

## PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015

### Amendment/De-brief Sheet

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:        14/1154/FUL

Location:     West's Garage, 217 Newmarket Road

Target Date: 16.10.2014 (extension of time has been agreed)

To Note:

#### **A.0 Transport advice**

A.1 Since completion of the Committee report, further comments have been received from transport officers at the County Council. The full advice is attached to this amendment sheet.

A.2 In summary, this advice is as follows: the County Council has no objections on transport grounds, but requires the submission of Servicing Management and Travel Plans, and a contribution of £120,683 to transport mitigation measures. I consider that the requirement for a Servicing Management Plan is already covered by my proposed Condition 23. I recommend that the Travel Plan and contribution to mitigating measures as specified by the County Council are secured via a Section 106 agreement.

#### **B.0 Third Party Representations**

B.1 Riverside Area Residents Association have, since the publication of the Committee report, sent further representations to members of Committee emphasising the key points of their objection. These additional comments, to which a number of images are attached, have also been copied to the case officer.

#### **C.0 Development Control Forum**

C.1 A Development Control Forum was held on this proposal on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2014. The minutes are attached to the main agenda. The DCF was held with respect to the original application details, before the amendments of October 2014 and January 2015.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

The following additional condition is recommended:

24: Prior to occupation, the proposed on-site renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational and shall thereafter be maintained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme previously agreed by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/16).

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 14/1797/FUL

Location: Judge Business School, Trumpington Street

Target Date: 13.02.2015

To Note:

I have received comments from the County Council Transport Team in relation to the addendum to the Transport Assessment. They raise no objection to the planning application, subject to two provisions:

1: a contribution towards the Trumpington Road Mini-Roundabouts Scheme, which is an allocated scheme in the County Council's 3 year Transport Delivery Plan. The total cost of that scheme is estimated at £300k. The County are awaiting further traffic survey information to confirm the proportionate costs to be attributed to this application, but it is anticipated to be no more than £32,207. This replaces the sought contribution towards the SCATP.

2: a condition seeking a revised Travel Plan to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

I have not received any feedback from the Council's Public Art officer concerning the submitted Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP). In my view, the PADP gives me confidence that public art will be integrated into the scheme and it is appropriate to grant permission subject to a S106 provision to secure this.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Additional Travel Plan condition (20) to read as follows:

20: Notwithstanding the submitted Travel Plan, prior to first occupation a revised Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable working arrangements, public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved in accordance with the details agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes of transport to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/3).

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                      APPLICATION REF:              14/1805

Location: Judge Business School, Trumpington Street

Target Date: 09.01.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 14/1691/S73

Location: Addenbrookes CBC, Land South Of Robinson Way West of the Forvie Site, Robinson Way

Target Date: 23.01.2015

To Note:

**Full County Highway Comments on the amended proposal** – are attached as Appendix A.

### **Further Representations**

1 Fendon Road  
5 Fendon Road  
6 Fendon Road

The comments can be summarised as follows:

- Proposed Fendon Road crossing point is not in a safe location.
- Cars enter Fendon Road too fast.
- Vegetation will obstruct drivers view of the crossing point.
- Loss of trees because of Fendon Road crossing point.
- Noise created from crossing point an issue.
- Fendon Road crossing point will be out of keeping with the grassy tree lined road.

### *Officer Comments*

- As described in paragraph 8.17 of the report, the Fendon Road crossing point has been positioned to avoid significant reductions in vehicle capacity.
- While it is noted that the conifer boundary hedge reduces visibility for motorists existing the gyratory, this is not considered to present a hazard to highway safety.
- The crossing point is a Toucan crossing which does not emit a noise.
- In the view of officers, the crossing point will not adversely affect the character and appearance of this section of Fendon Road.

### **Vehicular Capacity Clarification**

Paragraph 8.26 and summary point 2 – The officer report describes minimal impact on vehicle capacity at the Addenbrooke's roundabout.

The applicant has provided further clarification of the detailed capacity impact for each arm of the roundabout. (Table 1 below).

This data shows in the **AM peak** the revised layout results in some reduction in

capacity on all arms of the roundabout, with the exception of Fendon Road. However, the roundabout remains within capacity. In the **PM peak** the most significant impact occurs on the Hills Road north approach, which is 7% over capacity.

Officer Comments

This new information suggests a more significant impact on vehicle capacity for Hills Road north junction than was originally presented in the application submission.

However, localised increases in highway capacity at the junction itself (as required under the original **Condition 63**), are unlikely to bring any significant traffic benefits overall due to constraints elsewhere on the network. (Described in paragraph 8.22).

Before 2031 Strategic improvements are required to the Hills Road corridor overall, which may require significant remodeling of the Addenbrooke’s roundabout junction. This is likely to be considered through the second tranche of City Deal proposals in the medium to long term.

In summary, although the revised data suggests a greater impact on vehicle capacity for Hills Road north and the hospital than was originally presented, the benefits to pedestrian connectivity are still considered to outweigh the harm.

**Table 1**

<b>Arm</b>	<b>DoS (%) – existing layout – 2031 flows</b>	<b>DoS (%) – proposed layout – 2031 flows</b>
Hills Road South	59	67
Hospital	38	53
Hills Road North	54	66
Fendon Road	77	54

**AM peak hour degrees of saturation**

<b>Arm</b>	<b>DoS (%) – existing layout – 2031 flows</b>	<b>DoS (%) – proposed layout – 2031 flows</b>
Hills Road South	67	76
Hospital	54	80
Hills Road North	82	107
Fendon Road	60	62

**PM peak hour degrees of saturation**

**Tree Issues**

**Paragraph 8.41** – The amended scheme now removes the central wishbone pathway across the Addenbrookes roundabout. There are no tree removals therefore proposed within the central island.

One tree will be removed on Fendon Road. It is a category C hornbeam and should not constrain development. The Council’s Arboriculture Officer has confirmed that the amended scheme is acceptable in terms of impact on retained trees. Tree

protection is required during the works. New **condition 67** is recommended below.

**Legal Update** – paragraphs 2.8, 8.11

The Council’s solicitor has considered the wording of the proposed **Condition 63** further. A S106 Deed has been agreed as the most suitable mechanism of securing contributions for a future scheme to the Fendon Road roundabout. As such the wording of **Condition 63** has been amended as per the recommendation section below.

Amendments To Text:

Paragraph 1.7 – cyclists and pedestrians are able to use the **uncontrolled** crossing. (Not signalised).

Paragraph 8.23 – Three new advance cycle stop boxes are proposed, not four. (There are already three on the existing roundabout).

Paragraph 8.34 – spelling – wheelchair **users**.

Paragraph 8.41 – spelling – significant improvement to pedestrian **safety**...

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

**Amended recommendation:**

**Approve** subject to the completion of the associated S106 Agreement by 3 April and subject to the following conditions. *(All conditions listed in report).*

**Amended Condition 63**

**No occupation of any floorspace for clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), or biomedical and biotech research and development (B1b) or higher education building under use classes B1 and D1 or sui generis medical research institute uses shall take place until the offsite highways works at Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way shall have been fully laid out and implemented in accordance the approved schemes/plans in the Highway Design Report prepared by Lanmor Consulting dated March 2015, reference 140546/DS/KTP/01 Rev C.**

**Reason:** In order to safeguard highway safety and network capacity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11).

**New condition 67**

**Details of the specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval before any**

equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of the Addenbrooke's roundabout upgrade development required under condition 63 of this permission. The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made.

**Reason:** To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 4/4)

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:            14/1938/S73

Location:            1 Milton Road

Target Date: 09.03.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:            15/0009/FUL

Location:            Slipway, Garret Hostel Lane

Target Date: 09.03.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:        15/0010/LBC

Location:        Slipway, Garret Hostel Lane

Target Date: 03.03.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:        14/1947/FUL

Location:        Land rear of 2 Saxon Road

Target Date: 30.01.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:        15/0097/FUL

Location:        Land adjacent To 1 Campbell Street

Target Date: 17.03.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:            15/0033/FUL

Location:            4 Rustat Road

Target Date: 06.03.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:            14/2028/FUL

Location:            St Stephens Church And Church Hall, 24 Brooks Road

Target Date: 16.02.2015

To Note: On 30<sup>th</sup> March, additional representations were received from the occupier of 26 Brooks Road. This document is available on the City Council website, but because it is more than 21,000 words long it has not been attached to the amendment sheet. The issues raised are as follows:

- Threat to structural integrity of 26 Brooks Road
- Threat to health of children at 26 Brooks Road
- Noise and vibration
- Description of application incorrect because it is a new substation
- Notification not distributed to enough neighbours
- No adequate drawings provided
- Inconsistencies in drawings
- Other possible sites for substation not explored
- Current validity of TPOs on the site to other possible locations not explored

- This proposed location solely to do with cost and convenience for applicant
- Threat of pollution (to air, and also from oil leaks, noise, vibration, light and EMF (electric and magnetic fields) and ELF (extremely low-frequency fields))
- Visually dominant
- Danger to underground services
- Substation too close to storm water tanks
- Soil contamination from weed control chemicals
- Fire risk (fire and rescue service not consulted). No evacuation plan submitted.
- Risk of explosion or arcing to power cable on fence serving shed and cabin
- Flood risk
- UKPN guidelines ignored
- Long-term health risk from EMF – no Health Impact Assessment submitted
- Impact on wi-fi and radio signals
- Security danger from people climbing on substation
- Loss of earnings if concerned parents do not wish to use this site for childminding any longer
- Negative impact on house value

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

## West Garage, Newmarket Road

(14/1154/FUL)

### TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS

**PREPARED BY: Transport Assessment Team**

**AUTHOR: Emily Butler**

**DATE: 25<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

#### Background

The proposals include the redevelopment of the West Garage site for erection of new student housing and communal facilities, cycle parking. The development will comprise 222 student rooms, with no on site car parking.

The below provides a review of the revised Transport Statement submitted in response to our comments dated 18<sup>th</sup> August 2014 and 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014.

#### Existing Conditions

##### *Local Planning Policy*

It is important to note that the draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire should not be prejudiced by the West Garage development proposals.

##### *Existing Local Transport Network*

Further plans have been provided detailing the potential routing of students to key facilities within the local area.

##### *Accident Data*

The Newmarket Road/ Coldhams Lane junction is an accident cluster site identified by the County Council. The Transport Statement identifies that each of the incidents can be attributed to a combination of driver error, volume of traffic and/ or poor road safety awareness.

The development is expected to reduce motorised vehicular traffic on the highway network although pedestrian and cyclist movements are expected to increase. The County Council

considers that the contributions towards local cycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements detailed below will help to improve facilities for vulnerable road users travelling to and from the site.

In addition it is advised that residents of the development be offered cycle training classes through the Travel Plan initiatives to ensure they are made of road safety.

## **Trip Generation and Distribution**

### *Existing Trip Generation*

The September 2013 survey results indicate that the site is used as a through route for pedestrians and cyclists. The County Council have calculated that 117 trips are associated with trips travelling through the Wests Garage site, which will continue to operate along River Lane and Newmarket Road after the development is built out and therefore should be treated as such and not included in the existing development trip calculation.

### *Future Trip Generation*

The applicant has provided further information in respect of the trip surveys at Tripos Court. The trips applied to the development are in keeping with the ECATP trip rate figure. The applicant suggests that servicing was not captured as part of the survey as it did not occur across this period, although the servicing of the proposed site is anticipated to be less disruptive than a car transporter stopping and unloading on Newmarket Road at the frontage of the development. Although we do not anticipate significant movements we recommend that a servicing management plan be secured.

## **Transport Impact**

The development is expected to have fewer motorised vehicular movements associated with it compared to the existing use, although overall person trips particularly those travelling by cycle or foot are expected to increase.

## **Transport Contributions**

Transport improvements in the Eastern Corridor to mitigate the transport consequences of the development are sought, these being via either the ECATP or as a contribution towards the a project adhering to the principles of Project 4 'Remodelling Coldham's Lane Junction' outlined

within the Eastern Gate SPD which will form part of wider scheme improvements on Newmarket Road as part of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

The contribution has been recalculated to exclude through trips in the existing trip consideration as follows:

202 student rooms x 4 student trips = 808

808 - (398 existing person trips – 117 through trips) = 527 net additional trips

527 x £229 = £120,683.00

## **Site Parking Assessment**

### *Car Parking*

The Transport Statement identifies that occupants of the accommodation will be under the control of the appropriate student parking control policies and will not be permitted to own and run a car whilst resident in Cambridge at The University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin. The County Council are concerned how Proctorial Control will operate for a block of flats if occupied by students from several different education establishments, although the site is located within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) resulting in students being prevented from parking on local streets.

It is recommended that suitable measures be included in the Travel Plan to ensure that students are prevented from owning and having a car in Cambridge whilst living at the student residents.

