



TOWN
Reeds Wharf,
33 Mill St,
London,
SE1 2AX

22nd March 2023

Ms Alison Dyson
Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Ms Dyson,

Planning appeal APP/W0530/W/23/3315611: Brookgate Ltd on behalf of The Chesterton Partnership, land north of Cambridge North Station, Cambridge, CB4 0AE

I write further to your letter to South Cambridgeshire District Council dated 16th February, confirming that day as the start date for the above appeal.

This letter is sent on behalf of U + I plc and TOWN, who are the appointed master developers of the 'Core Site' on Cowley Road, Cambridge; which consists of the Anglian Water treatment works, a depot (former park and ride site owned by Cambridge City Council) and a golf driving range. The Core Site lies at the heart of the emerging North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NEC AAP) – which also covers the site which is the question of the above s.78 appeal.

U+I and TOWN objected to planning application 22/02771/OUT, which is the subject of this appeal for non-determination. I enclose a copy of that objection which was prepared on our behalf by Carter Jonas. The principal ground for objection was the threat to the comprehensive redevelopment of North East Cambridge, in line with Policy SS/4 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2018, and Policy 15 of Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Key extracts of these policies are reproduced below¹:

The amount of development, site capacity, viability, time scales and phasing of development will be established through the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the site. The AAP will be developed jointly between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council, and will involve close collaborative working with

¹ Wording is slightly different between both policies, but the message is consistent

Cambridgeshire County Council, Anglian Water and other stakeholders in the area. The final boundaries of land that the joint AAP will consider will be determined by the AAP.

And:

All proposals should ensure that the development would not compromise opportunities for the redevelopment of the wider area.

We support many of the aims and objectives of the emerging NEC AAP as set out by the two Local Planning Authorities and Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Services (GC SPS). We recognise that growth of the scale set out in the R19 NEC AAP requires the timely provision of infrastructure to support that growth.

Fundamental to our objection remains the significant gap between the requirements for funding of strategic infrastructure which would be in accordance with the emerging R19 NEC AAP and that which the appellants set out in their application. To note one issue alone, strategic transport contributions, there is a gap of in excess of £10m between the funding required for mitigation measures as set out in the draft IDP and that offered by the appellants.

On behalf of the Core Site, we have significant concerns that application of piecemeal funding approaches such as the appellants propose would widen the funding gap for strategic infrastructure; and that increased contributions would be sought from those developments which will come later in the process. This would challenge the viability of developments such as the Core Site; threatening not only the comprehensive redevelopment of NEC but also the delivery of the 8,350 homes envisaged in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (of which approximately 3,900 homes are envisaged in the Plan period), potentially jeopardising a key source of housing supply in the development strategy).

Unfortunately, whilst the attached objection letter was received by the Case Officer at Greater Cambridge SPS it appears that it was not loaded on the Planning Portal until very recently. As a consequence, neither Carter Jonas nor ourselves received the notification of the timelines for the appeal.

Given the practical challenges of responding within the statutory timescales, I would like to request attendance at the Inquiry as a (non-Rule 6) party to present the case set out in this letter and the attached objection.

I have discussed this approach with GCSPS and it is supported by officers there.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this letter and inform me of the Inspector's response to this request in due course.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MAB', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Mike Bodkin MA MRTPI
Head of Planning
TOWN