



Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (Regulation 18) Consultation

Representations

January 2026

Prepared for:
Mission Street and BGO Propco Newton Ltd

Prepared by:
Stantec

Project Number:
333102040

Registered Office: Stantec House, Kelburn Court,
Birchwood, Warrington, WA3 6UT

Office Address: 50/60 Station Road, Cambridge CB1 2JH
T: 01223 882 000 E: cambridge.uk@stantec.com

Revision Schedule

Revision	Description	Author	Date	Quality Check	Date	Independent Review	Date
Final	Draft	JD	01.26	RM	01.26	PD	01.26

Disclaimer

The conclusions in the Report titled **Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (Regulation 18) Consultation** are Stantec’s professional opinion, as of the time of the Report, and concerning the scope described in the Report. The opinions in the document are based on conditions and information existing at the time the scope of work was conducted and do not take into account any subsequent changes. The Report relates solely to the specific project for which Stantec was retained and the stated purpose for which the Report was prepared. The Report is not to be used or relied on for any variation or extension of the project, or for any other project or purpose, and any unauthorized use or reliance is at the recipient’s own risk.

Stantec has assumed all information received from **BGO Propco Newton Ltd** (the “Client”) and third parties in the preparation of the Report to be correct. While Stantec has exercised a customary level of judgment or due diligence in the use of such information, Stantec assumes no responsibility for the consequences of any error or omission contained therein.

This Report is intended solely for use by the Client in accordance with Stantec’s contract with the Client. While the Report may be provided by the Client to applicable authorities having jurisdiction and to other third parties in connection with the project, Stantec disclaims any legal duty based upon warranty, reliance or any other theory to any third party, and will not be liable to such third party for any damages or losses of any kind that may result.

Prepared by:

 Signature
 JD

 Printed Name

Reviewed by:

 Signature
 RM

 Printed Name

Approved by:

 Signature
 RM

 Printed Name



Contents

1 Introduction 1
1.1 Preamble 1
1.2 The Representor 1

2 Policy S/C/SCL: South of Coldham’s Lane 2
2.1 S/C/SCL Response 2

3 Policy S/AMC/SCL: South of Coldham’s Lane 3
3.1 S/AMC/SCL Response..... 3

4 Policy J/AW: Affordable Workspace 4
4.1 J/AW Response 4

5 Summary 5



1 Introduction

1.1 Preamble

1.1 This report ('the Representations') has been prepared by Stantec on behalf of Mission Street and BGO Propco Newton Ltd ('the Representer') and sets out the Representer's responses to the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) which is currently out for consultation until 30 January 2026 17:00.

1.2 The Representer

1.2.1 BGO Propco Newton Ltd is the sole landowner of land south of Coldham's Lane. That land formed part of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change site allocation. The Site ID is 115696.

1.2.2 The land benefits from Detailed and Outline Planning Permission, granted on 31 January 2025 (ref. 23/04590/OUT), for:

"Offices (Use Class E(g)(i)), Research and Development (Use Class E(g)(ii)) Ancillary retail & facilities (Use Classes E(a) and E(b)), car and cycle parking, landscape and public realm, infrastructure and associated works, leisure uses (sui generis), and community uses (Use Class E (a-f)) including landscape works."

1.2.3 BGO Newton Propco Limited was the Applicant for this planning application. The Site is deliverable in the next five years and will contribute towards meeting the need for employment floorspace in Greater Cambridge over the next plan period. All pre-commencement planning conditions have been submitted for approval and most have been discharged, so that a start on site for Phase 1 can commence in early 2026.

1.2.4 The land has been allocated in the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) and as such, the Representer is a key stakeholder to help shape the GCLP as it progresses through to Adoption.

1.2.5 The remainder of this report sets out the comments to the relevant draft policies but does not repeat the policies in full. The following policies are commented on:

- S/C/SCL
- S/AMC/SCL
- J/AW

1.2.6 These comments have also been submitted online via the Council's consultation portal.



2 Policy S/C/SCL: South of Coldham's Lane

2.1 S/C/SCL Response

- 2.1.1 Paragraph 1c) of S/C/SCL suggests that there are areas for potential archaeological activity in the vicinity of the site and that archaeological investigation will be required via Desk Based Assessment.
- 2.1.2 It appears to us that this part of the policy has been drafted erroneously. Planning application 23/04590/OUT was subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) where, at Scoping stage, archaeology was scoped out of the Environmental Statement, therefore indicating a very low risk of any archaeological significance - the Site was previous landfill.
- 2.1.3 We therefore suggest that S/C/SCL paragraph 1c) should be deleted in full, as it is irrelevant to the Site's conditions and context and is unnecessary.



3 Policy S/AMC/SCL: South of Coldham's Lane

3.1 S/AMC/SCL Response

- 3.1.1 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.”
- 3.1.2 The application of a maximum limit on storeys in the draft policy is a) inflexible and b) inconsistent; discussed in turn below.
- 3.1.3 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.
- 3.1.4 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.
- 3.1.5 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.
- 3.1.6 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.
- 3.1.7 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.”



4 Policy J/AW: Affordable Workspace

4.1 J/AW Response

- 4.1.1 The intent behind Policy J/AW is acknowledged. We recognise the importance of ensuring that a mix of different types of employment space, at different price-points, is delivered to contribute to the overall success of the business ecosystem. We acknowledge that the Councils are open to ideas on how the J/AW policy should develop. However, we have some concerns over the way the draft policy is currently drafted.
- 4.1.2 For example, several other science and technology schemes in the local area appear to have stalled and simply are not being delivered at the required rate. Many of these projects will cite development viability as the core reason for this. As such, a mandatory policy requirement to deliver affordable workspace is likely to put added strain on viability and ultimately stymie delivery.
- 4.1.3 We acknowledge that the Councils have studied similar types of policies from other boroughs and districts and may be favouring a flat rate proportion of 10%-20% of the overall permitted floorspace to be dedicated as affordable workspace. However, we would suggest that such an application is inflexible and would contradict with part 1 of the policy which requires affordable workspace to meet a local identified need. In that sense, there is a risk the policy will be found to be unsound.
- 4.1.4 We would challenge the draft policy's requirements that affordable workspace should be delivered before or at the same time as 50% of the non-affordable workspace. Based on our understanding of the science and technology occupier market, start-up business prefer to co-locate close to established, more mature, businesses so that they can fully take advantage of the clustering benefits which can in turn drive innovation. Part 4, as drafted, therefore may not properly reflect market signals and again may hinder quick delivery of floorspace within the early parts of the plan period.

5 Summary

- 5.1.1 This report ('the Representations') has been prepared by Stantec on behalf of BGO Propco Newton Ltd ('the Representer') and sets out the Representer's responses to the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) Regulation 18 consultation.
- 5.1.2 BGO Propco Newton Ltd is the sole landowner of land south of Coldham's Lane. That land formed part of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change site allocation. The Site ID is 115696.
- 5.1.3 The land benefits from Detailed and Outline Planning Permission, granted on 31 January 2025 (ref. 23/04590/OUT), for:
- "Offices (Use Class E(g)(i)), Research and Development (Use Class E(g)(ii)) Ancillary retail & facilities (Use Classes E(a) and E(b)), car and cycle parking, landscape and public realm, infrastructure and associated works, leisure uses (sui generis), and community uses (Use Class E (a-f)) including landscape works."*
- 5.1.4 BGO Newton Propco Limited was the Applicant for this planning application. The Site is deliverable in the next five years and will contribute towards meeting the need for employment floorspace in Greater Cambridge over the next plan period. All pre-commencement planning conditions have been submitted for approval and most have been discharged, so that a start on site for Phase 1 can commence in early 2026.
- 5.1.5 The land has been allocated in the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) and as such, the Representer is a key stakeholder to help shape the GCLP as it progresses through to Adoption.
- 5.1.6 The Representer has submitted comments to the following policies:
- S/C/SCL
 - S/AMC/SCL
 - J/AW
- 5.1.7 These comments have also been submitted online via the Council's consultation portal.