

JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

21 July 2026
12.00 - 1.30 pm

Present

Committee Members: Bennett, Clough, Illingworth, Porrer, Smart, Bostanci, Bradnam and Sandford

Also present Councillors: Councillor Payne

Officers:

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

Team Leader, Strategic Sites: Michael Sexton

Legal Adviser: Vanessa Blane

Committee Manager: Sarah Michael

For Applicant:

Alex Duchesne (Applicant)

Paul Harvey (Agent)

For Petitioners:

Neal Jennion

Jonathan Conder

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/1/DCF Introduction by Chair to the Forum

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. They stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

26/2/DCF Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Cahn, Fisher, Flaubert and Griffin.

Councillors Bennett and Clough attended as alternates.

26/3/DCF Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Bradnam	All	Personal: Formerly employed by NIAB and receives a pension from NIAB. Discretion unfettered.

26/4/DCF Application and Petition Details

Case by Applicant

- 1) Prior approval to convert Chapter House from offices to 60 residential apartments had been granted in 2020. The conversion had taken place in May 2022, and the postal lockers had been installed shortly after as part of the facilities for the residents in that building.
- 2) Howes Place Conservation Area received its designation in 2024, after the installation of the postal lockers.
- 3) All statutory consultees had independently reviewed the proposal and had identified no planning harm.
- 4) The Applicant presented usage data showing low and consistent activity at the lockers. The parcel lockers were used solely by residents and had no commercial function.
- 5) The Applicant advised that the Highways Authority had identified no significant adverse impact on the public highway.
- 6) The Conservation Officer had concluded that the lockers were not a dominant feature and did not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area or the setting of Chapter House.
- 7) Environmental Health had raised no objections to the proposal.
- 8) The retrospective application had arisen from an administrative matter rather than evidence of planning harm.
- 9) The lockers provided a secure, CCTV-monitored facility that was particularly beneficial for residents working irregular hours, consolidating deliveries into a single location. Removing the lockers would not stop deliveries and would not change the postal address.

Case by Petitioners in Objection

- 10) Clarified that residents did not object to the provision of parcel lockers but objected to their location within the Howes Place Conservation Area.
- 11) Howes Place Conservation Area had been designated in January 2024 because of its architectural interest, townscape value, formal landscaping and historical significance. The Conservation Area Appraisal had identified risks to the area's special character from cumulative minor changes.
- 12) Howes Place was a private, unadopted and unlit road, The existing footpaths provided limited separation between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
- 13) Transport information submitted with the prior approval application had identified vehicular access to Chapter House via Lawrence Weaver Road.
- 14) The Planning Authority's Compliance Team had described the lockers as harmful to the character of Chapter House and the Howes Place streetscape.
- 15) The location of the lockers had effectively established Howes Place as the principal vehicle access point to Chapter House, which had led to a significant increase in delivery vehicles, taxis and e-scooters. This had harmed the character and amenity of the conservation area and had increased highway safety risks.
- 16) The proposal conflicted with Local Plan Policy 61 and relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to heritage protection, highway safety and street clutter.
- 17) Two pre-occupation planning conditions relating to pedestrian and cycle connections, and covered cycle parking at Chapter House, had not yet been discharged. An agreement had reportedly been reached with the Planning Authority to address those matters as part of a forthcoming adjacent development.
- 18) Presented a proposal to relocate the lockers to land adjacent to Chapter House with access from Lawrence Weaver Road in order to retain the benefits of the lockers while removing harm to the conservation area and directing delivery and visitor traffic to the intended access route.

Case Officer's Comment

- 19) The application was a retrospective full planning application for the provision of postal lockers at Chapter House, Howes Place.
- 20) The application site lay within the Howes Place Conservation Area. Chapter House had been designated as a Building of Local Interest.

- 21) The prior approval process was limited to specific matters, including transport and highway impacts, contamination, flood risk and noise impacts on future occupants. No issues had been identified in relation to those matters at the time the prior approval application was determined.
- 22) Land adjoining the site had been the subject of pre-application discussions and a briefing to the Joint Development Management Committee on 15 April.
- 23) The Local Planning Authority had received two planning applications relating to the adjoining site, which were undergoing validation prior to public consultation.
- 24) 13 individual objections had been received regarding the application under discussion.
- 25) A further letter of objection had been submitted on behalf of Howes Place residents with 29 signatories, together with a DCF petition containing 29 signatories.
- 26) The principal grounds of objection related to heritage impacts and highway safety concerns.
- 27) 54 representations in support of the application had been received, including 51 from residents of Chapter House and 3 from residents of Howes Place.
- 28) The Council's Conservation Team had been consulted and had raised no objection to the proposal on heritage grounds.
- 29) The County Council Local Highways Authority had reviewed the application and had raised no objection on highway safety grounds.

Case by Ward Councillors

Cambridge City Councillor Cheney Payne spoke as a ward councillor on behalf of herself and Cambridgeshire County Councillor Rory Clark to make the following points:

- 30) Supported the petition submitted by Howes Place residents.
- 31) Referred to comments from the Council's Principal Planning Compliance Officer, which concluded that the large-format parcel lockers were harmful to the character of Chapter House and the Howes Place streetscape.
- 32) As a small and narrow residential street, Howes Place was not designed to function as the principal vehicular access point for a development the scale of Chapter House.
- 33) The location of the lockers had effectively established Howes Place as the default access point for deliveries and visitors to Chapter

House. This use was inconsistent with the historic function and character of Howes Place.

- 34) The increased activity had caused harm to the arcadian character and amenity of the conservation area and had increased highway safety risks for residents.
- 35) Residents' concerns were longstanding and had been raised repeatedly with the Applicant.
- 36) Residents had sought the relocation of the lockers to a location accessed from Lawrence Weaver Road via the signal-controlled junction with Huntingdon Road.
- 37) Previous attempts by residents to secure relocation of the lockers through direct engagement with the Applicant had been unsuccessful. Residents had raised the matter with the Planning Authority's Compliance Team only after those attempts had failed.
- 38) There were policy grounds on which the application could be refused, resulting in the removal of the lockers, however, residents were not solely seeking refusal of the application and had proposed a constructive alternative solution.
- 39) Supported the residents' proposal to relocate the lockers and urged both the Applicant and the Planning Authority to engage positively with that option.

Members' Questions and Comments

- 40) Queried what triggered the establishment of the postal address point and whether it could be changed? Requested this information be clarified before the application was brought to JDMC.
- 41) Queried the access arrangements in the original prior approval permission?
 - i. The Planning Case Officer confirmed that vehicular access to the development had been shown from Lawrence Weaver Road to the north. The plans also showed an access route running parallel to Howes Place, for pedestrians.
- 42) Queried whether future development proposals for the adjacent site still included vehicular access from Lawrence Weaver Road?
- 43) Could a physical intervention such as a bollard be installed to prevent vehicles accessing Chapter House via Howes Place?
- 44) Queried whether concerns regarding cycle parking provision and cycle access routes mentioned by the petitioners were pertinent to the application?

- 45) Could a temporary arrangement be secured to allow the parcel lockers to be relocated as part of a future development?
- 46) Could a management condition could be imposed to assist with traffic management?
 - i. The Applicant confirmed that on-site staff were present daily and that the area was monitored by CCTV.
- 47) Queried who had responsibility for the upkeep and maintenance of Howes Place and its verges?
- 48) Queried where residents arriving from the car park would enter the building?
 - i. The Applicant confirmed that there were pedestrian routes linking the parking area to entrance doors on the building's north-western side.
- 49) Could parcel lockers be relocated within the Chapter House site itself, for example on the north-western side of the building close to the existing parking area and access routes?
- 50) Queried whether alternative entrances to the building were equipped with entry-phone systems and whether relocating the parcel lockers would adequately address issues associated with taxis and food deliveries?
- 51) Could the Voi scooters and bicycles being left near the Howes Place entrance be moved?

Summing up by the Applicant

- 52) The DCF was concerned with a standalone planning application that should be assessed on its own merits and not linked to future development proposals or potential outcomes that remain uncertain.
- 53) Statutory consultees had raised no objections.
- 54) The parcel lockers provided an important service for the 68 Chapter House residents, including facilitating the delivery of medication and essential items.
- 55) The lockers were for residential use only, with no commercial operation associated with them.
- 56) The lockers reduced delivery traffic movements to Chapter House.
- 57) The access point from Howes Place had existed and been in continuous use for over 100 years.

Summing up by the Petitioners

- 58) Noted that the current position of the parcel lockers had been identified as a planning compliance issue.

- 59) The Local Planning Authority and the Applicant had agreed that the failure to discharge other pre-commencement conditions around cycle provision could be addressed through the forthcoming development on adjoining land, demonstrating a precedent
- 60) Residents' concerns extended beyond the physical presence of the parcel lockers themselves and related more broadly to the impact on the special arcadian character of the Howes Place Conservation area, and the highway safety.
- 61) The proposal they had put forward was intended to assist the Applicant as it could be a simpler option to integrate the lockers within any forthcoming development, however residents would support relocation of the parcel lockers within the curtilage of Chapter House, if that were viable.

Summing up by the Chair

- 62) The Chair noted the following:
- i. Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties, published on the council's website and appended to the Planning Officer's report.
 - ii. The Planning Case Officer should contact the Applicant/Agent after the meeting to discuss the outcome of the meeting and to follow up any further action that was necessary.
 - iii. The Applicant would be encouraged to keep in direct contact with the Petitioners and to seek their views on any proposed amendments.
 - iv. The Council would follow its normal neighbour notification procedures on any amendments to the application.
 - v. Application to be considered at a future Joint Development Management Committee.
 - vi. Along with other individuals who may have made representations on the application, the Petitioners' Representatives would be informed of the date of the meeting at which the application is to be considered by Committee and of their public speaking rights. The Committee report would be publicly available five clear days before the Committee meeting.

The meeting ended at 1.30 pm

CHAIR