

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

18 June 2025  
10.55 am - 3.20 pm

**Present:** Councillors Bradnam, S. Smith, Baigent, Flaubert, Porrer, Smart, Thornburrow, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart and R. Williams

Councillor R Williams left the meeting after item 25/5a/JDMC.

In attendance: Councillor Hawkins joined online for item 25/5b/JDMC

**Officers Present:**

Strategic Sites Manager: Philippa Kelly

Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward

Principal Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Meeting Producer: James Goddard

**Developer Representatives:**

The Crown Estate: Matthew Sampson

WSP, Planning Consultant: Victoria Chase

SEW Architects: Daniel Mahony (Architect)

SEW Architects: Tommy Clark (Landscape Architect)

Arup, Transport Consultant: Emma Ranger

Arup, Sustainability: Anna Kennedy

Ramboll, Drainage and SuDS: Alexander Pridige

Kanda, PR/Community Engagement Consultants: Charles Mabbutt

3PM, Project Manager: Hannah Harmens

Tate Hindle Architects: Mike Jamieson

Rural Solutions (Landscape Architects): Matt Jarvis

Barratt Redrow: Becky Bonnett

Bidwells (Planning Agent): Harriet Wooler

Woods Hardwick (Engineering): Scott Darrington

Hoare Lee (Sustainability): Jamie Pincott

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

## **25/1/JDMC Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for Municipal Year 2025/26**

The Strategic Sites Manager for the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service took the Chair whilst the Joint Development Management Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed, and Councillor Baigent seconded, the nomination of Councillor Fane as Chair.

**Unanimously resolved** that Councillor Fane be elected as Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Fane took over as Chair of the meeting and called for nominations for Vice-Chair of the Joint Development Control Committee.

Councillor Bradnam proposed, and Councillor Hawkins seconded, the nomination of Councillor S Smith as Vice-Chair.

**Unanimously resolved** that Councillor S Smith be elected as Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.

## **25/2/JDMC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Cahn, with Councillor Garvie attending as the alternate.

Councillor Flaubert provided apologies for leaving the meeting after item 25/5a/JDMC. Councillor Illingworth attended as the alternate.

## **25/3/JDMC Declarations of interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Bradnam	25/4/JDMC 25/5/JDMC	Personal: Member of Milton Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussion's relating to the science park applications. Discretion unfettered
Councillor Bradnam	25/6/JDMC	Personal: Had attended public exhibitions for Crown Estate Site as a

		Miton Parish Councillor and had accompany the MP to an exhibition. Discretion unfettered
Councillor Stobart	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Thornburrow	25/6/JDMC	Personal: Former Director at Cambridge Architectural Research Ltd; worked with Dr Stephen Platt, author of the Neighbourhood Guide, New Neighbourhoods in Cambridge. Discretion unfettered

**25/4/JDMC Address: 191 Cambridge Science Park, Milton Road, Cambridge**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of two-storey 2,145.2 sqm (GIA) extension to the north-west of the existing building to provide a new filling and packaging hall (B2 and B8 uses) with first-floor specialist building services plant, enclosed link to the existing warehouse at ground level and roof-mounted solar photovoltaics, along with installation of external plant, relocation of external recycling compound, new groundsman store, alterations to existing car park, new landscaping scheme and associated external work.

The Principal Planner referred to the amendment sheet which highlighted the following:

- i. Access Officer had no objections. Amended information was acceptable.
- ii. Condition 18 Biodiversity Net Gain
  - Condition had been put on in error and could be removed.
  - Applicants had demonstrated a net gain through the application and this was not required. Details would be addressed through the hard and soft landscape scheme and the landscape ecology management plan.

Mr Lee Hoenderkamp (applicant) spoke in support of the application.

During Members' questions, Councillor Porrer proposed an additional condition to monitor water consumption and efficiency and ensure that the data would be made publicly accessible.

This inclusion of the additional condition was carried **nem con**.

Cognisant of the Members' debate and the additional condition, the Strategic Sites Manager offered the following reasons to approve the application as outlined in the Officer's report including:

- i. Subject to planning conditions set out under section 22 subject to removal of condition 18 relating to biodiversity net gain as advised by the Principal Planner.
- ii. An additional condition/amended condition 10 relating to water efficiency which would address water monitoring in respect of the proposed extension. This would include the requirement for water monitoring equipment to be appropriately installed and verified, the information collected should be made publicly available. With Delegation to officers to agree with Chair and Vice Chair

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to approve application 25/00113/FUL –subject to:

- i. The planning conditions as set out in the Officer's report (section 22) with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers.
- ii. The removal of condition 18 relating to biodiversity net gain.
- iii. An additional condition/amended condition 10 relating to water efficiency which would address water monitoring in respect of the proposed extension. This would include the requirement for water monitoring equipment to be appropriately installed and verified, the information collected should be made publicly available. With delegation to officers to agree with Chair and Vice Chair.

**5a Address:** Cambridge Business Park, Milton Road, Cambridge

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers and comments were supplied, 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.

- i. The vision for a more permeable and connected site, along with the significant increase in greenery, was welcomed.
- ii. Clarification was sought on what specific measures would be implemented to encourage and support employees to use alternative modes of transport instead of private cars.
- iii. Would there be a traffic to work management plan in place?
- iv. Expressed concern about displacement parking outside of the site.

- v. What provisions would be made to ensure full accessibility for disabled individuals, both in terms of arriving at the site and navigating through the employment and community areas?
- vi. Should consider providing infrastructure for the parking and safe use of e-bikes and e-scooters on and through the site.
- vii. Would like to have more information on the community purposes in the two buildings on either side of the green cut through referenced in the presentation.
- viii. Would contractors' vehicles be permitted to park on site during construction?
- ix. How dependent was the proposals on the removal of the sewage works and the Hartree development. Could the proposed development proceed independently if these did not occur?
- x. If the sewage works remained in place, odour mitigation measures should be implemented.
- xi. Would be helpful to provide more information on the open spaces especially in the housing area.
- xii. Should consider the safety of those walking through the dark closed office zones at night to access the housing area; how would this be addressed?
- xiii. What traffic calming measures would be in place to reduce traffic speed on those roads which did permit cars on site?
- xiv. When the application came forward to Committee it would be useful to see visuals of the different heights of the buildings, the distance between each building and how they would sit in the surrounding landscape.
- xv. Welcomed the mixed use on site, the guided bus stop, road crossings and the opening of the drain.
- xvi. What plans were in place to comply with the trip budgets referenced in the Area Action Plan and emerging Local Plan?
- xvii. Would recommend the installation of a changing place toilet on site to be accessed by all users.
- xviii. The presentation had demonstrated how much the workplace had evolved in recent years and described the scheme as fun, which was welcomed and should be embraced.
- xix. Long term maintenance for all the planting planned throughout the site needed to be considered.
- xx. The presentation's reference to inequality and social and economic factors, all needed to create a good society, but what plans were in place to action this?

- xxi. Reference had been made to 'variety' throughout the site, how would this variety be delivered?
- xxii. Would question whether the Area Action Plan (3.5), Open Space for Informal Open Space and Play would be met.
- xxiii. Given the ongoing housing crisis in Cambridge, it was essential that the target of delivering 500 homes on the site was achieved. If this target cannot be met, an explanation should be provided outlining the reasons for the shortfall.
- xxiv. Welcomed the hub space.
- xxv. When considering the trip budget, it would be helpful to explain existing movement and then proposed changes using the transport movement hierarchy which started with pedestrians.
- xxvi. It was possible to negotiate with the train companies a discounted rate for the final site. Stansted Airport had negotiated a 70% discount on train fares for staff working at the airport.
- xxvii. Would highlight the advantages of modular construction, particularly for laboratories. Assembly in a factory environment enabled faster, more accurate installation on site.
- xxviii. Would designated wildlife corridors be included on site?
- xxix. Would the site be able to accommodate future light rail should such a system be installed to this part of Cambridge.
- xxx. Further detail was requested on the current number of parking spaces and the proposed provision, particularly in relation to the anticipated 5,000-person occupancy and the number of jobs expected at full site capacity.
- xxxi. Was there phased build plan for the housing on site, when would building work start?
- xxxii. Were there any plans to work with Cambridge Regional College and Cambridge Room?

**5b** Address: Darwin Green Phases Two and Three Development Site, Cambridge Road, Impington

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers and comments were supplied but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the Council as the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

- i. Was the hedge shown on the plans for the existing site being retained?
- ii. Would there be a skate park in the area? Would recommend looking at the design of the skate park at South Trumpington.

