
Mission Street & BGO Propco Newton Ltd response to S/AMC/SCL

Site ID 115596

Paragraph 2c) discusses the need for new buildings to be appropriate to the historic environment and their setting; however, the paragraph goes on to require that building heights “are no taller than 6 storeys to ensure there aren’t negative impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets.”

The application of a maximum limit on storeys in the draft policy is a) inflexible and b) inconsistent; discussed in turn below.

The application of a maximum storey height on buildings is inflexible. The heights of new buildings should be tested through the planning application process and the proposed development should be assessed against the development plan and material considerations at that time. To apply a storey height limit would stifle innovation and creative design where buildings of over 6 storeys may be demonstrated to be the most appropriate and optimised use of land this previously developed Site.

S/AMC/SCL is inflexible when assessed in the context of other emerging spatial strategies and projects including East West Rail. It is known from EWR’s “You said, we did” report (2025) that the preferred location for the Cambridge East railway station is on the western end of land known as “Parcel B”, south of Coldham’s Lane. If a railway station is developed on that site, the public transport accessibility and connectivity all this part of East Cambridge, including Cherry Hinton, will be significantly improved. The South of Coldham’s Lane site would be within excellent walking distance of a railway station (within 800m) on a safe and segregated pedestrian/ cycle route. As such, the Site would represent a highly sustainable location for increased density to deliver scale which can take into account proposed availability of infrastructure – which would represent alignment with planning policies at all levels.

S/AMC/SCL is inconsistent with other parts of the draft GCLP. Draft Policy S/C/SCL, paragraph 1b) sets out how development proposals must demonstrate how they “sensitively respond in height, mass, density and landscaping to its immediate residential context, to nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets, and short, medium, and strategic viewpoints.” There is no reference to a maximum storey height and quite rightly, as there is no need. Policy S/AMC/SCL should therefore be updated to become consistent with S/C/SCL paragraph 1b) as drafted in the Reg. 18 version.

S/AMC/SCL is inconsistent with the approved development under planning permission ref. 23/04590/OUT which approves, at its tallest point, a building of 8 storeys (ground plus 7). It is therefore inconsistent to apply a 6 storey maximum height and this should be amended and removed.

We therefore propose that S/AMC/SCL paragraph 2c) should be amended as follows:

“They are appropriate, in height, mass, density and landscaping, to the immediate residential context, to nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets and short, medium and strategic viewpoints of the site (in particular Strategic Viewpoint F (Little Trees Hill, Magog

Down). ~~historic environment including specific assets and their setting, implementing design-based mitigation, appropriate massing, and ensuring building heights are no taller than 6 storeys to ensure there aren't negative impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets.~~
A Heritage Impact Assessment and Townscape Assessment should be completed to support this approach.”