

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

15 April 2026  
10.00 am - 2.25 pm

**Present:** Councillors S. Smith (Vice-Chair), Griffin, Illingworth, Porrer, Smart, Thornburrow, Bradnam, Cahn, Hawkins, Stobart and R. Williams

Councillors Williams and Griffin left the meeting during item 26/16/JDMC and did not return.

Also present: Councillor McPherson

**Officers Present:**

Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites and NSIP/Major Infrastructure Projects):  
Philippa Kelly  
Principal Planner: James Truett  
Senior Planner: Melissa Reynolds  
Legal Adviser: Richard Pitt  
Committee Manager: Sarah Michael  
Meeting Producer: Matthew Hussey

**Developer Representatives:**

(Carter Jonas), Peter McKeown  
(JTP Architects), Emma Armstrong  
(JTP Architects), Bradlee Mulroe

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**26/11/JDMC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Fane.

As the Chair, South Cambs Councillor Fane, was not present at the meeting, the Vice Chair, City Councillor Smith, chaired the meeting.

Cllr Hawkins proposed and Councillor Thornburrow seconded South Cambs Councillor Bradnam to act as Vice Chair for the purposes of any procedural matters concerning decisions arising from the applications for this meeting. This was **unanimously agreed**.

**26/12/JDMC      Declarations of interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Councillor Stobart	26/14/JDMC 26/15/JDMC	Personal:      Member      of Camcycle  Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart	26/15/JDMC	Personal:                  Former employee                  at Addenbrookes Hospital  Discretion unfettered.

**26/13/JDMC      Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2026 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**26/14/JDMC      25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow, Cambridge**

The application sought approval for a single storey front extension, single storey side and rear extension and first floor side extension to create change of use from residential (Use Class C3) to a large 7-bed HMO (sui generis) and associated works.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to the amendment sheet to note the representation received from a Ward Councillor.

A representative from RoseTree Estates addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Irfan Arslan (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Russ McPherson (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

The Committee adjourned at 11:10 to allow Officers to discuss new information regarding the application that had become apparent during the debate.

Following adjournment, The Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites and NSIP/Major Infrastructure Projects) advised the Committee that the Change of Use proposal had not been made clear in the planning application. Officers understood the proposal (as per the Officer's report) was for change of use from residential (Use Class C3) to a large 7-bed HMO (sui generis) and associated works. During committee, the Applicant said that it would be used for student accommodation. In light of this new information, Officers requested further time to consider the application under the relevant policy.

Councillor Smith proposed and Councillor Porrer seconded a recommendation to defer the application to:

- i. Seek further information on the Applicant's intended future use of the property to ensure Officers could consider the application under the appropriate policy.

#### The Committee:

The Committee **Resolved (by 6 votes to 4, with 1 abstention)** to defer the application.

#### **26/15/JDMC      26/00092/FUL AstraZeneca South Plot, West Of Francis Crick Avenue, Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

The Committee received an application for demolition of existing structures and redevelopment for a Conference Centre (Use Class F1) and Office (Use Class E(g)(i)). Including hard and soft landscaping, servicing, access and associated infrastructure.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet with reference to:

- i. Anglian Water's updated approach to dealing with planning applications in water recycling catchments from 01 April 2026.
- ii. Foul water update (Additional paragraph 18.20 of report)
- iii. Foul water update (Additional paragraph 18.24 of report)

Richard Surma (Applicant's representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow made a request that Hobson's Conduit Trust be included as a formal consultee in future planning applications on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to Condition 10 to include specific reference to water run-off from the building roof.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to Condition 17 to include reference to the coach drop-off arrangements in the travel plan.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Smith proposed an amendment to replace Informative 1 on signage with a new Condition regarding signage strategy.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Stobart proposed an amendment to include an advisory on public art.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved by 10 votes to 1** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to delegated authority to officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair to draft and include the following:

- i. An amendment to Condition 10 relating to surface water run-off;
- ii. An amendment to Condition 17 relating to the travel plan;
- iii. An additional condition regarding wayfinding/signage;
- iv. An additional advisory regarding public art.

**26/16/JDMC      Former NIAB HQ Huntingdon Road, 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. How would car parking in the mews be managed?
2. Would two spaces be sufficient for car clubs?
3. Could developers clarify the management of delivery vehicle drop-offs?
4. Had residents of Howes Place been consulted on the use of the names Howes Green and Howes Lane?
5. Arrival by car onto Howes Green – a green space – may not be appropriate.
6. With less parking provision in the basement, what would be done to prevent the surface being dominated by cars?
7. Regarding affordable housing, was 40% not the requirement of the co-living policy? What was the meaning of ‘delivered at the equivalent of 20% C3 units’ in relation to affordable housing?
8. Was the development really co-housing, when defined as living together in a commune, or was it a commercial enterprise?
9. Concerns raised around offering the affordable housing element as an off-site component.
10. Were the shop uses shown in the presentation guaranteed to happen?
11. Were play areas integrated into drainage schemes?
12. Would the play areas be fenced with access gates?
13. Did the advertised 7.5m<sup>2</sup> communal space per person include the gym and other facilities?
14. Would there be any restrictions to accessing the scheme, for example age?
15. What would be the best bus pattern around Huntingdon Road to make this development a success?
16. Could developers explain the dependency/relationship with Darwin Green and Eddington? For example, in terms of school places or nursery facilities?
17. Was co-living a new terminology for bedsits with communal space?
18. Would the rent payment include access to all communal facilities?  
Concerns raised about the rent levels compared to those for a bedsit.
19. The previous residential consent had 291 build-to-rent and 202 apartments. This proposal is for 369 build-to-rent and 240 co-living spaces. How had the developer managed to intensify the site to this extent?

20. With this proportion of build-to-rent, there would most likely be children in the properties. How would the on-site open space requirement be fulfilled?
21. There was an outstanding requirement to provide additional, covered cycle parking. How would that be dealt with?
22. Could delivery vehicles use the turning head to deliver, accessing via Lawrence Weaver Road?
23. The additional height would increase the massing. Would this have an impact on residents of Howes Place and Plymouth Close?

The meeting ended at 2.25 pm

**CHAIR**