

JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

16 July 2025
10.00 am - 12.40 pm

Present: Councillors Bradnam, S. Smith, Flaubert, Illingworth, Porrer, Cahn, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart and R.Williams

Councillor Flaubert left after the vote on item 25/9/JDMC

Officers Present:

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Principal Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan
Senior Planner (Strategic Sites): James Truett
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe
Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Developer Representatives:

AstraZeneca (Applicant & End User): Richard Surma
Bidwells (Planning Consultant): Guy Kaddish
Bidwells (Planning Consultant): Edward Jones
Department of Transport (Senior Programme Client): Joe Redmond
Jestico and Whiles (Architects): Jude Harris
Network Rail Town Planning and Heritage Manager (Anglia): Elliot Stamp
Network Rail: Sanjay Patel
Ramboll (Transport Consultant): Jamie Ward

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/6/JDMC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor, Baigent, Smart and Thornburrow.

Councillor Gawthrop-Wood attended as an alternate for Councillor Thornburrow.

25/7/JDMC Declarations of interest

Name	Item	Interest
Stobart	25/09/JDMC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycle Campaign

25/8/JDMC Re-ordering of the agenda

The Chair used their discretion to alter the order of the agenda items and move Minute Item 25/8/JDMC to the end of the agenda. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

25/9/JDMC Reform of Planning Committees Technical Consultation

The Strategic Sites and NSIP/Major Infrastructure Delivery Manager presented Members a report on the Councils' draft response to the Government Consultation Paper which sought views on the reform of planning committees.

The implementation of three aspects of reform proposed to modernise planning committees were highlighted, further to the introduction of the Planning and Infrastructure Bill, focusing on the following:

- i. A national scheme of delegation.
- ii. The size and composition of planning committees.
- iii. Mandatory training for committee members.

The Committee

Unanimously resolved to note the content of the report and authorised that Officers should submit a formal response based on the recommended responses contained in the report, with updates made as follows:

- i. A call-in mechanism should be included for all Tier A applications.
- ii. Where a caveat was included in a response, the default answer should be 'no' rather than 'yes'.
- iii. Mandatory Councillor training should be valid for a period of 15 months.

25/10/JDMC Address: Cambridge Biomedical Campus, 1 Francis Crick Avenue, Cambridge

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers and comments were supplied, 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. What measures would be taken to put in place a travel management plan to accommodate large numbers of people using the conference facilities?

- ii. Disabled access plans should be clear, with parking close to the building.
- iii. Clarification was sought on plans for cycle parking.
- iv. Signage and navigation to the site should be clear.
- v. Had thought been given to reducing the massing of the roof?
- vi. What were the navigation plans between this building and the DISC building?
- vii. Water use should be considered, could grey water and suds be used for flushing, etc?
- viii. What would the view from Hobson's Park look like? Concerned that the roof may be prominent.
- ix. Have the community benefits and links that may be possible with a large lecture theatre been considered?
- x. The building appeared to be heavily glazed, which was unusual from a climate perspective. It would be useful to have more information on the environmental impact of the glazing.
- xi. The wooden roof could appear to be abrupt in relation to neighbouring building styles.
- xii. Roof style could provide cooling for the building.
- xiii. What were the implications of the new rail access at Cambridge South and East West Rail on assumptions about mode of travel?
- xiv. What was being done regarding making safe cycle access easier across busy roads when approaching from West Cambridge?
- xv. The glazing would have implications on the heating/cooling systems. Had the demand for energy been considered, especially in relation to the demand for air conditioning, and how would it be tackled?
- xvi. What were the links with the energy centre on the Biomedical Campus and what would the energy usage be?
- xvii. How light was the roof and how would that contribute towards cooling of the building?
- xviii. How robust was the landscaping and how would it be managed in long term? Once the planting was in place, it must be able to survive.
- xix. How many people would the conference facility accommodate? If 60/70% were local, did the developer anticipate the remaining 30/40% might travel nationally and internationally? Many could use taxis to the site. Had the access and transport implications of the large conference facility been taken into consideration?
- xx. Bus services should be promoted.
- xxi. Sustainable transport strategy and solutions could be developed in coordination with other users of the wider site.
- xxii. Environmental sustainability outlined in the presentation was important and the building should meet the highest environmental standards.

- xxiii. Water efficiency would be crucial to the plans.
- xxiv. Consideration should be given to travel and the extent to which conferences of up to 700 people will be accommodated without causing further congestion on the site.

The Chair thanked the presenters for attending.

25/11/JDMC Address: Cambridge South Station, West Anglia Main Line Land Adjacent To Cambridge Biomedical Campus

The Principal Planner provided information on why the pre-application had been brought to Committee.

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers and comments were supplied, 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. Frustrated at the omission of public toilet facilities from the proposals; the toilet had been put forward as a benefit to offset harm to the greenbelt when members considered the station design condition (condition 17)
- ii. Assurances had been given at the time of the discharge of the station design condition (condition 17) that the automatic barrier and lack of ticket office would have no bearing on whether a public toilet could be provided. An informative was added that explicitly mentioned a publicly accessible toilet.
- iii. Suggested that a condition of rental of the retail unit could be that it included a toilet accessible to the public.
- iv. It was noted that anecdotally Greater Anglia routinely allowed people without platform tickets to use facilities at other stations.
- v. Although there was no condition, some Councillors had considered the community benefit of a public toilet in their decision to approve the station design condition application (condition 17).
- vi. Delegating responsibility of toilet provision to retail space may be an onerous responsibility for the tenant.
- vii. Disappointment expressed with the lack of public toilet facilities and the potential implication on the wider local area.
- viii. The west and east sides of the station appeared very similar from the outside. Signage on each side should very clearly state which side it was.

- ix. Disappointed that assurances made at planning stage had seemingly been disregarded.
- x. The lack of public access to toilets appeared to be down to the location of ticket barriers and their proximity to the main entrance. Could the barriers be moved so that the retail space was completely in front of them?
- xi. The retail space has provision for water and drainage. Could the whole area be used as a toilet block as this appeared to be within the physical possibilities of the site?
- xii. Could the location of the toilets be moved? It was noted that the building appeared to be almost complete, so this might not be possible.
- xiii. If toilet provision was in the retail unit, the opening hours might be limited to e.g. 9am to 5pm. This could limit access for the public.
- xiv. Putting the responsibility for toilets on the first tenant had the potential to work as a solution, but it may not be guaranteed that future tenants would want this responsibility.
- xv. Moving the ticket barrier to the rear of the unit would allow for public toilet use.
- xvi. If the two cubicles were each made to be unisex, one could be outside of the ticket barrier and one inside.
- xvii. Most station users approaching from the west would either be buying a ticket or looking to use toilet facilities, they might not necessarily be looking to use a cafe. Could the concerns of Members on this matter be accommodated as these concerns were based on consultation with residents.
- xviii. It was recognised that the application to discharge condition 17 in the Autumn would be for approval of details of the signage for the station; the signage should help people to locate themselves easily.
- xix. The toilets were a civil matter and there was no condition that requires the applicant to provide them; however Greater Anglia could set a requirement that any leaseholder provide toilet facilities.
- xx. Both the Planning Inspector and Minister had supported some provision for public benefit in considering the application.

The Chair thanked those present for their presentation and urged Network Rail and Greater Anglia to give further consideration as to whether it was still possible to provide for a publicly accessible toilet at the station (recognising the request had no planning status).

The meeting ended at 12.40 pm

CHAIR