

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Report by: Head of Planning Services

Date: 6 September 2012

Application Number	12/0890/REM	Agenda Item	
Date Received	12/07/2012	Officer	Michael Ovenden
Target Date	6/09/2012		
Parishes/Wards	Queen Edith Ward		
Site	Bells School Development Site Babraham Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 0RA		
Proposal	Reserved matters application for proposed road junction of site access road with Babraham Road, and initial section of access road, including additional details required under condition 28 of the outline planning permission (06/0795/OUT).		
Applicant	The Bell School Educational Trust Ltd		
Recommendation	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS		
Application Type	Major	Departure:	No

The above application is reported to the Planning Committee for determination in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation for the Joint Development Control Committee for the Cambridge Fringes

INDEX

	Page
1 BACKGROUND	2
2 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT	4
3 THE PROPOSAL	5
4 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY	5
5 PUBLICITY	6
6 POLICY	6
7 CONSULTATIONS	7
8 NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS	7
9 CONTEXT DEFINED BY THE APPEAL	8
Principle	9
Junction/access road design	9
Interaction between movements from and past the site	10
Highway capacity	11
Interaction between access and No6 and 6B Babraham Road	12
Other matters	13
10 ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT APPLICATION	13
Approval details under condition 28 – Submission of access details	15
11 CONCLUSION	16
12 RECOMMENDATION	16
13 PROPOSED CONDITIONS	16
14 REASONS FOR DECISION	16

APPENDICES

- A INSPECTOR'S APPEAL DECISION LETTER (11/0918/REM)
- B CONDITION 28 (06/0795/OUT)
- C OUTLINE APPLICATION SITE PLAN – 8495.13.02 (06/0795/OUT)
- D INDICATIVE MASTERPLAN – 425.1/101K (06/0795/OUT)
- E PARAMETER PLAN – 425.1/15E (06/0795/OUT)
- F APPROVED ACCESS AND CYCLE ROUTES PLAN – 425.1/22C (06/0795/OUT)
- G CONSULTATION REPLIES
- H SUMMARY OF NEIGHBOUR / THIRD PARTY COMMENTS
- I SAFETY AUDIT

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In 2006 the principle of developing the land, including providing its vehicular access from Babraham Road, was agreed by its allocation as one of the Southern Fringe sites in Cambridge Local Plan Policy 9/5. This policy was adopted following examination at the local plan inquiry. In June 2008 the Fringe Sites Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) resolved to grant outline planning permission for the residential development of the Bell School site, with access shown from Babraham Road, subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement. The

outline permission allows up to 347 dwellings and 100 student units for use by Bell School. That application clearly indicated the vehicular access to the site to be from Babraham Road, in the location shown in the reserved matters application (see Appendices A).

- 1.2 In December 2010 the S106 agreement was completed and the outline planning permission issued. The outline permission approved the illustrative masterplan, parameter plans and access plan (see Appendices D, E & F). All those plans show the vehicular access to be in the location proposed in this application. As part of the S106 agreement improved pedestrian and cycling routes have been secured. These include the upgrading and widening of the permissive footpath to the south of the site and links to national cycle route 11.
- 1.3 In approving the outline application, the JDCC agreed the principle of the junction in the location shown on the access plan (Appendix F) with the exact design details to be considered as part of a reserved matters application. In addition a condition (condition 28) was applied to require details of the access (including cross sections, tree survey data, tree protection, planting, kerbs, shared use pathway/cycleway foundation design and construction, associated improvements and links to existing pathways/cycleways within the vicinity of the junction. The full wording of condition 28 is provided in Appendix B.
- 1.4 In January 2011 details were submitted to discharge condition 28 and officers considered that the submission should be determined with the reserved matters scheme for access design. Publicity was given to the discharge of conditions submission and a large number of objections received. City Council and Highways officers entered negotiations with the applicant to address matters of concern. These details were later withdrawn pending submission of a reserved matters application for the design of the access/junction.
- 1.5 In August 2011 a reserved matters application was submitted for the access. This submission followed months of discussion between City Council and Highways officers, near neighbours and the applicant. That proposal was for a two vehicle width access in the location approved by the outline permission. The access was proposed to be 5.5 metres wide increasing to 7.0 metres wide at the highway boundary. It was shown to have a 2.5 metre wide combined pavement and cycle

path along its northern edge and be a simple T-junction. There was no pavement proposed along its southern edge. In this area would have been a tapering verge along the site boundary narrowing at its eastern edge. No traffic lights or turning lane was proposed in Babraham Road.

1.6 The County Highways officer supported the proposal and a report recommending approval was taken to the JDCC in October 2011. The application was refused on the grounds that inadequate information had been submitted to demonstrate that the design was 'sufficiently safe'. The full wording of the reason for refusal is provided in paragraph 9.1 below. The refusal was subject to an appeal to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate). The appeal was heard in January 2012 and the appeal decision was issued in May. The appeal was dismissed but the decision letter defines the context for considering this follow up application. The decision is assessed in section 9 'Context Defined by the Appeal' (below). A copy of the decision letter is attached as Appendix A.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

2.1 The Bell School site lies on the southern edge of Cambridge near to Addenbrookes and covers an area of 7.78 hectares. Apart from the access, the development site has no direct frontage to Babraham Road (A1307).

2.2 The reserved matters application site is approximately 'T-shaped', covering a 94 metre stretch of the Babraham Road (including the carriageway, grass verges and shared cycle way/pavements) and the first 52 metres of the access into the site. The site is marginally lower level than the Babraham Road which lies to the east of the site.

2.3 The access land lies between 4A Babraham Road to the north and 6 and 6B to the south - the latter's driveway runs approximately parallel to the application access. Behind the pavement and verge the front boundary is defined by a metal agricultural type gate and an overgrown, gappy field type hedgerow in excess of two metres in height. This finger of land is laid to mown grass and has no other vegetation on it. A mix of fences, the side elevation of a garage and vegetation define its northern boundary. The southern boundary is defined by a boundary wall, closeboarded fencing of varying heights and vegetation towards the rear.

3. THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This reserved matters application provides the detailed design of the access - the location, principle and purpose of which is already approved under the outline permission and accepted before that in Policy 9/5 (item n) of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2006). Its design has been revised in accordance with the Inspector's comments. It remains in the location approved by the outline permission, retains the 2.5 metre wide combined pavement/cycleway along its northern edge and is still a simple priority T-junction. It is identical to the appeal proposal except in two linked respects – the carriageway maintains a width of 5.5 metres along its entire length (it does not widen as it approaches the highway) and as a result the position at which the pavement crosses the proposed access provides enhanced visibility. The access point at the Babraham Road is therefore narrower where pedestrians would have improved visibility along the access road. These changes are in response to the Inspector's comments. The merits of the revised scheme are assessed in section 10 below.
- 3.2 The application is accompanied by a submission to discharge Condition 28 of the outline permission showing details of the access (including cross sections, tree survey data, tree protection, planting, kerbs, shared use pathway/cycleway foundation design and construction, associated improvements and links to existing pathways/cycleways within the vicinity of the junction).

4. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

- 4.1 The following applications are relevant.

Reference	Description	Outcome
06/0795/OUT	Residential development not exceeding 347 dwellings (houses, apartments, inc affordable and key worker housing), 100 bed student living accommodation for the Bell Language School, public open space, vehicular access from Babraham Road and associated roads, footpath/cycleways and drainage infrastructure.	Approved subject to conditions and S106 agreement
06/0959/FUL	Construction of 3m wide combined	

	footpath / cycleway and emergency access link from proposed residential development site at land off Babraham Road to the public highways in Greenlands.	
11/0918/REM	Reserved matters for access from Babraham Road to serve residential development (outline planning permission 06/0795/OUT).	Refused 2011 and dismissed on appeal 2012
11/1477/REM, 11/1478/REM & 11/1479/REM	Reserved matters for access from Babraham Road to serve residential development (outline planning permission 06/0795/OUT).	

These applications for the following different permutations of the access were held in abeyance pending receipt of the appeal decision.

11/1477/REM	Nearside (southbound passing bay)	All withdrawn by applicant in July 2012.
11/1478/REM	Traffic lights	
11/1479/REM	Right turn lane	

5. **PUBLICITY**

Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notices Displayed:	Yes

6. **POLICY**

Government and Regional Guidance and Advice

- 6.1 The main national planning policy document is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In comparison to previous planning policy, expressed in Planning Policy Guidance and Planning Policy Statements (PPGs and PPSs), it is a clearer, simpler and more coherent framework that is easier to understand. The document has a limited amount to say about detailed design of highway infrastructure that is relevant to this application although it does make reference to the provision of safe and secure layouts. The NPPF was published before the Inspector made his decision on the recent appeal.
- 6.2 In 2010 the coalition Government indicated its intention to abolish Regional Strategies – including the East of England Plan. Since then the Localism Act (2011)

has been enacted which gives the Secretary of State the power to repeal Regional Strategies. This is subject to the outcome of environmental assessments and will not be taken until the Secretary of State and Parliament have considered the findings of the assessments. This process has not been completed and at the time of drafting this report the Regional Strategy remains part of the Development Plan - but as advised by the Secretary of State it should be afforded limited weight. If the situation changes prior to the committee meeting this will be reported.

Relevant Structure Plan and Local Plan Policies

3/2	Setting of the City
3/4	Responding to Context
3/11	The Design of External Spaces
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value
4/4	Trees
8/2	Transport impact
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility
8/11	New Roads
9/3	Development in the Urban Extensions
9/5	Southern Fringe

7 CONSULTATIONS

Highways Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary

- 7.1 Following the investigation of various junction proposals for the access to the Bell School site, reviewing the comments of the Safety Auditors and taking note of the Planning Inspectors decision and accompanying report, the Highway Authority has considered the current application and considers that the present design is, subject to detailed design, acceptable and provides an appropriate balance in design between transport function and place making; an approach recommended in the Manual For Streets guidance documents.

See Appendix G for further detail

8 NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

- 8.1 148 occupiers in the locality were notified of the application.

Summary

All representations received (currently 25) are objections to the proposal. The grounds of objection range between the differences between this proposal and the

appeal scheme, matters of principle and issues addressed in detail by the appeal inspector. See Appendix H for further detail

9 CONTEXT DEFINED BY THE APPEAL

- 9.1 This application is a revision of 11/0918/REM that was refused in October 2011. That application was refused for the following reason:

“Inadequate information has been provided to demonstrate to the Joint Development Control Committee’s satisfaction that the junction design is sufficiently safe at this location and therefore the proposal is compliant with policy 8/2 [Transport Impact] of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan (2006).”

- 9.2 In refusing the application for a single reason the committee indicated that the development was acceptable in every other respect. Although many of the representations received last time referred to the other issues – for example the principle of development, whether this is the right location for the access, the effect on congestion, displacement of vehicles elsewhere, effect on ambulances, how adjacent residents will exit their properties, the reliability of traffic data used in transport modelling, effect on cyclists, whether a signalised junction would be safer and whether a right turn lane is required - these were not referred to in the reason for refusal. These issues cannot be re-opened. The principle of developing the land and accessing it from Babraham Road is agreed in Cambridge Local Plan Policy 9/5. This policy was adopted following examination at the local plan inquiry. In turn the outline permission granted in December 2010 for dwellings, student accommodation, public open space and vehicular access (to Babraham Road in the position maintained in this application), roads, cycle, footways and drainage cemented this acceptance. All of these issues remain settled and this current application does not reopen them.
- 9.3 The refusal was appealed and an informal hearing was held in January 2012. The Inspector’s decision letter was issued in May 2012. It is attached as Appendix A to this report for ease of reference. The Inspector carried out a site visit as part of the appeal process and the position of the access was indicated on site. Recently the access has been marked out on site showing that the dimensions on the plans are correct and that it is feasible to physically construct the access arrangements as proposed within land controlled by the applicant.

Principle

- 9.4 The Inspector noted that the point of access was approved as part of the outline permission and commented: “*therefore that matter is not open to re-assessment. It is the design of the site access road with the Babraham Road and the initial section of the access road, submitted in pursuance of reserved matters conditions no. 3 [requirement for approval of reserved matters] which is the subject of the appeal application.*” This remains the case for this application. The combination of the decisions on the planning application and appeal constrains the issues for the applicant and local planning authority to focus on. The Inspector stated “*the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of highway users*”. This remains the case for this application.
- 9.5 Although a number of objections have been raised on the grounds of the principle of an access in this location, these are not considered to be sustainable for the above reasons.

Junction/access road design (Inspector’s letter paragraphs 7-10)

- 9.6 The appeal was dismissed for one reason – the layout of the access was judged to pose a risk to the safety and convenience of highway users. In the appeal proposal the access was 5.5 metres wide for about half of its length but started to widen from a point approximately 40 metres from highway land. At the point it met highway land it was to be approximately 7.0 m wide. The Inspector took the view that the wide access left inadequate space for pedestrians to look along the access clear of the carriageway to see whether vehicles were approaching the junction; possibly requiring them to pause in the highway if vehicles appeared, putting them at risk from vehicles turning into the site. He also believed that the excessive width would encourage higher vehicle speeds.
- 9.7 At the hearing the appellant tabled a revised plan showing a modified design of access. The Inspector’s comment suggests that he thought the revisions may overcome his concerns:
- “The appellant has also indicated that the carriageway width could be reduced, if required by the Highway Authority. This may in turn, as suggested by an interested party, allow the width of the southern verge to be increased close to*

the junction providing an improved western sightline for people crossing from the south.”

- 9.8 However he felt that the revision, that would modify the geometry of the junction would constitute a substantial change to the proposals, should not be considered at the appeal held in January 2012, as no consultation had been carried out on it. Nor did he consider that he could impose a condition requiring such details to be submitted for approval as part of his decision. He therefore made it clear that this change to the proposals would need to be considered as part of a new application to the local planning authority. The current application is this application.

Interaction between movements from and past the site (paragraph 11-21)

- 9.9 Having determined the main issue, the Inspector took the opportunity of addressing the other issues raised by third parties. He considered potential conflict between vehicles turning in and turning out of the junction and conflict between turning traffic and through traffic and reached the view that “... the risks would be likely to be low and would not be sufficient to justify withholding approval of the appeal application”. He considered the necessity of larger vehicles entering and leave the site to run outside their lane was common behaviour, likely to happen rarely and would be acceptable.
- 9.10 He was content that the other non vehicular accesses to the site mitigated the absence of a pavement along the southern side of the access road which would be of sufficient width. Whilst objections had been raised about the carriageway gradient approaching the junction and he noted that the proposal did not comply with the standard set out in ‘Local Transport Note 2/08-Cycle Infrastructure Design, October 2008’ he agreed with the Highways Authority that despite this, acceptable gradients could be achieved subject to a planning condition (addressed in condition 28). He had no concerns about the vertical alignment of the access. With regard to concerns about conflict with ambulances the Inspector considered that the Construction Method Statement attached to the outline permission would adequate deal with conflict during the construction period and raised no concerns on this issue in the post construction period.

9.11 Although a number of objections have reiterated previous objections relating to the above including the principle, location, interaction between those passing or entering/leaving the site, including ambulances and construction vehicles, given the Inspector's decision, there have been no material changes on circumstances or the proposals in this respect since the appeal decision was made in January 2012 that could justify a refusal on this basis.

Highway Capacity (paragraphs 22-29)

9.12 During the appeal a number of parties suggested that the traffic flow figures were not reliable. The Inspector considered that while the traffic study results should be treated with a degree of caution the developer had not relied on them but tempered them with knowledge of the area and its approach was sound. In summary he concluded that the junction would operate within capacity - and was content that projections of traffic flows (including those relating to Addenbrookes expansion) were adequate especially with provision of a 'keep clear' box.

9.13 Some of the representations made on the current application express concern about how the junction would operate in peak traffic hours or in combination with the traffic lights in the area. In both respects the Inspector considered that the development would be acceptable. Noting concerns expressed at the time, the Inspector carried out his site visit so that he was able to experience the area during the whole of the morning rush hour. His visit was made during term time during the working week. He saw how the area functioned during that time. *"I saw blocking back of northbound Babraham Road traffic which extended from the signal controlled junction to the north of the appeal site entrance to a point beyond the junction with Granham's Road, which which adjoins the western side of Babraham Road some distance to the south of the site entrance. Queuing traffic gave way on a courtesy basis to allow vehicles to turn into and out of Granham's Road in a relatively speedy manner. This would also be likely to occur at the proposed junction."*

9.14 *"The relatively close proximity of the signal control junction to the northwest would be likely to result in platooning of southbound traffic past the site from time to time. When passing the site those platoons would limit the ability of emerging vehicles to turn right onto Babraham Road. However, this restriction would be offset by the increased capacity for such manoeuvres during the*

periods when the traffic is held back by the signals. I have no compelling reason to dispute the view of the appellant's highway consultant that over the course of a peak hour any platooning affect due to the signals is unlikely to have an appreciable effect on the capacity of the proposed junction. I consider that the same is likely to be true with respect to the impact of the Toucan crossing, the future provision of which, some distance to the south of the appeal site access, was secured by a section 106 agreement in association with the grant of outline planning permission."

- 9.15 He considered that the access would operate properly even with the existing crossing to the north and the proposed Toucan crossing required by the S106 agreement linked to the outline permission. *"In my judgement, subject to condition, the proposed junction would be likely to operate within capacity"*.

Interaction between access and No 6 and 6B Babraham Road (paragraphs 30-34)

- 9.16 He specifically considered the potential for conflict between vehicles and those using the access to No 6 and 6B. He noted that the construction of the access would increase the likelihood of vehicles entering/leaving the site at the same time as movements associated with 6 or 6b were happening. However he considered that the traffic movements from those two properties to be low, that intervisibility would be good and that drivers would be aware of potential hazards and the risk of vehicles coming into conflict would be low. He noted that research reported in Manual for Streets shows very few accidents occur involving vehicles turning into or out of driveways. He considered that the potential works to provide alternative accesses to properties 6 and 6B were not agreed with third parties and were unnecessary. He concluded by judging that other works – such as widening the pedestrian route on opposite side of Babraham Road were unnecessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms so that it would be unreasonable to make approval conditional on the replacement of the existing entrances. In summary other than the width of the access (see paragraph 9.6 above) the Inspector considered that none of these other matters were unacceptable or required revision. Objections have been received on this basis concerning the current application but as there have been no material changes since appeal decision it would be unreasonable to re open this issue.

Other matters (paragraph 35)

- 9.17 The Inspector noted that walking and cycling routes had been secured by the S106 and said that he had seen no compelling evidence that other additional off site works were necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Condition 28

- 9.18 The Inspector noted that the submission relating to condition 28 was not before him for consideration.

- 9.19 To conclude, in relation to the Inspector's decision in all matters other than excessive width of the access – its affect on pedestrian visibility and speed of vehicles - the Inspector found the proposal to be acceptable. In making his decision in May 2012 it post dated the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and therefore took it into account.

10 ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT APPLICATION

- 10.1 The Inspector's decision letter defines the key issue to be highway safety. The applicant has taken the Inspector's decision letter as the starting point for redesigning the access. The design is very clearly an amendment of the appeal proposal. It follows the description in paragraph 10 of his decision letter (quoted in paragraph 9.7 above). It is still proposed to emerge onto Babraham Road at the point approved in the outline planning permission. It is still a simple priority T-junction with a 2.5 metre wide combined footway/cycleway along the northern side of the access road. No footway would be provided on its southern side, instead there would be a verge between the southern edge of the carriageway and the boundary enclosure of No. 6B Babraham Road. These aspects of the proposal were accepted by the Inspector and remain unaltered. However in contrast to the appeal proposal the access road would maintain a constant width of 5.5 metres from its western extremity to the point that it meets highway land. The verge along the common boundary with 6B would be wider than previously proposed. As a result at the approach to the junction the revised carriageway width would be 1.5 metres

narrower than proposed at appeal. The access design has been the subject of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit by Cambridgeshire County Council which has identified no remaining concerns. A copy of this is appended as APPENDIX I.

10.2 By narrowing the carriageway as described by the Inspector the applicant has been able to improve the westward (into the site) visibility available to pedestrians crossing the access from south to north (towards the City centre). Consequently pedestrians would be able to see vehicles approaching the site exit before beginning to cross the access and therefore would not need to pause on the carriageway if a vehicle was then spotted leaving the site. The reduction in width also addresses his concern that the flaring of the access above 5.5 metres would encourage higher vehicle speeds in proximity to the junction thereby increasing the risk to people crossing the junction. Therefore the revised design addresses both the Inspector's concerns – inadequate visibility and a widening that encourages higher speeds.

10.3 In his decision letter the Inspector considered the merits of cross providing a 'keep clear' box on the northbound section of the Babraham Road. Objections to its inclusion are included in representations made on this current application. The Inspector however decided that it would be a positive element of the junction:

"I consider that through the provision of 'keep clear' road markings on the northbound lane of Babraham Road it would be possible to ensure that gaps are sufficiently wide to allow adequate visibility between those road users, thereby satisfactorily reducing the potential for collisions. The provision of appropriate road markings would be a positive and relatively minor change to the proposed junction design, which, in my view, could be secured through the imposition of a suitable condition.

13. There may be occasions when a vehicle waiting to turn right into the site from Babraham Road may give way to a vehicle turning right out of the site. Intervisibility between that emerging driver and southbound through traffic, such as cyclists, may be limited by the waiting traffic. However, under those circumstances the emerging vehicle would be joining, rather than crossing the flow of traffic, and so, to my mind, the risk of collision is reduced.

14. In relation to the identified scenarios of vehicles that are turning right into or out of the site coming into conflict with through traffic on Babraham Road, I consider that, subject to condition, the risks would be likely to be low and would not be sufficient to justify withholding approval of the appeal application."

10.4 A 20 metre long 'keep clear' box is shown on the application drawings. This can be secured through the imposition of a suitable condition. Given the Inspector's clear

support for the 'keep clear' box it would not be appropriate to object to its inclusion in this revised scheme.

- 10.5 The Inspector took the view *“that the other routes secured as part of the outline planning permission would adequately mitigate the absence of a footway along the southern side of the proposed access road.”* He considered the width of the pavement/cycleway along the northern side of the access to be acceptable and this remains unaltered. Various objectors have criticised the proposal on this basis but given the Inspectors acceptance of it and of the lack of a pavement on the southern side of the access it would not be reasonable to reopen this matter.
- 10.6 City Council and Highway officers consider that the revisions to the proposed access junction design successfully overcome the Inspectors concerns and are therefore acceptable.

Approval details under condition 28 – Submission of access details

- 10.7 Condition 28 of the outline permission requires the submission of engineering details of the access. The full wording is given in Appendix B. The details required by the condition were submitted at the same time as this application. The condition requires approval in writing and subsequent implementation of the approved scheme before any approved dwelling is served by the access. The details require cross sections, information on trees to be lost and trees to be retained, tree protection, details of the path/cycle.
- 10.8 The details show that the slight downhill slope into the site will be retained, all trees in the site are to be retained, it identifies the protection measures to be put in place. No planting is proposed within the site which is acceptable given that the access leaves no room for planting and existing boundaries are to be retained.
- 10.9 Officers have requested further details and an update will be given at the meeting.

11 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 The revised design of access follows the design outlined by the Inspector and overcomes his single concern in relation to the width of the access. There has been

no material change in circumstances since the appeal decision was made. The Localism Act was enacted prior to the Inspector making his decision and there have been no subsequent changes in policy since his decision. The amended design has been assessed in detail by County Highways officers and has been subject to a Stage 1 Safety Audit. It is considered to be acceptable and the Reserved Matters application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

11.2 The access details required under condition 28 are to be supplemented by further information which is expected to be acceptable.

12 **RECOMMENDATION**

1. APPROVE Reserved matters subject to condition
2. That following technical approval from the Highways Authority the discharge of condition 28 of outline planning permission 06/0795/OUT be APPROVED (subject to receipt of the further information requested by officers)

13 **PROPOSED CONDITIONS**

1. The access hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings i.e. 10 174 REV A (A3), 14951 100 153, 14951 100 154, 14951 1100 1151, 14951 1200 1251 & 14951 700 751.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. The vehicular access hereby permitted shall not be brought into first use until the cross hatched 'keep clear' marking shown on drawing 14951/1200/1251 has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings.

REASON: In the interests of the safety and convenience of highway users.

14 **REASONS FOR DECISION**

14.1 This development has been approved subject to conditions because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

Cambridge Local Plan 2006: 8/2, 8/5, 8/11 and 9/5

14.2 The proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the capacity of Babraham Road and would provide a safe and appropriate access to the Bell School

development. The proposal takes into account the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and ensures that access for Emergency Vehicles along Babraham Road is maintained. The proposal is in accordance with guidance contained in Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2 which set out guidance on the design of urban streets. This states that a capacity will not always be the primary consideration in street design. The junction has been designed to minimise speed by reducing the number of approach lanes and providing a tight radii at the junction. This is in accordance with Manual for Streets 2 which states that keeping speeds lower has been demonstrated to have significant safety benefits. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission. These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission.