JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

17 December 2025
10.00 am - 1.10 pm

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

Officers Present:
Strategic Sites Delivery Manager: Philippa Kelly
Strategic Sites Team Leader - Emerging Growth Sites: Jonathan Brookes
Principal Planner: Elisabeth Glover
Committee Manager: Sarah Michael
Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Developer Representatives:
(The Crown Estate) Matthew Sampson
(SEW) Daniel Mahony
(SEW) Tommy Clark
(Arup) Emma Ranger
(WSP) Catrin Stephens
(Kanda) Charles Mabbutt
(Rural Solutions) Matt Jarvis
(Woods Hardwick) Scott Darrington
(Bidwells) Alison Wright
(David Wilson Homes) Sam Coleman
(Carter Jonas) Peter McKeown
(JTP) Emma Armstrong
(JTP) Dave Swindells

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/33/JDMC Apologies

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor Stobart, (Councillor Garvie attended as an alternate).
- Councillor Nestor, (Councillor Thornburrow attended as an alternate).

25/34/JDMC Declarations of interest

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Bradnam	25/36/JDMC	Personal: Attended public exhibitions as a Parish Councillor. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Hawkins	25/36/JDMC	Personal: Has attended exhibitions and is a Trustee of Cambridge Room. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Thornburrow	25/36/JDMC	Personal: Trustee of Cambridge Room. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Cahn	25/37/JDMC	Personal: Ward member for the development. Has been to open meetings but expressed no opinion. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor R Williams	25/37/JDMC	Personal and prejudicial: Fellow of Christ's College. Recused himself from the meeting for this item.
Councillor Smith	25/38/JDMC	Personal: Has made representations on behalf of residents on previous planning applications for the site. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Bradnam	25/38/JDMC	Personal: Former employee of NIAB. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Fane	25/38/JDMC	Personal: Former Director of a co-living company. Discretion unfettered.

25/35/JDMC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 15 October and 19 November 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

25/36/JDMC Cambridge Business Park, Milton Road

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. Welcomed the creation of a Masterplan.
2. Had the proposed residential area been left out because the percentage of it in odour zone was too high?
3. Places were made by people. Had consideration been given to what the area would be like on a Sunday morning, for example?
4. What would the developer do about the foul water issue?
5. Height of the buildings was a concern.
6. The emerging Local Plan would provide for 30% tree cover on any major site, how close would this development be to that?
7. Mixed use would be important, including attempts to create a form of ‘high street’ at ground level.
8. The design of roof lines should be as important as the height of the building.
9. Access route across the Guided Busway could cause problems. How would this be rectified?
10. Would the odour zone impact commercial viability of site?
11. Was the potential market for retail options sufficiently large?
12. What would be the impact of additional traffic on Milton Road?
13. Questioned the usefulness of tall buildings for wayfinding.
14. Had the developers been asked to comply with the trip budget for this development?
15. The design appeared attractive in principle, how would it work in practice on a busy main road?
16. Developers should liaise closely with the developers of Trinity Hall Farm Industrial Estate, particularly on the busway crossing.
17. What was the design rationale for such a high building on the corner?
18. CCTV sight lines needed to be very clear.

19. Community uses and restaurants that brought people in at night could make the space safer.
20. What contribution would the developer make to the subsidised workspace incubator?
21. What was the modal split underpinning the car parking and cycling infrastructure?
22. Would S106 contributions address the required strategic transport measures?
23. 70% of the site was in the odour zone, could the remaining 30% be used for residential?
24. The tall building could create a windswept microclimate.
25. Had there been public support for a fifteen-storey building?
26. An update to the Cambridge wastewater plant position could provide the opportunity to increase residential provision.

25/37/JDMC Darwin Green Phases Two and Three Development Site, Cambridge Road, Impington

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. Play spaces integrated with SUDS drainage had been unsuccessful in the past.
2. Had the impact of noise from the pumping station been considered?
3. Who would be responsible for the long-term maintenance of trees?
4. Decision on tree species would need to take into account the height of double decker buses.
5. Could work be undertaken with landowners to the north to offer some public access in future?
6. The width of connectivity routes was important. They should be sufficiently wide for all users to enjoy.
7. Traffic calming measures should ensure that the 20mph speed limit is adhered to.
8. Could they reconsider the location of the community building in comparison to the location of community assets, such as the country park.
9. It was disappointing that the country park would be split in two.
10. How would the impact of the A14 be mitigated?

11. The country park would be important for North Cambridge.
12. Could a link be made with Impington Farm?
13. Concern that water discharge could affect areas north of the A14.
14. Could developers provide information on the passage into Wellbrook Way?
15. The green corridor should be maintained as much as possible.
16. Sustainability of construction should be considered.
17. Effective management of cycle paths would be essential.

25/38/JDMC Former NIAB HQ, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge

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. What were the viability issues with the existing planning consent?
2. Could developers clarify rent data used in presentation?
3. What research had been done on graduate retention and demand for co-living, as Cambridge was different to bigger cities like Birmingham and London?
4. The studios appeared to be smaller than nationally prescribed space standards – how could this be justified?
5. Why had the developer compared the co-living spaces with Houses of Multiple Occupation, yet used Build-to-Rent for cost comparison?
6. What facilities would be provided in the spaces – where would residents do laundry, for example?
7. What percentage of the co-living provision would be affordable?
8. Would such small spaces be appropriate places to live?
9. Shared spaces should not be a substitute for minimum levels of living space and private amenity space.
10. Spaces should not be as small as student accommodation as the intention would be for people to live there year-round.
11. Would there be any workspaces in the building?
12. Where would residents store their belongings?
13. No national planning policy guidance on co-living developments.
14. Homes needed sufficient living space if people were required to quarantine in a future pandemic.
15. Developers could look to Devonshire Gardens as an example of a similar development locally.

16. Affordability would be an important benefit of co-living and was as important at the loneliness issue.

The meeting ended at 1.10 pm

CHAIR