

Appendix G: CONSULTATIONS

1. Highways Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council)

- 1.1 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.
- 1.2 The junction arrangements that were considered were priority junctions with and without a right turn lane and traffic signals.
- 1.3 The provision of a junction should now be considered in regard to the advice provided in Section 9 of Manual for Streets 2, which seeks to balance the issues of junction capacity with safety and place making.
- 1.4 For a signal controlled junction the land take and its impact upon the treeline on the east of Babraham Road, necessity for signal heads and other design features make this design solution less appropriate, and, in real terms the junction would offer little in advantage over the priority junction forms.
- 1.5 Variants of a priority junction design are therefore considered more appropriate, but each would have implications that were considered in assessing the most appropriate junction form.
- 1.6 A priority junction with a left turn lane requires more carriageway width, which would be disadvantageous for pedestrians crossing.
- 1.7 It would also provide slightly less visibility as the side road give way is set further back from the southbound running lane whilst increasing the distance in pulling out to accept a gap in southbound traffic.
- 1.8 The ghost island would, however, provide a facility for right turning vehicles to wait for an acceptable gap in northbound traffic to complete their manoeuvre.
- 1.9 A priority junction without the right turn lane would provide slightly increased visibility by bringing the give way line forwards on the bend and reduce the distance travelled by vehicles pulling out from the side road to join southbound traffic.
- 1.10 The absence of a ghost island would, however, result in a car turning right into the estate blocking other motor vehicles for a short period of time, resulting in queuing for traffic waiting to exit the City.
- 1.11 The priority junction with no ghost island right turn facility would, in the opinion of the Highway Authority and subject to detailed design, provide an acceptable balance between the competing aspirations for and constraints on the junction.

- 1.12 The recent Inspectors report highlighted one issue with the design previously submitted, in regard to visibility for pedestrians crossing the road from south to north across the junctions, and the possibility that car drivers may increase speed (albeit not on a conscious level) when approaching the junction, in response to the road flaring slightly.
- 1.13 In response to this the designer has maintained a constant width of carriageway on the approach to the junction, right up to the radii kerbs at the junction itself. The reduced carriageway width has been used to widen the southern verge, providing a vision splay for pedestrians crossing the road allowing them to see approaching vehicles over a greater distance.
- 1.14 This does result in a potential increase in vehicle conflicts when turning into the site with an HCV.
- 1.15 However the number of HCVs turning into such a residential street would be likely to be small; routinely only occasional deliveries and the regular refuse collection. Such situations occur at many locations throughout the highway network on similar roads without resulting in unacceptable risk, and drivers of such vehicles are experienced manoeuvring in such circumstances.
- 1.16 The operation of junctions in this manner is considered in Paragraphs 9.4.10 to 9.4.12, and, in that document, is considered acceptable in the urban environment.

2. Street And Open Space (Cambridge City Council)

- 2.1 Any comments received will be reported.

3. Urban Design (Cambridge City Council)

- 3.1 Any comments received will be reported.

4. Cycle & Walking Officer (Cambridge City Council)

- 4.1 Any comments received will be reported.

5. Landscape Architects (Cambridge City Council)

- 5.1 Comments that Root Protection Areas need to be marked on the drawings and has made suggestions about vegetation outside the site boundary.

6. Access officer (Cambridge City Council)

- 6.1 I would ask for as shallow gradients as possible on the dropped crossing points. They must fall within guidance.

Any further comments received will be reported.