

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

21 January 2026  
10.00 - 11.10 am

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

**Officers Present:**

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

Legal Adviser: Vanessa Blane

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Matthew Hussey

**Developer Representatives:**

(Prologis), Andrew Blevins

(Prologis), Derek Lloyd

(Scott Brownrigg), Jason Lebidineuse

(Scott Brownrigg), Ross McWatt

(Growth Industry), Jon Akers Coyle

(Hoare Lea), Sami Kamal

(Bidwells), Alfie Hood

(Bidwells), Jennie Hainsworth

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

**26/1/JDMC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor M. Cahn (Councillor Garvie attended as an alternate) and Councillor Hawkins.

**26/2/JDMC Declarations of interest**

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Stobart	26/4/JDMC	Personal: Member of Camcycle.  Discretion unfettered.

Councillor Stobart	26/4/JDMC	Personal: Member of Rail Future.  Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Fane	26/4/JDMC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future but has not discussed application with them.  Discretion unfettered.

### **26/3/JDMC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **26/4/JDMC Land South of Dame Mary Archer Way, Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

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. The top floor of the building, referred to as a crown, appeared to be stepped out rather than stepped in which made it quite a prominent illuminated feature. What would the implications be for views at night?
2. Could the lighting be dimmed or switched off at night?
3. How much water would this building use?
4. Was the aspect of this building facing into the existing cluster or towards Mary Archer Way, and would that make a difference to how people would approach it and understand it?
5. Could it be made very clear where the entrance to the building is within the cluster?

6. How would the design of the building fit in with others as it appeared to be from a different era?
7. How would the lighting scheme of the building connect with the lighting in the surrounding area and would it utilise emerging technologies, such as people-sensitive lighting?
8. How did the notion of art fit with and carry over into the building?
9. It could be useful to have a coloured delineation near the doors.
10. How to help people navigate around the site?
11. Cycling connections were welcome.
12. Managing foul water discharge was an issue across Cambridge – it would be useful to see innovation in that respect.
13. How would the developer ensure that landscaping comes forward to prevent the site looking barren?
14. Would there be any delineation, for example, separation of vehicles and traffic calming, on mixed use access routes?
15. The southern access road may lead to more traffic in the area. Could developers address that?
16. Did the design of buildings in 'families' (as described by the developer) complement each other and their relationship to the masterplan? What would happen to the site when not in use (for example, at night)? Would it seem empty?
17. Concern over what the developer was trying to achieve. Where was the architectural attractiveness in the design?
18. How could disabled people access the building?
19. Could nursery provision be considered?
20. Cambridge Institute for Sustainable Leadership have a standard for well-being, which could be interesting to consider.
21. Use Eddington as a comparator for successful landscaping that has developed over a few years.
22. This location should be seen in the context of the wider setting to the south.
23. A multistorey car park would detract from what the developer was trying to achieve with the beacon of lighting.
24. Consideration should be given to developing access / egress routes that follow peoples' desire lines but also protect landscaping quality.

The meeting ended at 11.10 am

**CHAIR**