

JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

15 October 2025
11.00 am - 4.30 pm

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

Councillor Thornburrow was not present at the start of item 25/22/JDMC therefore was ineligible to vote.

Councillors Williams, Smith and Flaubert left after the vote on item 25/22/JDMC.

Officers Present:

Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites and NSIP/Major Infrastructure Projects):
Philippa Kelly

Strategic Sites Team Leader - Emerging Growth Sites: Jonathan Brookes

Planning Team Leader – Delivery: Mike Huntington

Legal Adviser: Vanessa Blane

Committee Manager: Sarah Michael

Meeting Producer: James Goddard, Matthew Hussey

Other Officers Present:

Principal Transport Officer: Tam Parry (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Developer Representatives:

Richard Selby, Brockton Everlast

Ulrich Van Eck, Bellway Latimer LLP

David Fletcher, Ceres Property

Alexis Butterfield, PTE Architects

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/19/JDMC Apologies

No apologies were received for this meeting.

25/20/JDMC Declarations of interest

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Bradnam	25/22/JDMC	Personal: Attended a number of exhibitions relating to this proposal and has presented to Milton Parish Council on the application. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Stobart	25/22/JDMC	Personal: Member of Camcycle Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Fane	25/22/JDMC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart	25/22/JDMC	Personal: Family member works on the science park. Discretion unfettered.

25/21/JDMC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

25/22/JDMC 24/04575/FUL 210-240 Cambridge Science Park

The Committee received an application for demolition of existing units 210, 211, 214, 220, 230, 240 and redevelopment with Use Class E(g) floorspace (office) (E(g)(i)), research and development (E(g)(ii)) with complementary floorspace (Use Class E (a-g)) along with access, landscaping and supporting infrastructure. Retention of Unit 216.

The Planning Officer updated his report by referring to:

- i. The amendment sheet.
- ii. An amendment to the Officer recommendation in their presentation as follows:

To approve subject to the conditions set out in appendix 1 of the report, the expiry of the EIA site and press notice, and completion of a s106 agreement to secure appropriate mitigation measures. In the event that any substantive / further issues are raised as a result of the EIA site notice requirement, delegated authority to determine the application is given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of JDMC;

- iii. The numbering of para 18.42 on page 68 had a typographical error and should be numbered 25.14a.

Richard Selby (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Fane proposed, and Councillor Smith seconded, an amended Grampian condition to read:

- i. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, written confirmation will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority evidencing that the anticipated additional net increase in waste water generated by the development is capable of being accommodated by the Cambridge Water Recycling Centre, or there is sufficient on-site capacity to deal with a net increase in waste water flows from the development.

This amendment was carried by **9 votes to 1**.

Councillor Porrer proposed, and Councillor Bradnam seconded, an amendment to condition 6 to relate to phasing and to include that community facilities should come forward as needed.

This amendment was **carried by 9 votes with 1 abstention**.

Councillor Porrer proposed, and Councillor Flaubert seconded, an amendment to condition 16 to refer to the applicant being required to provide commercial water metering data on request.

This amendment was **carried by 8 votes with 2 abstentions**.

Councillor Porrer proposed, and Councillor Smith seconded, an amendment to condition 22 to include reference to car clubs and cargo bikes.

This amendment was **carried by 8 votes with 2 abstentions**.

The Committee

Resolved (by 9 votes to 1) to approve application 24/04575/FUL subject to:

(a) the planning conditions and informatives set out in the officer report to committee with delegated authority to officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives (and to include others considered as appropriate and necessary) prior to the issuing of the planning permission, and:

(b) the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with delegated authority to officers to negotiate, settle and complete such an Agreement as referenced in the Heads of Terms within this report, including any other planning obligations considered appropriate and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and the expiry of the EIA site and press notice. In the event that any substantive / further issues are raised as a result of the EIA site notice requirement, delegated authority to determine the application is given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of JDMC. With the following updates to the planning conditions:

- additional amended Grampian condition as agreed by Members at Committee.
- Update to Condition 3 as outlined in the amendment sheet.
- Updates to the following conditions as agreed by Members at Committee:
 - i. Condition 6 – phasing of community facilities;
 - ii. Condition 16 – provision of commercial water metering data;

iii. Condition 22 – parking allocation for car clubs and cargo bikes.

(c) Delegated authority given to officers to set out as part of the decision notice and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017, reg. 29 'information to accompany decisions' a reasoned conclusion of the significant effects of the development on the environment and to carry out appropriate notification under reg. 30 accordingly.

25/23/JDMC Land North of Cherry Hinton – Pre Application Developer Briefing

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.

1. How many homes was the north park originally intended to accommodate and what did the uplift in density mean?
2. How many homes would be build-to-rent?
3. Clarification was sought on the changes in the next phase of development in terms of development footprint.
4. Clarification was sought on the route for refuse collections.
5. Had the developers considered the potential for increased construction and vehicle traffic through Cherry Hinton?
6. What would be the impact on the public right of way to/from Teversham?
7. How could the scheme be designed to be resilient against extreme weather, such as heatwaves and droughts? Had passive cooling and landscaping been considered?
8. Had the allocated density been reached because the developer had built out to the maximum density of the site? Would further development impact upon school/GP/open space provision?
9. Had the developer considered the noise implications of padel courts?
10. How could the development move towards 40% affordable homes, and could long-term leases be considered?
11. Heating and cooling was an issue and was there a way to educate new residents to achieve gains?
12. What had take-up of photo-voltaic panels been and would new panels be installed?

13. Would new homes have electric vehicle charging points?
14. Garden spaces could be more attractive to allow neighbours to interact, using hedging and other planting.
15. Who would manage and maintain public spaces?
16. Noted that refuse stores and bring banks have the potential to encourage fly-tipping.
17. Community gardens could be considered to bring people in the neighbourhood together.
18. Were potential residents being consulted on plans for the community they would live in?
19. Had developers considered the transition from initial management by developers, to the community taking control? The process should be made clear.
20. Had developers considered the role that co-living could play?
21. Could swift boxes and bricks be considered for the development?

The meeting ended at 4.30 pm

CHAIR