

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

19 March 2025
10.05 - 11.27 am

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

Also present (virtually) Councillors: Baigent and Hawkins

Officers Present:

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly

Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Officers Present:

Principal Transport Assessment Officer: Jez Tuttle (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Developer Representatives:

David Fletcher (Agent)

Ulrich Vaneck (Applicant representative)

Paul Keating (Applicant representative)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/11/JDCC Apologies

There were none.

25/12/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
25/13/JDCC	Stobart	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
25/13/JDCC	Baigent	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

25/13/JDCC Land North Of Cherry Hinton Coldhams Lane 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. Asked where the proposed cycleway was in relation to the greenway which was proposed to be delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).
2. If the cycle route wasn't provided asked how cyclists would travel across the site?
3. Asked how cyclists would cross the Norman Way junction. Would it be a lit junction, would there be a pelican crossing.
4. Believed a cycle route should be provided and that it should be 3m in width. Commented that the cycleway was a key factor in the outline planning approval. Queried whether alterations could be made to the road (reduce the road width, include traffic calming measures) so that the cycleway could be accommodated.
5. Commented that when land was released from the green belt to create opportunities for development; the Transport Strategy which accompanied this focussed on routes into the city centre and routes to the north of the city. Both routes were required. Asked if a cycle route on the southern side of Coldham's Lane had been considered where there was an existing footpath.
6. Noted that it was advised that a cycle route could not be accommodated on the northern side of Coldham's Lane without removal of the existing hedge.
7. Asked if the Applicant had engaged a cycling consultant to assist with the application.
8. Believed members were being asked to weigh up the value of the hedgerow against the provision of a cycle route.
9. Asked how the Applicant would address the biodiversity loss if the hedgerow was removed. Commented that off-site biodiversity mitigation was less desirable than on-site provision.
10. Asked if the airport site came forward how cycle /pedestrian routes along Coldham's Lane could be assured.
11. Asked if any work had been undertaken to understand where the principal destinations would be for people travelling from the site.
12. Asked if the Applicant had had any discussions with cycling groups or local communities.
13. Commented that the GCP greenway would serve a different destination

- to the cycleway which was proposed as part of this development.
14. Believed the cycleway should take priority; the majority of the hedgerow could be replaced on the northern side of Coldham's Lane and other biodiversity enhancements on the site could be made. Suggested the Applicant explored whether it could obtain ownership of land not currently in their control, which would assist in the delivery of the cycleway as proposed.
 15. Noted Coldham's Lane had been closed to traffic for substantial periods of time over the past two years for electricity / gas etc works. Queried if Coldham's could be closed to traffic or if traffic calming measures could be considered to make the road safer for cyclists. Could the speed limit be reduced from 40mph to 30mph for example.
 16. Believed the hedge was planted approximately 20 years ago by the airport to provide screening. If the hedge was removed alternative screening of the airport site would need to be provided.
 17. Did not agree with other Member's comments that the cycle route could be located on the southern side of Coldham's Lane as it would require cyclists to cross the road twice to reach their destination.
 18. Asked for clarification regarding current cycling routes from the site towards the railway bridge and beyond..
 19. Suggested that the cycleways needed to comply with LTN-120.
 20. Did not agree with other Member's comments that Coldham's Lane should be closed to vehicles.
 21. Commented that if the hedge was to be removed and replanted that it is replanted before the cycle way was completed so that the hedge had time to establish and provide on-going screening.

The meeting ended at 11.27 am

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank