



Cambridge Past, Present & Future
Wandlebury Country Park
Cambridge CB22 3AE
Phone 01223 - 243830
www.cambridgeppf.org

21 June 2023

APPEAL BY BROOKGATE LAND LTD
ADDRESS: LAND NORTH OF CAMBRIDGE NORTH STATION, MILTON AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGESHIRE
LPA REFERENCE: 22/02771/OUT
APPEAL REFERENCE: APP/W0530/W/23/3315611

Closing Submission of Cambridge Past, Present & Future

CPPF's case against this development has centred, not on the principle, but on design and specifically the design of the buildings on the eastern edge.

We have stressed that the development of this site will create a new edge to the city and that it is vital that it is designed to make a positive contribution to the special visual characteristics of Cambridge.

Furthermore, it is important to recognise that the development will not only to be enjoyed by the residents and employees of the development, but also the tens of thousands of people who use the river cam and the meadows.

We set out the special characteristics of Cambridge as described in the Cambridge Local Plan

- Keys views of Cambridge from the surrounding countryside
- A soft green edge to the city
- A distinctive urban edge and distinctive skyline

We set out our view that the new urban edge needs to include a variety of architecture and of building heights and a screen of mature trees. We consider that Cambridge's distinctive skyline is characterised by variety, including towers, turrets, chimneys and spires set amongst large trees. We disagree that it is characterised by long horizontal buildings as set out by Mr Ludewig.

We argue that the appeal site differs from other new developments on the edge of Cambridge because it overlooks two Conservation Areas and a significant public open space whose character is defined by the landscape.

We argued that the massing and design of the proposed development creates large square blocks of uniform height. That the articulation of the roof and elevations, and the gaps between buildings are not discernible from a distance thereby creating the appearance of a wall of development when viewed from the meadows. We disagree with Mr Wallis and Mr Smith that using materials, light and shade to break up the bulk of the buildings is successful. Mr Smith's proof of evidence *Drawing CN-041* clearly shows that it is not successful.

To enhance the soft green edge to the city a screen of mature trees is needed. We consider that sufficient space needs to be given to allow the trees to grow to full maturity. Mr Myers, in his evidence, confirmed that there was insufficient space to do this, that the trees would be pruned to keep them at medium size and that the purpose of the trees was not to screen the buildings.

In conclusion, given the large numbers of people who benefit from their enjoyment of the river corridor and meadows we do not believe that the harm to the landscape, views and the setting of the Conservation Areas will be outweighed by the benefits of the development, and it should be refused. Instead, we would very much welcome a new development to come forward on this site that is design-led, respects the meadows and conservation areas, and will create a new city edge that the city can be proud of for generations to come.