### *Cycle Parking*

The Transport Statement identifies that the development will provide 188 secure cycle parking within designated cycle stores located within the building and accessed from River Lane and Newmarket Road. In addition there will be 16 spaces will be located within the improvement scheme for the River Lane frontage, for use by visitors. The total number of cycle parking spaces is in keeping with Cambridge City Cycle Parking Standards, although it should be noted that 44 of the spaces should be accessible to visitors not just the 16 spaces to be provided to comply with standards.

Section 6.3 of the Transport Statement identifies that the cycle provision will be regularly monitored to ensure the provision is adequate, which is welcomed by the County Council but require that the methodology for monitoring and implementing this be detailed in the Travel Plan.

## **Travel Plans**

The applicant has identified as part of the revised Transport Statement details of what will be contained in the Travel Plan, including objectives of the travel plan, an indication of some measures to be implemented, details of how the travel plan will be monitored, managed and funded.

The full Travel Plan should be submitted and agreed prior to occupation. The Travel Plan should demonstrate how students will be encouraged to travel by sustainable travel and how safer routes will be promoted to students.

The Travel Packs listed in the Transport Statement should also be supplied to staff to encourage them to use sustainable modes of transport to get to and from work. The contents of the Travel Packs should be submitted and agreed with the County Council prior to occupation.

The Framework Travel Plan should include details of the arrival and departure of students at the beginning and end of term time, including how students will be made aware of arrangements and how they will book their allocated slot to unload/load.

The Travel Plan should also make reference to how students will be prevented from owning a car. Measures should include cycle training for students living at the development.

In addition, the Travel Plan should contain details of the how students will be prevented from owning a car whilst resident on site.

## **Conclusions**

Having reviewed the supporting information associated with the application the County Council raise no objection to the proposals subject to the following being secured through planning condition or Section 106.

- Servicing Management plan
- A transport contribution should be provided for £120,683.00, as detailed above
- A Travel Plan should be provided and agreed with the County Council prior to occupation of the development.

## PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

To: Cambridge City Council	<p><b>Economy Transport and Environment</b></p> <p><b>Highways Development Management</b></p> <p>Unit 5, Wellbrook Court Wellbrook Way Cambridge CB3 0NA</p>
<b>App Reference:</b> 14/1691/S73	<b>Contact:</b> Ian.Dyer@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk
<b>Date:</b> 16 <sup>th</sup> March 2015	

**Re: S73 Application to vary condition 63 to read: no occupation of any clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), or biomedical and biotech research and development (B1b), or higher education building under use classes B1 and D1, or sui generis medical research institute uses shall take place, until the off-site highway works at Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way roundabout and Queen Ediths Way/Mowbray Road/Fendon Road have been fully laid out and implemented in accordance with the approved schemes/plans set out in the Highway Design Report 140546/DS/KTP/01 dated Oct 2014**

**Land South Of Robinson Way West Of The Forvie Site Robinson Way  
Cambridge Cambridgeshire**

### *Additional comment*

In consideration of this proposal the historic background is relevant.

The original scheme proposed for the Addenbrookes access gyratory on Hills Road was a scheme intended to provide additional highway capacity at the junction to accommodate predicted traffic generation linked to the development.

In the intervening years there have been many significant changes to the transport policy and the approach to dealing with traffic from developments, and, indeed, traffic generally.

The National Planning Policy Framework refers to the promotion of walk / cycle / public transport in a number of places:

Paragraph 17:

“actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”



Paragraph 32:

Plans should take account of whether:

“the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure”

Paragraph 35:

Developments should:

“give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities”

And the National Planning Policy Guidance paragraph 6 states that:

“Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements can positively contribute to:

- encouraging sustainable travel;
- **lessening traffic generation and its detrimental impacts;**
- reducing carbon emissions and climate impacts;
- creating accessible, connected, inclusive communities;
- improving health outcomes and quality of life;
- **improving road safety; and**
- **reducing the need for new development to increase existing road capacity or provide new roads.”**

[My emboldening shows those sections relevant to the scheme before us.]

Local adopted policy in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire is also relevant:

For example:

**“Policy TSCSC 2: Catering for travel demand in Cambridge**

For more travel demand to be accommodated on the constrained transport network of Cambridge:

- More people will walk, cycle and use passenger transport services for journeys into, out of and within the city.
- More people will car share.
- Pedestrians, cyclists and buses will be prioritised for trips across the city. General vehicular traffic will not be prohibited and accessibility will be maintained, but a car journey may be longer and more time consuming than at present for many trips.
- General traffic levels will remain at current levels.”



