

JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

15 July 2026
10.00 am - 3.45 pm

Present: Councillors Porrer (Chair), Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Fisher, Flaubert, Griffin, Illingworth, Smart, Bostanci, Cahn, Sandford, Sebastian and R.Williams

Councillors Williams, Flaubert and Griffin left the meeting after the vote on item 26/30/JDMC and did not return.

Councillor Smart left the meeting after item 26/32/JDMC and did not return.

Councillor Fisher left the meeting during item 26/33/JDMC and did not return.

Also present virtually: Councillor Bennett.

Officers Present:

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

Principal Planner (Strategic Sites): James Truett

Principal Planner (Strategic Sites): John Shuttlewood

Principal Planner (Strategic Sites): Janine Richardson

Principal Planner (Strategic Sites): Rebecca Ward

Legal Adviser: Vanessa Blane

Committee Manager: Sarah Michael

Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Developer Representatives:

(LNT Care Developments), Alistair Wood

(LNT Care Developments), Tom Smith

(Allies and Morrison), Alex Baker

(Allies and Morrison), Oliver Unwin

(Twenty5), Lyndon Gill

(Wrenbridge), Harry Gibson

(Iceni Projects), Josh George

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/26/JDMC Apologies

No apologies were received.

26/27/JDMC Declarations of interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Smart	26/29/JDMC	Formerly employed as bank staff at Addenbrookes Hospital. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Bradnam	26/30/JDMC	Former employee of NIAB and currently receiving a NIAB pension. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Cahn	26/33/JDMC	Darwin Green was in Histon and Impington ward. He had made public comments on the development. May ask questions at this pre-application briefing but would not sit on committee when the application was heard.

26/28/JDMC Minutes

Councillor Bradnam requested an amendment to the minute of her declaration of interest for item 26/22/JDMC to read:

The site adjoined Milton Parish and Councillor Bradnam was a member of Milton Parish Council. In addition, she had received briefings on the site in her

capacity as ward councillor for Milton and Waterbeach but had not expressed a view. Discretion unfettered.

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2026 were then approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

26/29/JDMC 26/01066/REM Land South of Dame Mary Archer Way, Cambridge Biomedical Campus

The Committee received a Reserved Matters Application pursuant to 16/0176/OUT for all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) relating to the development of a mixed-use laboratory and office building (4000 Discovery Drive) including associated plant, access, car parking, cycle parking, landscaping, public open space, and other works, and the discharge of Conditions 8 (Transport spurs), 10 (Energy Demand), 14 (EV Charging), 31 (On Plot Cycle and Pedestrian Facilities), 33 (Car Parking Spaces), 36 (Disabled Car Parking Spaces), 37 (Cycle Parking Spaces), 39 (Ecological Conservation Management Plan), 41 (Drainage), 43 (Sustainability), 48 (Waste), and 49 (Landscape) of Planning Permission 16/0176/OUT.

Derek Lloyd (Applicant) addressed the committee speaking in support of the application.

Councillor Fisher proposed, and Councillor Flaubert seconded, an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include reference to Policy 28 of the Local Plan within Condition 2 (Design Details and Materials).

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee

Unanimously resolved to:

- i. grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in Section 24 of the Officer's report, with delegated authority to officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives, including:
 - a. an amendment to Condition 2 to include reference to policy 28 of the Local Plan.

- ii. part discharge the following conditions on the outline planning consent reference 16/0176/OUT in relation to these reserved matters only:

- Condition 8 (Transport spurs)
- Condition 10 (Energy Demand)
- Condition 14 (EV Charging)
- Condition 31 (On Plot Cycle and Pedestrian Facilities)
- Condition 33 (Car Parking Spaces)
- Condition 36 (Disabled Car Parking Spaces)
- Condition 37 (Cycle Parking Spaces)
- Condition 39 (Ecological Conservation Management Plan)
- Condition 41 (Surface Water Drainage)
- Condition 43 (Sustainability)
- Condition 48 (Waste)
- Condition 49 (Landscape)

26/30/JDMC 23/04643/OUT Former NIAB Site, Huntingdon Road

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to the updated recommendation to delegate authority to the Director of Planning to refuse planning permission for the development of outline planning application 23/04643/OUT for the reasons outlined on the amendment sheet if, in the Director of Planning's view, the applicants had failed to complete or failed to make satisfactory progress towards the completion of the Section 106 agreement by the 31 October 2026.

The Legal Advisor agreed to bring an update on progress towards the completion of the Section 106 agreement to the JDMC meeting on 19 August.

Councillor Fisher proposed, and Councillor Smart seconded, reverting to the original recommendation as detailed in the Officer's report. The proposal was **rejected by 9 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.**

The Committee

Unanimously resolved to delegate authority to the Director of Planning to refuse planning permission for the development of outline planning application 23/04643/OUT for the below stated reason if, in the Director of Planning's view, the applicants had failed to complete or failed to make satisfactory

progress towards the completion of the S106 agreement by the 31 October 2026.

The proposed development failed to make adequate provision for the necessary mitigation and infrastructure contributions required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In the absence of a completed S106 Planning Agreement, the Council as the local planning authority was unable to secure financial contributions towards public transport improvements and the provision of waiting restrictions/controlled parking zones. Without the impacts of the development being mitigated, the proposal was contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2025) which seeks to ensure that developments provide for necessary infrastructure and mitigation. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies 81 and 85 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 which state that planning permission for new developments would only be supported/permitted where there are suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision and phasing of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

26/31/JDMC Springstead Village, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge

Pre-application Developer Presentation

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 were binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently were not recorded in these minutes.

1. How would the cooling system work, would condensation form on underfloor pipes?
2. Passive ventilation usually involved chimneys to achieve sufficient throughput – would there be any chimneys? How would passive ventilation be managed in all the rooms?
3. Had ground checks been carried out to ensure suitability for the boreholes for the ground source heat pumps?
4. Was the design of the care home a standard one that had been used in other locations?
5. What proportion of rooms would be allocated to dementia care?
6. How would noise from borehole drilling be mitigated?
7. Would there be sufficient parking for the number of staff required to run the care home?

8. Had the developers considered on-site accommodation for members of staff?
9. The design appeared functional and similar to an office building.
10. Had the developers considered whether the single-aspect, south-facing bedrooms would overheat?
11. Could the car park be situated to the north, with landscaping to the south?
12. Consideration would need to be given to the care and watering of mature trees once planted.
13. Would the bedrooms meet space standards of 12 square metres, and 15 for wheelchair users? Would there be any double bedrooms?
14. Climate modelling showed some rooms could be over 26 degrees on some nights during the year, would that temperature be manageable within the current plans?
15. Would there be louvres or sunken windows as part of the single aspect building to help with cooling?
16. Had mechanical heat ventilation been considered for cooling, especially given the heat and humidity in Cambridge?
17. Could the developer consider working with local schools, perhaps on public art, for an intergenerational link?
18. How many disabled and non-disabled car parking spaces would there be?

26/32/JDMC William James House, Cowley Road, Cambridge

Pre-application Developer Presentation

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 were binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently were not recorded in these minutes.

1. Had the developers considered the circular economy and whether the materials or structure of the existing building could be reused?
2. Could cargo bike storage be considered in the plans?
3. Had the developers considered how each of the units would be used?
4. Were the developers working within a trip budget and would that influence the nature of the buildings?
5. Photovoltaic (PV) panels were welcomed. Had access to maintain the PV panels in the longer term been considered?
6. How had the developers decided upon the plans for the roofscape?

7. Had the colour scheme been chosen for any particular reason?
8. How would heating and cooling be managed? Would that be the responsibility of individual tenants?
9. The plan showed skylights, could these easily be covered and uncovered?
10. How would the route for delivery lorries intersect with pedestrian and cycle access? Would there be priority for pedestrians and designated crossing points?
11. Would there be disabled access to the mezzanine floor?
12. The site was in an odour impact zone, could anything be done to mitigate conditions for workers?
13. Could developers explain the rationale for the sawtooth roof over a larger south-facing roof?
14. Clarification was sought over the height of the building and height comparisons with other local buildings.
15. Clarification was sought over how the interior and exterior of the roof area would work together.
16. What forms of employment were anticipated on the site? Was retail envisaged or would the warehouses be for distribution only?
17. How many parking spaces would be for staff and how many for visitors?
18. BREEAM outstanding plans would be welcomed.

26/33/JDMC Darwin Green 2/3

Pre-application Developer Presentation

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 were binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently were not recorded in these minutes.

1. The country park would serve the whole north of Cambridge and could deliver the opportunity to provide a well-connected centre for the whole area, potentially including a farm.
2. It would be important for the developers to work with local communities, societies and groups.
3. Could the developers consider retaining the eastern access point?
4. Who would manage the park and how would it be maintained? What sort of machinery would be required for maintenance and would the management/maintenance team need a base onsite?

5. Would there be a visitor centre?
6. How had climate change been considered in the designs for the park?
7. The connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists was welcomed.
8. The banks of the ponds appeared to be steep, would this cause any risks? Could they be mitigated and could the ponds be used for swimming?
9. Were the ponds designed to be seasonal, or should they be flooded throughout the year?
10. The new connections to Girton were welcomed, however developers should bear in mind that there may be times when gates needed to be closed, for example in high winds.
11. The risks and limitations of dual-use attenuation ponds should be taken into account.
12. Had the developers considered how to protect the paths that were solely for pedestrians to avoid use by bikes or motorbikes?
13. Had the landowner been consulted about using the overbridge as a connection route to the north?
14. The plans for the outer edges of the park described them as self-maintaining; what action would be taken to avoid unmanageable bramble growth?
15. How was the phasing planned for the park in comparison to the residential areas?
16. Would there be scope to use the existing balancing pond, for example by installing a hide?
17. What proposals would be put in place for the existing rented houses on site?
18. Had parking been considered as some visitors would arrive by car.

The meeting ended at 3.45 pm

CHAIR