 2.45 pm

CHAIR