### **“Policy TSCSC 7: Supporting sustainable growth**

The transport network will be developed in line with the strategy approach and objectives, to provide the capacity necessary to accommodate planned growth levels while protecting the area’s distinctive character and environment.

New development will be required to make provision for integrated and improved transport infrastructure to ensure that most people have the ability to travel by foot, bicycle or by passenger transport and in line with specified modal split targets where relevant.

Access by walking, cycling and public transport will be maximised in all new developments, ensuring that planning contributions are sought for transport improvements where appropriate.”

Importantly the Local Transport Plan also set out a User Hierarchy which prioritises pedestrians over other modes. An extract is provided below.

### **“User hierarchy**

The user hierarchy reflects Manual for Streets 1 and 2, and is shown below.

1. Pedestrians.
2. Cyclists.
3. Public transport.
4. Specialist service vehicles. (e.g. emergency services, waste collection, disabled drivers).
5. Other motor vehicles.

The user hierarchy will be used as a guide for setting priorities and allocating funding towards programme areas and schemes.”

It is considered that the above *transport* policies support the approach being taken with this application. It is also considered that the adopted and emerging Local Plan policies support this approach but the LPA will need to reassure themselves that this is the case.

Increases in capacity locally have been found to encourage additional car based trips, and that capacity has often disappeared in advance of the full development generation appearing. Furthermore, by allowing local traffic growth at specific locations, this can exacerbate existing problems elsewhere on the network.

Recent policies at national and local level have concentrated more on facilitating a modal shift away from the private car to pedestrian, cycle and public transport based trips, or linked trips using these modes, such as park and ride or park and cycle. This approach can facilitate further economic and housing growth without significantly increasing the demand for movement by car and is an approach that has been adopted in managing traffic demand in and around Cambridge. For example, traffic monitoring<sup>1</sup> undertaken by the County Council has shown that, since 2004, there has been a 13% decline in car movements across the River Cam screenline, and an increase of just 2% in car movements across all of the main radial routes into Cambridge despite continued housing and economic growth in the sub-region.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Traffic Monitoring Report 2013 Cambridgeshire County Council*



This is the thrust of the approach within the adopted Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and supported via the City Deal, which aims for more journeys to be made by bus, train, bike and on foot so that traffic levels are not increased.

The original scheme, when considered against this approach, would not provide pedestrian connectivity and would be likely to further deter cyclists from using what is, already, a challenging junction.

Recent schemes implemented in the City, such as the Radegund Road roundabout, Northampton Street signals and Catholic Church signals have taken the approach of encouraging connectivity, capacity for the motor vehicle having a lesser priority within the aims of the design, although still a consideration.

The accommodation of modes at these junctions also reflects current guidance on design targeting facilities for each mode using the modal user hierarchy.

The Manual for Streets design documents provide guidance on highway design and set out, as one of the principle changes to practice, “**Developing street character types** on a location specific basis requiring a balance to be struck between place and movement in many busier streets”. (Manual for Streets 2 Section 1.2 MfS Principles, Para 1.2.1).

This concept is explained further in Manual for street 2, Section 2 Networks Contexts and Street Types. This junction would be deemed to have a relatively high Movement Status and a medium to high Place Status. Whilst this makes the use for motor traffic important, the importance of pedestrian and cycle movements and the residential environment is still an important factor.

With this in mind the Highway Authority requested the developer to look again at the junction design, using actual resultant growth and changes to use on the network in the intervening period with a view to an alternative scheme being developed that is more in keeping with the Authority’s current approach to transport policy and planning. Of course, the impact upon highway capacity remains an important consideration.

The resultant revised scheme, which is acceptable to the Highway Authority, therefore provides improved pedestrian connectivity across the junction. There are also benefits, albeit more limited, for cyclists as the improvement provides alternative routes using the signalised crossing for cyclists who wish to avoid mixing with motor traffic on the main circulatory carriageway and puts the junction under signal control at all times. Further improvements to cycling within and around the gyratory are considered impractical due to land and other constraints.

The developers have provided additional modelling of the gyratory junction that demonstrates to our satisfaction that the impact of signalling the Fendon Road arm would have such significant impact (in the model it results in a reduction in highway capacity at the junction by 43%) that provision of full pedestrian connectivity at the



roundabout is undeliverable without unacceptable impact upon the overall operation of the junction, However, the modelling also provides a scenario where the missing signal crossing on Hills Road, south of the gyratory, is provided. This model shows a reduction in capacity in the region of 4%. This is considered acceptable when weighed against the benefit to pedestrian connectivity.

County Officers have found there to be some minor discrepancies in the calculations which underpin the traffic flows entered into the junction modelling assessment. However, officers have been reassured through their own analysis that the traffic flows are broadly consistent and therefore acceptable for the purpose of this assessment. However, the County request that the assessment and accompanying technical note be updated in line with the comments provided by email on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and provided prior to committee so that the final results are available in the public domain and are available to committee members.

The County would, however, point out that this is modelled behaviour, and, if this is not reflected on the ground and the impact upon the capacity of the junction proved unacceptably high, would reserve the option to switch off the controlled crossing to maintain levels of vehicular access to the hospital.

The ability to provide this facility would reduce the benefits provided by the wishbone path within the central island as originally requested by the Highway Authority and so the Highway Authority would consider removal of this facility acceptable.

There would be a residual risk for pedestrian connectivity as, should the southern crossing of Hills Road need to be switched off, anyone wishing to cross that arm under the cover of signal control, would have a long detour.

Given the number of movements involved, the Highway Authority consider that, on balance, the acceptance of this risk would be reasonable, given that the omission of pedestrian crossings to the central island allows the retention of advanced cycle reservoirs on the circulatory carriageway, and provision of an addition reservoir.

The provision of a signalised crossing on the inbound arm of the access to Addenbrookes on the amended plans provides additional controlled linkage for pedestrians and cyclists.

Whilst the provision for on-carriageway cyclists is not improved greatly by the proposals, the current scheme is seen as providing those improvements that can reasonably and practically be provided within the scope of developers works whilst not resulting in significant disincentive to cyclists, as may have resulted from implementation of the original scheme.

The scheme as proposed enhances connectivity, particularly for pedestrians, which feeds into the toolkit for achieving aspirations of the developing City Deal strategy in that this approach supports and enhances scope for the modal transference within the Addenbrookes Travel Plan. This process is already well underway and achieving significant changes in travel to work patterns for staff.



It is recognised that there is limited scope for modal transference for trips by patients and visitors as Addenbrookes is a regional hospital and the practical needs of many patients do not lend themselves easily to travel by the most sustainable modes. This scheme is aimed at those trips for which it is possible to achieve change.

The City Deal identifies this corridor as being subject to a scheme in the second tranche of works.

This scheme would be anticipated to address overall problems on the corridor, which the developer's scheme would not and could not be required to. The developer can only be held responsible for offsetting detriment linked directly to impact from their development. Wider, existing problems would not be addressed.

The City Deal proposals are considered likely to involve significant engineering works.

In the interim, it major works would appear inappropriate as the final scheme would be likely to undo, or be frustrated by the interim scheme. This interim would be likely to involve major disruption to the network.

To have two schemes, with associated disruption, one of which may well undo the work of the other, is not considered an appropriate course of action and so this scheme, which could be provided with minimal disruption and would provide much needed pedestrian and cycle connectivity in the intervening period until resources are available to address the fundamental issues is preferred.

In regard to the issues raised at the public consultation regarding the distance along Fendon Road at which the Toucan crossing is provided, this is seen as a reasonable location, given the need for such a crossing and the inability to provide same at the gyratory: moving the crossing closer to the gyratory increases the potential for interaction between queues of traffic and the flow on the main circulatory carriageway, in the final extreme, becoming the same as provision of signal control on that arm, or worse.

The proposed location avoids conflicts with existing driveways as far as is practicable and provides sufficient reaction time for drivers exiting the gyratory to stop at the crossing point.

In regard to the junction of Queen Edith's Way with Mowbray Road and Fendon Road, the County Council in response to requests from local Members of both City and County Councils and local residents has agreed to develop a scheme to improve connectivity in the area around the junction. This scheme is likely to be more wider reaching than the proposals and, again, should the developer provide works, there is a significant risk that the works would prove abortive and the final scheme developed following full consultation to address wider issues, rather than just developer-related issues, would replace much of what is proposed as a stand-alone scheme.

With a resolution by the Council to progress a scheme in the immediate future it is considered more appropriate for the developer to provide a financial contribution



towards the wider scheme, avoiding wasted time, cost and disruption, whilst contributing to wider benefits.

Ian A. Dyer  
Lead Highways Development Management Engineer



This page is intentionally left blank