

S/WC West Cambridge

Table 3 Comments Specific to Policy S/WC	
Policy Para	Comment
Para 1	Does not identify the approved floorspace 5,700sqm of sui generis uses including energy centre and data centre. While the approved planning permission takes precedent this should be included for consistency. It is mentioned in the 'uses' section of the policy.
Para 2	Supported to give greater flexibility over the plan period.
Para 5	Paragraph 5 states that any applications must be in accordance with the Spatial Framework Diagram. The Spatial Framework Diagram is high level (and incorrect in places- see below), it is more appropriate to say that any applications must be in accordance with the approved parameter plans before then listing the design code and Amenities Delivery Strategy.
Para 6	In paragraph 6, this should also include revised parameter plans.
Para 8(c)	It seems strange to identify one particular transport measure in isolation. It would be better left as 'Contributions towards strategic transport infrastructure local to the site and surrounding area' or similar.
Para 3.2.46	We object to the phrase in '3.2.46' which states the site 'Must' include residential development. The innovation district quite reasonably includes Eddington which provides a strong residential offer in close proximity (the plan acknowledges this in 3.2.47). While the University could look at residential options for this site in the future, residential accommodation may limit the site for its intended uses (for example may constrain research as it presents a new sensitive receptor and therefore noise constraint). The wording 'uplift in number of dwellings and additional mid-tech use' seems to describe Eddington better than Cambridge West.
Para 3.2.52	The University objects to statement in 3.2.52 'The current Sports Centre built on the Eddington site has been found to inadequately serve the needs of the development and this policy seeks to rectify this'. It is incorrect to say that there is a sports centre on Eddington- there is not. It is also incorrect to say (if the plan means to say this) that the one on Cambridge West has been found to be inadequate- it is not inadequate. Both sites have been developed in accordance with the standards set out in policy and will continue to do so within the extant approvals and obligations they have. The University continues to look to enhance Sports facilities at West in accordance with its approved outline consent.
Figure 67	Object to Figure 67 which shows a main vehicle access into the site from Madingley Road at the eastern end. The pink arrow needs to come from Clerk Maxwell Road. The southern most cycle link from Clerk Maxwell Road does not exist and would puncture the mature woodland. There are several cycle access points from the south not shown. The bus access arrows appear to be in the wrong locations- which seems to be an error.
Site within the Policy map	Object to open space within the policy map. The policy map highlights protected open space within the Cambridge West site. Some of this is strategic landscape (site edges and the lake) but others are small pockets of grassland that will not be retained in accordance with the approved parameter plans. The Protected open space around the Ray Dolby Centre has consent for an additional phase to be built. All small pockets of protected open space should be removed from the policy map as they conflict with the approved proposals.