

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

22 January 2025  
10.00 am - 2.44 pm

**Present:** Councillors S. Smith (Chair), Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Flaubert, Porrer, Smart, Cahn, Fane and Stobart

Also present (virtually) Councillors: Hawkins, Thornburrow, R.Williams

**Officers Present:**

Joint Director of Planning & Economic Development: Stephen Kelly

Area Development Manager (East): Jane Rodens

Area Team Leader (West): Michael Sexton

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Claire Tunncliffe

**Developer Representatives:**

**In person:**

Mike Bodkin

Nick Taylor

Rachel Underwood

**Online:**

Fiona Bryant

John Cormie

Astrid Gabrielsson

Ashmi Thapar

Monika Jachimowska

Mark Smith

Stefan Sjöberg

Matt Fox

David Watson

Gabriela Costa

Fred Labbe

Debra Yudolph

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**25/1/JDCC Apologies**

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Thornburrow who subsequently joined the meeting virtually during item 25/6/JDCC.

Councillor R. Williams and Councillor Hawkins attended the meeting virtually.

### **25/2/JDCC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Interest</b>
All	Baigent	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
All	Stobart	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

### **25/3/JDCC Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 16 October, 12 November and 20 November 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **25/4/JDCC Scheme of delegation**

The Committee received a report from the Area Development Manager (East) recommending changes to the Scheme of Delegation for the City Planning Committee, South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) Planning Committee and the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) namely:

- The creation of one Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Scheme of delegation.
- Reviewing the types of applications that can be brought to committee, allowing Members to focus upon the more complex, significant and controversial applications.
- Aligning the triggers for committee referral
- Introducing a Delegation Panel for Cambridge City Committee and Joint Development Management Committee.
- Review and align triggers for the existing Delegation Panel
- Name Change for Joint Development Control Committee to Joint Development Management Committee
- Changes to the Public Speaking arrangements
- An updated Members Planning Good Practice Guide for Planning Committee

The Committee noted the following amendment to paragraphs 3.10 – 3.12 within the Members Planning Good Practice Guidance, which was also set out within the Amendment Sheet:

### **Pecuniary Interests**

- 3.10 Pecuniary interests are defined in regulations. Interests which fall into this category are those which include but are not limited to business, employment, trade, profession, contract and wider financial interests, assets such as land, payments, securities, and shares. All Planning Committee Members are encouraged to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer or the Legal Adviser to the Committee where they have any concerns as to whether a pecuniary interest exists.
- 3.11 Any Planning Committee Member with a pecuniary interest must, following declaration of the interest at the committee meeting immediately recuse themselves from the meeting and take no further part in the discussion on the application. Members can remain in the Chamber should they wish to do so but must sit in the public gallery until the item has been determined.
- 3.12 As a member (and not just a member of planning committee) there are things you should avoid if you have a disclosable pecuniary interest. These include the following:
- You should avoid representing ward or local views on a matter in which you have such an interest. In these circumstances it is appropriate to ask another ward councillor to take on this role;
  - You should avoid getting involved in the processing of the application by using your position as a councillor to get access to officers or papers;
  - You should not lobby other members of the Council, including the circulation of letters or emails, or by raising the matter in group or similar meetings;
  - You may address the meeting that considers the application or other matter in the same way that members of the public may address the meeting. However you should then withdraw from the meeting (formal or informal) at which the matter is under consideration, you can remain in the meeting room, and if you do you should sit in the “public gallery”. ;
  - To reiterate the advice in 3.1 above, if you are a member of planning committee you must avoid representing your ward or any local views on a planning matter in which you have a disclosable pecuniary interest. You can discuss your views with another local ward member but lobbying should be avoided (see 4.12, 4.13) In these circumstances it is

appropriate to ask another ward member to take on this role of representing the ward for you .

- If you are submitting your own planning application, or have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a planning application, you should be particularly careful to avoid any impression of either seeking or receiving special treatment. You should also make sure that the relevant Delivery Manager is aware of the interest. You may wish to consider employing an agent to act on your behalf in dealing with officers and/or addressing the committee. However, as mentioned above, you may exercise the same speaking rights as are afforded to members of the public at the planning committee meeting where your application is to be determined, provided that you then withdraw from the meeting when the item is considered and remain (as a member of the public would) within the public gallery.

In response to Members' questions the Area Development Manager (East) and the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development said the following:

- i. The changes to the Scheme of Delegation contained within the report were to update the City Council's current Constitution and this process was separate to the work being undertaken by the City Council to review its governance arrangements.
- ii. The receipt of five representations on an application would trigger the application to be referred to the Delegation Panel to consider if the application should be considered by the Planning Committee.
- iii. Prior approval applications could be referred to the Delegation Panel under the proposed Scheme of Delegation.
- iv. The Delegation Panel comprised a Senior Planning Officer, Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee. Ultimately the decision of the Delegation Panel was made by the Senior Planning Officer in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.
- v. Delegation Panels were not public meetings so there was no process for people to be able to make representations. Noted on major developments there would be early engagement with communities through pre-application developer briefings. Decisions of the Delegation Panel would be published on the council's website.
- vi. A review of the Delegation Panel process would be undertaken in 12 months' time and councillors could feed any comments into this process.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to endorse the following recommendations for approval at Cambridge City Council Civic Affairs Committee and the South Cambridgeshire District Council Civic Affairs Committee before final approval at each authorities Full Council:

- i. the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Scheme of Delegation, December 2024; and
- ii. the amended Public Speaking Rights at Planning Committee; and
- iii. the amended Members Planning Good Practice Guide with delegated authority for minor amendments to officers in consultation with the relevant Executive Councillors; and
- iv. to delegate authority for minor amendments to the drafting to assist in providing clarity only to officers in consultation with the relevant Executive Councillor; and
- v. that a review of the revised Scheme of Delegation be undertaken in 12 months and a report prepared to each Committee for consideration and action.

**25/5/JDCC Future JDCC meeting dates and proposed site visit dates - June 2025 to May 2026**

**Resolved unanimously** to approve the following JDCC meeting dates and site visit dates for municipal year June 2025 – May 2026.

Committee meeting dates:

18 June 2025  
16 July 2025  
20 August 2025  
17 September 2025  
15 October 2025  
19 November 2025  
17 December 2025  
21 January 2026  
25 February 2026  
18 March 2026  
15 April 2026

Site visit dates:

16 June 2025  
14 July 2025

18 August 2025  
15 September 2025  
13 October 2025  
17 November 2025  
15 December 2025  
19 January 2026  
23 February 2026  
16 March 2026  
13 April 2026

## **25/6/JDCC Land north and east of Cowley Road (Hartree), North East Cambridge**

Councillor Thornburrow joined the meeting virtually during this agenda item.

Councillors Fane, Baigent, Flaubert, Hawkins and R.Williams left part way through this agenda item.

The Committee received a pre-application developer presentation for the Hartree development at Land north and east of Cowley Road, North-East Cambridge.

The developer team provided a briefing note to the Committee in advance of the meeting which has been published on the meeting webpage: [Agenda for Joint Development Control Committee on Wednesday, 22nd January, 2025, 10.00 am - Cambridge Council](#).

Members raised 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. Asked if there would be a Design Code produced for this development and if it would be updated over time as it was estimated that the build out of the development would take 20 years.
2. Asked who was anticipated to live in the development.
3. Noted that consideration had been given to dual aspect windows in relation to overheating but had consideration also been given to insulation.
4. Is on-site wind power being considered.

5. Are ground source heat pumps being considered.
6. Asked about water recycling and noted that certain standards needed to be met for water to be drinking water, which meant currently water could not be recycled to be used as drinking water.
7. Noted the importance of natural light in rooms balanced against the need to ensure that rooms were appropriately heat controlled.
8. Asked what the microclimate would be like for single aspect units.
9. Asked if the ground level car park would be made from permeable materials.
10. Raised concerns regarding surface water drainage.
11. Asked what the three water tanks on-site would be used for.
12. Hoped the residential development would be tenure blind.
13. Asked if purpose-built Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) were being considered for this development.
14. Asked if the developers thought people would live within the development permanently or for limited periods.
15. Asked if services charges would be included within the rent charge or if it would be charged separately.
16. Asked if consideration had been given to providing a co-operative site (self-managed site).
17. Asked for further information regarding the 'income generating opportunities' on the site.
18. Asked whether the 'build to rent' accommodation was likely to be apartments or houses.
19. Asked for more information about cargo-bike parking provision.
20. Asked where delivery vans would be expected to park.
21. Requested car parking provision for the affordable housing units.
22. Asked if the development would take into consideration the vision for change in modes of transport.
23. Noted that car parking was proposed to be provided through 'car barns' and asked if the developers were aware of any examples of successful car barns being used elsewhere. Also asked whether the car barns would be lit to ensure that people felt safe to use them.
24. Asked how many parking spaces were proposed in the car barns.
25. Asked what measures would be put in place to deter on-pavement parking.
26. Asked whether provision for e-scooter parking was planned?
27. Asked what measures would be put in place to control displacement parking.
28. Asked if 'healthy street design' could be used for roads that carried traffic.

29. Asked what was being included in the biodiversity net gain calculations.
30. Asked what uses had been considered for rooftops and noted competing interests between amenity space, solar panels and air source heat pumps etc.
31. Queried the type of building materials which would be used on the site and if consideration would be given to the embodied carbon within building materials.

The meeting ended at 2.44 pm

**CHAIR**