

JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

25 February 2026
10.00 am - 1.00 pm

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

Officers Present:

Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites and NSIP/Major Infrastructure Projects):
Philippa Kelly
Legal Adviser: Vanessa Blane
Principal Planner: Cuma Ahmet
Principal Planner: Katie Christodoulides
Committee Manager: Sarah Michael
Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Developer Representatives:

(Trinity College), Jamie Trivedi-Bateman
(Allies and Morrison), Eric Martin
(DP9), Emma Woods
(Grainger), John Wood
(Blocwork), Richard Thomas
(Bidwells), Mike Derbyshire
(Franklin Ellis), Matthew Branton
(Applied Energy), Toby King
(Stripe), Abu Akhtar
(Make Architects), Greg Willis
(Robert Myers Associates), Robert Myers
(PJA), Andrew Rawlings
(PJA), Sonja Townsend

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/5/JDMC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Flaubert, (Councillor Illingworth attended as an alternate).

26/6/JDMC Declarations of interest

Name	Item	Reason
Cllr Williams	26/6/JDMC	Personal: Had been a supervisor for Trinity College in the past. Discretion unfettered.
Cllr Bradnam	All	Personal: Is a Ward Councillor for Milton and Waterbeach and a member of Milton Parish Council, but does not sit on the Parish Planning Committee and has not expressed opinions. Discretion unfettered.
Cllr Stobart	26/6/JDMC	Personal: Received a grant from Trinity College as a young person. Discretion unfettered.
Cllr Illingworth	26/7/JDMC & 26/8/JDMC	Personal: Is a ward councillor for East Chesterton. Discretion unfettered.
Cllr Porrer	26/7/JDMC	Personal: Partner works at 1 Cambridge Square. Discretion unfettered.

26/7/JDMC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2026 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

26/8/JDMC Cambridge Science 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. Had young people been consulted about their needs and whether there had been any changes since the pandemic?
2. Could a 5km track be considered for events like Parkrun?
3. Had groups like Cam Skate been consulted on skate-friendly routes?
4. A central 'hub' that could be used by the wider community could create links with local residents.
5. Were there opportunities for cooperation with Cambridge Regional College during the construction phase?
6. Had the plans been designed for safety, particularly safety of women?
7. Was there a masterplan?
8. A temporary market or outdoor cinema would be a good idea as part of community engagement but power supply, water supply and someone to run them should be considered.
9. Regarding sustainable urban drainage, requested clarification on how to make maximum use of water resources on site?
10. Requested developing the green infrastructure as early as possible, plus reassurance that vehicles would not destroy green infrastructure in later phases.
11. Had a Community Officer role been considered?
12. Would have been interested to see whether the energy requirements of new development had been considered through need for additional power centres.
13. Developers should cooperate with representatives from Milton to plan and consider the impact of drainage on the area.
14. Welcomed the active travel routes and connectivity to bus routes and train stations. Could coordination with electric scooter operators be considered?
15. Raised concerns about the car parking plans and a need to ensure that parking would not be displaced to surrounding roads.
16. Were the developers using the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service's Youth Engagement service?
17. How would the proximity to residential dwellings be managed, for example on Kings Hedges Road?
18. What would the height of buildings be in each of the zones?
19. Was the design influenced by patterns of working, taking into account the desire to mix while maintaining confidentiality?
20. What was being done to make the Science Park and facilities more accessible to those on low incomes?

21. The location experiences extreme infrastructure pressures and infrastructure deficits – had this been considered?
22. What was the forecast energy requirement and would there be on-site energy generation?
23. How many decades would it take to deliver this scheme?

26/9/JDMC Residential Blocks S11-S21 and Wild Park at land north of Cambridge North Station.

Councillor Williams left the meeting during this item and did not return.

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 size would the flats be? How many 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties; and how would they be distributed between affordable and market rates?
2. Would all dwellings meet minimum living space standards?
3. How would the grey building impact upon the general appearance and character of the area?
4. Was a pergola really necessary on an already tall building?
5. The development appeared triangular and inward-facing. How would potential problems with noise be minimised?
6. Would all buildings only be available to rent, or would any be put on the market for sale?
7. What was the percentage of affordable housing?
8. Could cycle provision be allocated per person rather than per bedroom, with some additional allocation for visitors?
9. Could there be provision for recycling rainwater for watering the landscaped areas?
10. Could the rooflines be made to be more visually interesting?
11. Would residents be able to access the green roofs?
12. Could ventilation stacks be added to the roof to showcase the technology being used?
13. Would the courtyard and the play equipment be private or could the public access it?
14. Would the affordable element be distributed tenure blind?
15. Could drainpipes be run through balconies so that residents could install water butts?
16. Had nursery provision been considered?

17. Was the company running the building a housing association?
18. What percentage of market rates would the affordable housing be?
19. Was the development outside of the sewage works exclusion zone?
20. The appearance was of an island development, how would it have been integrated with the Hartree site and also with any planned housing on the Crown Estate site?
21. How would the building be heated and cooled?
22. Why had signature buildings, notably high-rise, been avoided?
23. Permeable paving would be welcome.
24. North-facing properties could be cold and dark, they may welcome some accumulated heat.
25. Would heat pumps be situated on the roof?
26. Had viability without the Hartree development been considered?

26/10/JDMC Land North of Cowley Road and adjacent to Wild Park at land north of Cambridge North Station

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. Could developers clarify how drivers would access the multi-storey car park from the northwest?
2. How big would the car park spaces be?
3. What was the biodiversity net gain for the site?
4. Would there be a sustainable drainage system?
5. Would this be the main car park for the railway station?
6. How would access through the pocket park be made safe in the dark?
7. What was the planned future use for the temporary logistics area?
8. Was there a relationship between the balancing pond and delivering on 89 litres of water per person per day? Was that part of a water recycling system?
9. Where were the car parking spaces currently and would they all be moved to the mobility hub?
10. Who would maintain the wild park and play area, and for how long?
11. Scrapping plans for the basement would save both money and carbon.
12. Would the kiosk have toilet provision?

13. Welcomed accessible spaces, but they seem far away from buildings.
14. What would the temporary logistics hub be returned to?
15. The car park appears blocky and could be out of character with the rest of the area.
16. What security measures would be in place for cycle parking?
17. Would the pond connect to the first public drain?
18. Concerned about shadows from car park onto landscaping.
19. Could people use the pavement space for outdoor eating?

The meeting ended at 1.00 pm

CHAIR