- iii. Was there a potential to establish connections with the area north of the A14, possibly by creating underpasses that enabled circular walking and cycling routes?
- iv. Would recommend looking at Marmalade Lane on Orchard Park. The development did not have built up street facades, achieved by breaking down and focusing on landscaping, car free spaces, shared spaces, private and semi-private and public spaces. This would be a great opportunity to produce a whole series of 'Marmalade Lanes' which would be transformative on how the different blocks on site worked together.
- v. In the Marmalade Lane development, off-plot parking was in the northeast corner of the site, there had been no need for on-plot parking. A similar approach could be considered for this development to optimise space.
- vi. Noted all the materials used on the development would be brick, would recommend looking at new forms of construction and being expressive in design.
- vii. Recommended using the underground waste service that was used on the Eddington development which negated the use of wheelie bins.
- viii. Welcomed a gas free site.
- ix. Sufficient car club parking on site should be considered; two spaces would not be enough.
- x. Would discourage single aspect units on the site.
- xi. Requested additional information regarding roofscape types and edge characteristics. Providing more visual aids on these aspects would be beneficial
- xii. All play parks should be sustainable.
- xiii. Recommended the installation of early landscaping on site and a long-term management plan of that landscaping.
- xiv. Water butts should be installed as standard and downpipes run through the balconies of the flats.
- xv. What plans and materials would be used for traffic calming on site?
- xvi. How would those on site be encouraged not to drive their children to school.
- xvii. Welcomed the avoidance of cal-de-sacs.
- xviii. Hoped the site would meet adoptable standards early on to enable local authority management. Early adoption would support the management sustainable, non-profit landscaping, creating a more positive experience for all site users.
- xix. Reference had been made to the potential for de-regulation in design codes; however, considered this inappropriate for the following reasons:

- During Phase 1, the developer installed over 90 incorrect foundations and initially resisted the requirement to submit planning applications for the necessary demolition works.
  - Sought to rebuild according to former building regulation standards, rather than adopting the updated energy efficiency standards.
  - A key planning condition remained unfulfilled until significant effort was invested to ensure compliance.
  - Landscaping on plots BW5 and BW6 did not align with the approved drawings.
- xx. A positive shift in the developer's approach had since been observed and was welcomed. It was therefore essential to ensure full compliance with approved planning applications, building regulations, and associated conditions.
- xxi. This proposal represented the third phase of development by the same developer within the Darwin Green area. It was crucial to consider the quality of the built environment in this context.
- xxii. The first phase, Kings Court was characterised by a use of hard surfacing, resulting in an unattractive public realm. Additionally. On-street parking had become problematic and required enforcement action.
- xxiii. Looking ahead, there was a clear need to plan for reduced reliance on private car ownership and to design with future needs in mind. Emphasis should be placed on sustainable, attractive, and well-integrated placemaking such as that on Marmalade Lane.
- xxiv. It was imperative to think about the facilities required for the Country Park and the future stewardship.
- xxv. What site level adjustments were required to ensure proper drainage and gravity flow for the primary and secondary schools. What was the scope of these works, and how long would implementation take?
- xxvi. The original drawings included an entrance to the country park from Wellbrook Way, Girton, which had not been shown in the presentation plans. Why had this access point been removed?
- xxvii. Would recommend more design variety for the houses on site.
- xxviii. What was the projected forecast for heat pumps for the housing on site?
- xxix. Needed to be made clear how the management of the drainage would be maintained long term.
- xxx. Based on the master plan drawings, many of the houses would face southeast which would receive plenty of sunlight. As a result, the design should incorporate strategies and materials for passive cooling to manage heat accumulation effectively.



- xxxi. When considering areas of play, it was vital to take into the surroundings for example the installation of a skate park could be very noisy in a residential area.
- xxxii. A car free site should not be an aspiration but was a necessity. The primary school in Waterbeach was car free so this was achievable.
- xxxiii. Exploring a range of representative journeys through the development provided valuable insights into the street layout, connectivity, visibility, and overall quality of the street environment.
- xxxiv. Strive to achieve clutter free streets.
- xxxv. Mobility hubs were being created at the Hartree development which had freed up the development area to have minimal traffic through the site and on street parking. By having parking in one space would free up space on site.
- xxxvi. Why had Cambridge City Council been referenced to adopt the park and open spaces when the land was in the boundary of South Cambridgeshire District Council?

**5c** Address: Cambridge Biomedical Campus, 1 Francis Crick Avenue, Cambridge  
This item had been withdrawn.

The meeting ended at 3.20 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank