

JOINT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

17 June 2026
10.00 am - 2.00 pm

Present: Councillors Porrer (Chair), Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Flaubert, Griffin, Illingworth, Smart, Bostanci, Sandford, R.Williams, Rixon and Stobart

Councillors Flaubert, Rixon, Sandford and Williams left the meeting after the vote on item 26/24/JDMC.

Officers Present:

Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites and NSIP/Major Infrastructure Projects): Philippa Kelly
Principal Planner: Cuma Ahmet
Principal Planner (Strategic Sites): Janine Richardson
Senior Planner: Melissa Reynolds
Legal Adviser: Vanessa Blane
Committee Manager: Sarah Michael
Meeting Producer: Claire Tunnicliffe

Developer Representatives:

(Stanhope), Ron German
(Hilson Moran), Marie-Louise Schembri
(Robert Myers Associates), Robert Myers
(ShedKM), Alex Flint
(Marengo), Nick Vose
(Bidwells), Guy Kaddish
(Bidwells), Claire Galilee

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/17/JDMC Re-ordering Agenda

Under paragraph 4.13.2 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used her discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

26/18/JDMC Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

The Delivery Manager for Strategic Sites took the Chair whilst the Joint Development Management Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Illingworth proposed, and Councillor Stobart seconded, the nomination of Councillor Porrer as Chair.

Councillor Bennett proposed, and Councillor Flaubert seconded, the nomination of Councillor Flaubert as Chair.

As more than one nomination was received, Members proceeded to vote on each candidate. The results were as follows:

Councillor Porrer	10 votes
Councillor Flaubert	2 votes

Resolved by 10 votes to 2 that Councillor Porrer be elected as Chair for the ensuing year.

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

Councillor Sandford proposed, and Councillor Illingworth seconded, the nomination of Councillor Bradnam as Vice-Chair.

Unanimously resolved that Councillor Bradnam be elected as Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.

26/19/JDMC Apologies

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Sebastian, with Councillor Rixon attending as the alternate.

Apologies were received from Councillor Fisher, with Councillor Bennett attending as the alternate.

26/20/JDMC Declarations of interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Bradnam	26/22/JDMC	Site adjoins Milton Parish and she has received briefings but has not expressed a view. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart	26/25/JDMC	Family member works on the science park. Discretion unfettered.

26/21/JDMC Minutes

Councillor Stobart requested an amendment to item 26/16/JDMC to include a question on whether there would be nursery provision on the new development.

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 April 2026 were then approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

26/22/JDMC 26/00884/OUT Land North of Cowley Road and adjacent to Wild Park

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission for the construction of a Multi-Storey Commercial Car Park including pedestrian and vehicular access and a standalone amenity kiosk on land to the north of Cowley Road, adjacent to the Wild Park, approved as part of planning permission ref. 22/02771/OUT.

The Principal Planner updated his report to make reference to the amendment sheet and the amended proposed development description: Outline planning application for the construction of a Multi-Storey Commercial Car Park including pedestrian and vehicular access and a standalone amenity kiosk on land to the north of Cowley Road, adjacent to the Wild Park.

Mike Derbyshire (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee speaking in support of the application.

In accordance with information provided by the applicant at committee, Condition 5 would be updated to ensure provision of 10% of car parking

spaces with active electric vehicle charge points prior to first use of the MSCCP.

Councillor Stobart asked that the car park be included in the wider public art scheme as it comes forward for the whole development.

Councillor Stobart proposed, and Councillor Griffin seconded, an amendment to condition 14, to be expanded to include details of how harvested rainwater will be used in the wider surroundings.

This amendment was carried by **11 votes to 0, with 1 abstention**.

Councillor Bennett proposed, and Councillor Flaubert seconded, an amendment to condition 9 to require the construction ecological management plan to identify the impact on adjacent sites.

This amendment was carried by **11 votes to 0, with 1 abstention**.

The Committee

Unanimously resolved 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:

- i. The planning conditions and informatives as set out in Section 21 of the Report with delegated authority to officers to carry through amendments to those conditions and informatives (including additional / revised conditions as appropriate and necessary) in consultation with Chair and Vice Chair of Committee prior to the issuing of the planning permission.
- ii. Delegated authority to Officers to draft and include the following amendments to conditions:
 - a. An amendment to condition 5 (Electric Vehicle Implementation Plan) to increase the provision of electric vehicle parking spaces from 5% to 10%.
 - b. An amendment to condition 9 (Construction Ecological Management Plan) to require the construction ecological management plan to identify the impact on adjacent sites.
 - c. An amendment to condition 14 (Rainwater Harvesting) to include details of how harvested rainwater will be used in the wider surroundings.

26/23/JDMC 25/04604/FUL 1 Kings Meadow, Cambridge

The Chair made reference to the amendment sheet which noted that after the publication of the agenda, the agent, on behalf of the applicant, requested that the change of use to a large-HMO (sui generis use) be withdrawn from the application. The change altered the nature of the planning application in a way which was not reflected in the officer report as the report only addressed the principle of development/use of the house as a large HMO, with all other matters having been covered in the committee report that went before JDMC on 15 April 2026. In order to ensure that the current committee had all of the relevant information on this application before it to allow proper consideration of the application, and Officers having sought the advice of the Councils' Legal Officer, it was proposed that this application was deferred.

Councillor Porrer proposed and Councillor Bradnam seconded deferring the application to:

- i. Provide the Committee with the relevant information on the application to allow proper consideration.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to defer the application.

26/24/JDMC Planning Committee Review - Scheme of Delegation 12 Month Review

The Delivery Manager presented the report on the Scheme of Delegation 12 Month Review. Members discussed the item and provided feedback to the Delivery Manager.

The Committee

Unanimously resolved to note the contents of the report and:

- i. confirm that no changes are made to the scheme of delegation dated 22 May 2025; and
- ii. notes the potential for regulations (and accompanying guidance implementing the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025) to mandate a national scheme of delegation for planning decisions.

26/25/JDMC 163 Cambridge Science Park Pre-Application Developer Briefing

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. Where on Milton Road would this building be located?
2. Would the building be nine storeys in total with the mezzanine and plant enclosure?
3. Were the glass reinforced concrete (GRC) panels related to reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete (RAAC)?
4. Would the roof be green or would it have solar panels?
5. Would car parking be underground or on the ground floor?
6. How much would the proposed planting reduce the cooling load?
7. Consider whether native species of trees would be appropriate for potential future heatwaves or droughts.
8. What would the overall height be, with and without the rooftop terrace?
9. Was there provision in the car park plans for the increasing size of cars?
10. Would there be parking provision and charging points for e-bikes and mobility scooters, including appropriate fire safety provision?
11. Had the Designing Out Crime panel been consulted, particularly around lone employees working late and CCTV requirements?
12. Queried the need to raise the floor to make it safe from flooding, while also installing underfloor pits in the car park.
13. Noted that previous proposed stacker car parks elsewhere had been deemed expensive and impractical.
14. How would stacker car parks work?
15. What colour would the surface of the building be?
16. What was the current number of car and cycle parking spaces, and how many had been proposed for the new building?
17. How flexible would the design be – how easy would it be to convert the workspace into dry lab in future, and vice versa?
18. Was the intention that trees would last forever?
19. The angled front was interesting.
20. Would the GRC material hang on a steel reinforced concrete frame? Had timber been considered?
21. Were there any current examples of stacker car parks already in the UK?

22. Would like more information on the safety of the concrete at planning application stage.
23. How would the material weather?
24. How did the height compare with buildings being constructed on the southeast side of the A14/A10?
25. Had fewer storeys been considered?
26. Could there be more spaces for cargo bikes?
27. Could there be a Changing Places toilet?
28. Would the café be publicly accessible?
29. Plans could aim to be BREEAM outstanding.
30. Was the water reduction of 55% from what it is now or from what would be expected once constructed?
31. Cycleways should be segregated to manage conflict.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank