

## APPENDIX H: SUMMARY OF NEIGHBOUR / THIRD PARTY COMMENTS

Author	Comment
Jean Swanson - Queen Edith's Ward Councillor	<p>I continue to have grave reservations that this is the right place for such a junction but given the planning inspector's comments will just raise a few points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The pavement on the west of Babraham Road is in poor condition and will not cope with the increased number of users who will head to Addenbrookes via the front route when the toucan crossing is built.</li><li>2. While I see some merits in a boxed junction it will only really aid people turning right out of the estate or right into it in the morning rush hour. The chance of right turners holding up traffic out bound in the afternoon remains high with the risk of a rat run developing along Wort's Causeway in the afternoons.</li></ol> <p>These are both things that the County Council could alleviate the first by up grading that footpath and the second by raising the bollard on Worts Causeway for the afternoon as well as the morning rush hour. Having discussed this with a local resident it could cause considerable difficulty for cars returned to the Worts Causeway area from outside the city in the afternoons because of the no right turns at Wort's Causeway and Nightingale Avenue – though that is abused many times every day. If transponders were available to residents that could be of real benefit.</p>
Alderbrook Rd SOLIHULL	<p>The problems I foresee are – increased congestion on Babraham Road; danger from traffic turning right into Babraham Rd near to brow of hill. Would suggest traffic lights although two sets so close would be problematic. Suggest an access from Cranham Road.</p>
6b Babraham Road	<p>Comments are submitted in a personal capacity and as Chairman of Babraham Road Action Group (BRAG). The proposal is in the worst possible location. The Inspectors view was that an acceptable design was possible and the junction would operate within capacity. He was wrong. I know Babraham Road well and know the level of traffic. The keep clear box would add minimally to the safety of a dangerous design. Concerned that vehicles entering the box to turn south having to wait for a gap in southbound traffic will block the passage of northbound traffic. The box would put northbound traffic at a disadvantage. Turning southbound into the estate would cause significant delays. Disagrees with Inspector that there are sufficient appropriate routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Obstruction to free flow of ambulances. Concern over difficulty of existing property if the proposed access is constructed. The proposal is just as inadequate as all previous plans and would cause harm to the safety and convenience of highway users.</p>
Hewitson solicitors	<p>Owner of 6b Babraham Road claims ownership of hedge running along southern edge of site. He has maintained it since 1987. From examination of deeds it is concluded that our client owns the strip of land running alongside the fence adjacent to the access track. The drawings clearly show the application site encroaches onto our clients land. The ownership certificate submitted with the application is wrong and our client will not tolerate trespass on to his property, any interference or harm to his hedge.</p>

*Officer comment:* This was reported to the applicant's agent who

responded:

*I have sought legal advice.*

*No need to change the ownership Certificate. Certificate A says that 21 days before the application was submitted, the applicant was the owner of the Property.*

*The applicant is the registered proprietor of the land albeit that it has notice that someone may seek to rectify the boundary. An application for rectification is a fairly drawn out process where the parties do not agree to the rectification and is likely to be referred to an adjudicator to determine the boundary. There is no guarantee that an application would succeed and unless and until this is resolved the applicant is the registered proprietor.*

*In any event, the purpose of the certificates is to ensure that all owners (insofar as they are known) are given notice of an application. Here, we know that Dr Silverston is aware of the application by the very fact that he has objected and therefore he cannot claim that he has been prejudiced or disadvantaged by not having notice specifically served on him.*

11 Alwyne  
Road

Object. This will cause much more congestion in an area where there are already considerable traffic problems most days. If the School actually needs extra accommodation it should utilise Red Cross Lane with left turn only traffic on exit with existing lights upgraded to control that access.

c/o 29  
Greenlands

Objection. The 'KEEP CLEAR' box is dangerous. During rush hours the queue of traffic may well back over the box and there is likely to be confusion as some drivers attempt to exit the estate turning right whilst others coming from the city attempt to enter the estate also by turning right. Not only cars, but bicycles and other larger vehicles such as refuse vans will be attempting to manoeuvre through the box at the same time as pedestrians try to cross the access road. It is not clear who has to wait and who has priority here and confusion of this kind can lead to collisions.

The junction is liable to become blocked. As vehicles exit Cambridge in the evening they will need to wait for a gap in the northbound traffic. This may impede the progress of southbound vehicles who wish to continue along Babraham Road and lead to tailbacks and gridlock at the Addenbrookes roundabout.

Increased congestion will impede the progress of emergency vehicles. Congestion on Babraham Road is not now limited to rush hours. The number of ambulances using the road will increase when Papworth Hospital moves to the Addenbrookes site. The new car park being built for 1,200 vehicles at Addenbrookes and increased provision at the Park and Ride also will result in more vehicles using Babraham Road. In addition, I understand that the developers predict that 'there will be 800-900 vehicle movements a day' into and out of this estate.

The junction is sited at a very dangerous spot on Babraham Road and I hope the plans will be rejected, particularly because of safety issues.

9 Babraham Road	<p>Concerns about 'keep clear' box; evening congestion for southbound traffic extending to the Addenbrooke's roundabout or even to Long Road. Reference to traffic generated by Addenbrookes expansion and park and ride enlargement. There are no plans to improve the pathway on this side of the road nor to connect it to the new pedestrian crossing.</p>
4 Babraham Road	<p>The new plan shows a similar T-junction to the previous, but without the increase in width from 5.5 m to 7.0m at its junction with Babraham Road.</p> <p>Concern about competition between drivers exiting to turn right out of the estate, vehicles and cyclists turning right into the Estate, pedestrians and cyclists crossing the access road in both directions; evening southbound traffic will have to wait.</p> <p>Concern about passage of ambulances and traffic from future growth of Addenbrookes and park and ride expansion.</p> <p>Bell School could not have chosen such a worse or more dangerous position to site a junction on Babraham Road.</p>
347 Hills Road	<p>The access to such a large number of dwellings is in an inappropriate place. Concern about evening congestion causing traffic to rat run through adjacent housing areas. Traffic entering and leaving this development will cause further congestion and encourage more traffic to go through the adjacent housing estate.</p> <p>If it is decided that there must be a junction on Babraham Road, then it should be traffic light controlled or a mini roundabout. If there is not sufficient room for these options, then the access should be somewhere else.</p>
3 Babraham Road	<p>Babraham Road and it's traffic flow are unique to Cambridge in that it is a feeder road for the enormous complex that is Addenbrookes Hospital; emergency vehicles use this approach frequently and any junction here will hinder safe passage.</p> <p>Concern about extra traffic causing further delay.</p> <p>The sight of this proposed junction is the worst possible location for access to the development from the point of view of safety, and is a total trespass upon the amenity of the occupants of 6 and 6b.</p> <p>We therefore reject these plans and any form of access at this point vehemently.</p>
19 Stansgate Avenue	<p>The development of this junction will affect me considerably as I turn right on to the Babraham Rd from Red Cross Lane.</p> <p>Keep clear box may cause collisions. Exiting traffic would extend northbound queues. Concern about motor cyclists waiting to turn right into site. Concern about affect on ambulances.</p> <p>Concerned about condition of the pavements in the area, with the increase in traffic this development will cause, the pavements on many of the access routes are not fit for purpose.</p>

- 29 Greenlands, Objection to KEEP CLEAR box. Will impede the flow of traffic both northbound and southbound on that already busy road into Cambridge. Note that other local developments will be adding to traffic.
- Greenlands estate would suffer from greater use by pedestrians and cyclists of the footpath through our estate. Our gardens are open-plan; already the car-parking allowed often impedes easy access and egress to our homes and we suffer from careless fouling of the estate by individuals and animals who 'stray ' onto the estate with little respect for our privacy and property.
- I am surprised that after many applications for the proposed access road have been rejected, not least by the latest planning inspector, that it is yet again the subject of an appeal. Surely it must be apparent that the proposed positioning of such a road, onto a busy highway, is impossibly dangerous and should be rejected once and for all.
- 9 Greenlands The Bell School could not have chosen a more dangerous position on Babraham road to site their junction. The development will cause a large increase in traffic. Even now it is very difficult to get out of Red Cross Lane. I hope the Planning Committee realise that this is a deeply unpopular development locally due to the increase in danger& inconvenience.
- Grosvenor Lodge 6 Babraham Rd Near to brow of hill. Little warning of traffic; often travelling at speed. Narrowness makes it inadequate for construction traffic or large vehicles. Estates residents likely to be frustrated by congestion. Frustrated drivers may take risks. The gradient of the access would be potentially dangerous when wet or icy.
- The access would be same width as Red Cross Lane which serves many fewer dwellings. More cyclist and pedestrians are likely to use the western side of Babraham Road, immediately adjacent to private accesses. It does not incorporate a pedestrian crossing. If the junction is approved I request a dropped kerb and tarmac/paving to my boundary. Photographs depicting congestion are provided.
- 29 Worts Causeway The revised access arrangements will cause severe traffic congestion and potential safety issues. The morning traffic is already a problem and this new arrangement will exacerbate it.
- There appears to be serious flaws in the computer model being used:
- \_ the input data seems to be out of date, there is no evidence that data takes account of future growth demanded by the '2020 vision' of Addenbrooke's Hospital. The CB1 and Tim Brinton development sites, with their high-density mix of residential and commercial properties which are yet to come on stream
  - \_ it models only a single junction rather than the interacting complex of junctions and lights that are proposed
  - \_ it models the same input regardless of whether there is a right turn lane or not it is clear that the addition of this junction will lead to serious congestion along the Babraham road due to its many junctions and pedestrian lights. The inevitable gridlock will spill into neighbouring streets in our community.
- It is essential that before any decision can be passed current traffic flow data be collected over a full working month (when all schools are in session) in winter, augmented by projections of future flows. More careful consideration must be given to the various interactions of

junctions and crossings in this area, paying particular attention to the Worts Causeway junction. The new narrowing of the entrance to the Bell site raises serious issues about safety and delays as well as being inappropriate for the new residents of that site.

10 Babraham Road

The 'keep clear' box would create even worse tailbacks and competition between those passing and exiting the site. In the evening southbound traffic could be blocked by cars queuing to enter site with tailbacks as far as Addenbrookes. Ambulances would be adversely affected and the footpaths are narrow and substandard.

343 & 351 Hills Road

It is very clear that the points we are making below are a repetition of the points made previously by ourselves and others.

We would also like to make a more general point that this latest application and the Council's requirement for letter of objection coincides with the main annual holiday period and as such I would like to put on public record that objectors to current and previous planning applications may be seriously disadvantaged in their public right to make their objections known.

Specifically our opposition to the latest plan is based on the following:

- The location of the proposed junction could not have sited at a more dangerous position on Babraham Road. The speed of vehicles travelling in an southerly direction, on the blind bend at the Worts Causeway junction, hitting stationery traffic awaiting to turn right into the new estate is an "accident black spot" in design
- The KEEP CLEAR BOX ("the box") will seriously disadvantage vehicles travelling on Babraham Road.
- In the evening "rush-hour(s)" we believe there will be total blockage at this junction site the result of this will be for drivers to try and avoid this blockage and "rat run" up the Hills Road slip road and along Worts Causeway in an "out of town" direction.
- traffic will hinder the free flow of emergency vehicles, particularly but not exclusively ambulances.
- Refers to other developments in the area and their contribution to traffic growth.

The proposed plans do not in any way address the issues of poor footpath and cycleway provision in the immediate area; issues for both existing residents and those that will live on the proposed estate.

Harestone, Red Cross Lane

Concerns about affect on the flow of ambulances. Cars turning right to the access road would be positioned and there is not enough space for fast manoeuvres to clear Babraham Road enabling an ambulance to pass. Reference to Addenbrookes expansion. The fact that there is no widening of the road proposed makes this new plan even more dangerous than the previously rejected plan.

KEEP CLEAR box will result in chaos on the road with the current (let

alone the increased volumes of traffic - vehicle, cycle and pedestrian). The potential for increase in collisions is enormous.

In the late afternoon cyclists and vehicles leaving Cambridge wanting to enter the estate would have to pause in the southbound carriageway for spaces in the northbound traffic flow. This means that the cars that are waiting will hold up those wishing to proceed out of Cambridge, it may also mean that more people head out up the Worts Causeway towards the Gogs, the left turn at the top there is already extremely dangerous with the speed of the traffic coming from Cherry Hinton hill towards the Gog Magog Golf Club round about, this will make another accident blackspot even more dangerous.

As far as I'm aware there are no plans to improve either pavements or cycleways on this side of the road.

The pedestrian access along Greenlands and Red Cross Lane is inappropriate due to extremely uneven pavements, narrow pathways and numbers of vehicles parked. This will only get more dangerous with increased footfall and cycle flow. The Bell School's new accommodation on site will lead to an increase in students coming and going from there.

The junction is in a totally inappropriate position. the revised proposal is more dangerous and poses more risk to road users than the previous (rejected) plan and would urge the committee to reject it again.

27  
Greenlands

The local community is against it as they are aware of the traffic problems. The "keep clear" bow would cause tailbacks

13 Babraham  
Road

As far as we can see, the only difference in the new plan is: a) the access road is narrower, b) there's a 'Keep Clear' yellow box at the junction.

We would like to express our disappointment at the proposal in its entirety and our astonishment that they are being suggested at all.

The yellow box will give an advantage to the traffic exiting from the new estate the ensuing tail-backing on Babraham road an inconvenience to all the traffic coming in.

In the afternoon peak hour, the southbound carriageway will get blocked up because of cars waiting to turn into the estate. We can only envisage the truly bad tailbacks backing up along Hills Road well beyond the Long road junction if this junction were to be put in place.

When there is a queue backed over the yellow box, we are at a loss to understand who will have priority.

Concern about affect on movement of ambulances.

Reference to increase in all forms of traffic due to other local developments.

The footpath provided for people who will come to live on the new estate to come out onto Babraham road seems dangerously narrow,

very similar to the narrow and almost unfit-for-purpose footpath along Red Cross Lane.

The proposed new pedestrian 'Toucan crossing' would be right outside our house. The houses of 13 and 15 are the only buildings set so very close to the road and it would be a tremendous additional burden of noise pollution that residents of these two houses will be called on to bear if a crossing were to be put right outside no.13. We would like to earnestly beg you to have the crossing put further down the road where the houses are set well away from the road, where the impact of this extra noise pollution will not be felt at all.

We would like to sum up by saying that the site chosen by Bell School is perhaps the most dangerous one. The consequences of supermarkets' HGV vehicles, petrol tankers and articulated lorries - some of which thunder over the blind bend at Wort's Causeway - suddenly being confronted by stationary vehicles waiting to turn into the new estate is unimaginable.

27  
Greenlands

Yet another planning application by Bell School, as a Council Tax payer I would be interested to know the cost of this long process. The road junction on Babraham Road is proposed by Bell school is in a very dangerous position and should be abandoned. The local community are against the site as they are aware of the traffic problems, which the plan does not address.

The "keep clear" box would cause problems and tailbacks during the rush hour.

The poor footpath and cycleway along the access road will mean that more pedestrians will use the access via Greenlands.

Babraham Road will become more congested in the future as more building goes ahead at the hospital. Ambulances will not be able to negotiate the proposed junction when cars are in a queue during rush hours.

I hope the planning committee realise the consequences of its decision. There is no room for a "proper" junction i.e. like the one on Long Road and the new plan does not solve the problems.

18  
Greenlands

I can only repeat previous concerns about volume of traffic on Babraham Road and the difficulty of the emergency exit: Greenlands/Red Cross Lane.

1 Babraham  
Road

We object to this plan for the following reasons:

1. With increased numbers of pedestrians and cyclists from the expanded Park and Ride, the cycle path will not be sufficient to cope with such numbers. The council is actively encouraging the community to cycle and/or use public transport, so this plan seems counter-intuitive to that scheme and will increase the chance of accident or injury.
2. The levels of traffic in the morning and evening rush hours will

increase dramatically through stationary vehicles waiting for a gap. Even at the moment, it can sometimes take 5 or more minutes of waiting to exit our driveway into the flow of traffic. Gridlock. And then, bring an ambulance at high speed into the picture – chaos! The number of ambulances is bound to increase with the new hospital sites connected to Addenbrooke's 2020.

3. Re the Keep Clear box will produce a pinch point for all vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, road rage and people seeking other routes.

Cambridge  
Cycling  
Campaign

Cambridge Cycling Campaign is one of Cambridge's largest community charities. Our current paid-up membership is more than 1,100 people. Our aim, as always, is to secure excellent facilities which will, because they are of the highest standard, encourage more people to cycle. They must be attractive and safe for all cyclists including children, the elderly and the less confident and not only for road-aware, confident cyclists in their early adult life. The facilities must also provide properly for pedestrians whose interests are so closely entwined with those who cycle. Pedestrians will include many who are very vulnerable - children, the elderly and those with various kinds of handicap including blindness.

1. The principle of having a junction and associated access road at this location has been approved by the local planning authorities provided that a satisfactory design for the junction and access road is produced. Our view is that now is the time when, at long last, it should be accepted that a safe and otherwise satisfactory design is not achievable at this location and we ask Councillors to maintain their objections and to reject the present application so that alternative access routes can be fully assessed.

2. We recognise that details of possible alternative new accesses to this development cannot be considered in the planning process related to the present application. All we ask is that, when Councillors assess the current application, they bear in mind the general environmental context and background. Part of this context is the fact that far safer and – in every respect better – access routes are readily available, including a new one which has become available since the Planning Inspector gave his ruling. If Councillors decide again to reject the current application – we hope they do – they will certainly not be rejecting the entire 364-dwelling development. The development could go ahead if the Bell School were willing to develop and seek approval for alternative routes.

The change in the situation since the Planning Inspector's report is, we understand, that the Bell School authorities are now taking possession of a property they own adjacent to their main buildings which, until recently, was leased by them to Wallace Cancer Care (No 7 Red Cross Lane). Good access to the 364-dwelling development could be practicable alongside this building with the possible demolition of garages/outbuildings.

3. The current Local Plan (2006) states very clearly and explicitly in paragraphs 8/4 and 8.11 that priority should be given to pedestrians and cyclists.

The current planning application, like previous planning applications relating to this junction, fails to do this in a number of different respects.

4. The access road has a pavement only along one side (the Northern – or city – side). This is unacceptable for a new development.



The sole pavement is shared-use for cyclists and pedestrians but its width fails to conform to government guidance (Local Transport Note 2/08, October 2008 –Cycle Infrastructure Design, paragraph 8.5). The Inspector rightly states (Appeal Decision, paragraph 17) that the width falls short of the minimum standard. This failure to conform to government guidance should be treated as even worse than sub-standard because of the important emphasis in the Local Plan on high priority and convenience for cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new developments.

The Inspector draws attention to the guidance point (on the width of shared-use paths) that “whilst this standard is generally regarded as a minimum, in areas with few cyclists or pedestrians a narrower route may suffice.” He goes on to say that “the Council has indicated that there would be a number of alternative pedestrian/cycle links across the site which are likely to be of greater importance for pedestrian cycle connectivity.”

We say that these other pedestrian/cycle link routes are valuable for many potential users. But we must stress that for many people living elsewhere on the new estate they would require awkward, inconvenient and unsafe diversions from their natural direct ‘desire line’ which would be along the proposed worse-than-substandard shared-use pavement alongside the access road that is the subject of the present application. It would be unreasonable to expect cyclists to use an awkward diverted route. When the shared-use pavement is their direct route, many cyclists would use it.

For those wishing to walk or cycle into the city or towards the city the diversions would take most of them along a long section of Red Cross Lane which has much criss-crossing and reversing traffic in peak hours or past Addenbrooke’s Hospital and through the dangerous roundabout in front where a doctor cycling to work in the hospital was killed by a lorry not long ago. Parts of Red Cross Lane also have very rough, narrow pavements much damaged by tree roots which make them practically unusable for those with wheelchairs, pushchairs or children’s bicycles. Those particularly affected by the diversions would be children and young people living in much of the new estate and walking or cycling to primary or secondary schools in the Queen Edith’s Way or Wulfstan Way areas using the direct route via Nightingale Avenue. Those attending the schools along Hills Road such as the Sixth Form College or the Perse would also be affected. More generally, all those living in much of the new estate who would like to walk or cycle into or towards the city or along Nightingale Avenue would be affected.

So we believe that the City Council planners and the Inspector may not have fully appreciated the situation. If this unsatisfactory junction and access route were to be approved by Councillors, many cyclists and pedestrians would use the worse-than-unsatisfactory pavement along the access road rather than the diversions. Other potential cyclists and pedestrians would be put off and go instead by car.

### **Conclusion**

Cambridge has far more cyclists than anywhere else in the UK and plenty of potential for improving this number if provision is sufficiently attractive to encourage children, the elderly and the whole range of newly-arrived residents to use their bicycles rather than their cars for local journeys.

In the Netherlands, North Germany and Denmark, it has been shown time and time again that provision of attractive, safe routes greatly increases the number of people who cycle. New developments like the

Bell School development provide by far the best opportunity to achieve Dutch standards in Cambridge. We must not settle for worse-than-substandard provision which does not even meet the requirements of existing UK government guidance or the Cambridge Local Plan and is well below the Dutch standards which we believe could be achieved by a pedestrian, cycle and motor vehicle access route close to the Bell School buildings.

16 Babraham Road

Thank you for your letter of 19 July 2012 concerning the above. Having viewed the application documents and drawings we wish to record our strongest possible objections to the proposals as submitted and offer the following comments in support of these objections: -

The proposed access road has no footpath on it's south side because there is insufficient room. On a road intended to serve 347 dwellings and 100 units of student accommodation this is clearly inadequate and dangerous. Upgrading the present green belt permissive footpath some 200 metres further south (which leads nowhere) does not compensate for this and is in itself nonsense.

Concern about the need for large vehicles to turn outside the carriageway.

It contains no significant improvements over previous proposals, does not secure an appropriate access for users of the development. It is thus contrary to the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11.

1.3 There is a clear, obvious, safe and sensible route for an access road to the development site from the northern corner of the site running east to meet Babraham Road / Hills Road opposite the existing Worts Causeway junction to form a cross roads where traffic lights already exist. This would also provide pedestrian and cycle users of the development with ready access to a point on the main road nearest to the logical and shortest route to the City, the hospital, buses, schools, shops and doctors' surgery. In professional planning jargon this would comply with residents' 'desire lines'. In short, this should be regarded as the only acceptable solution. The proposed upgrading of the existing permissive footpath, together with it's related toucan crossing, would serve no purpose.

A petition has been signed by 49 people, it is noted that some of the signatures include more than one person from the same address. The first page lists the objections and is reproduced below.

**Petition against Planning Proposal 12/0890/REM: Bell Development Site.** August 11th 2012

We the undersigned on the attached sheets, request that Councillors and Planning Authorities reject this proposal, as they have on all previous occasions, on the grounds that the new plan suggesting a narrower entrance to the site will do nothing to alleviate the many concerns for which all previous plans were rejected. It will have a no less adverse effect on local traffic conditions, and while it may remove one danger it creates others. At the moment, south bound traffic builds up on Babraham Road and extends back past the critical Addenbrooke's roundabout to the Long Road traffic lights and beyond, especially on dark winter evenings. On these evenings, the Citi 1 bus can take 25-30 minutes to travel south on the short length of Hills Road. The proposed "Bell Access" would make this situation much worse. Seven supporting points are made below.

(1) The narrowing of the Bell site's access road with a new pedestrian crossing close by creates an arrangement similar to that at 'Red Cross Lane' on Hills Road. However unlike Red Cross Lane there is no equivalent of Nightingale Avenue to allow for safe undertaking past right-turning vehicles. The Bell site will moreover have over 4 times the number of dwellings, generating around 4 times the access and egress traffic. The Red Cross Lane/Worts Causeway complex already arrests traffic at the critical Addenbrooke's roundabout to cause severe queuing, on many evenings in the winter. Common sense suggests that this new junction will create even more vehicles backing down Babraham Road and quadrupling the frequency of gridlock at Addenbrooke's roundabout.

(2) The main text of the HIGHWAY DESIGN REPORT JULY 2012 states that traffic flows used are based on 'the future opening year'. This is seriously misleading. The PICADY computer model, in Appendix B to this report, on which it is based, clearly states that its figures are based on a four-year-old (2008) traffic flow, exactly as in the 2011 (11/0918/REM) submission. A previous PBA technical report suggested that this data derives from an even earlier six-year-old 2006 PBA Transport Assessment. The model may be new but the input data *appears* to be totally out of date. There is no evidence that the 2006/2008 figure has been augmented to take into account the future growth demanded by the '2020 Vision' of Addenbrooke's Hospital, the CB1 and Tim Brinton development sites, with their high-density mix of residential and commercial properties where resulting traffic is still to come on stream. It is essential that current traffic flow data be collected over a full school working month in winter, augmented by projections of future flows presented to Councillors.

(3) This underpinning PICADY model also fails to quantify the interactions with pedestrian crossings and nearby junctions. There will be a new Toucan crossing (between the Park and Ride and the Bell site), the P&R entrance, Granhams Road, Worts Causeway junction and lights along with Red Cross lane turn and its nearby pedestrian crossing. The proximity of Worts Causeway junction is particularly alarming because queues forming in the main southbound lane will affect this junction in a dangerous manner. Much more careful considerations of the *interactions of junctions and crossings* are required to show that traffic will not back up dangerously to the "Addenbrooke's" roundabout, threatening the safety of ambulance traffic and causing local chaos.

(4) The Planning Inspector advised narrowing the Bell site entrance to slow down cars in order to make it safer for cyclists. The Babraham P&R expansion by some 600 spaces will significantly increase numbers of cyclists and pedestrians. Both of these are largely ignored by the plan and PICADY model.

(5) The new narrow entrance to the Bell site raises very serious issues about safety and delays created by large construction traffic, maintenance traffic, and large delivery vehicles that will frequently need access, especially given the large number of dwellings proposed.

(6) The reduced access width will enhance the feeling that Bell site residents have been 'kettled in', and it will in all probability increase the number of accidents between traffic turning in and out of the site. Remember there are 4 times the number of dwellings here compared with Red Cross Lane, and thus (4x4 =) 16 times more potential collisions. The proposed developer is understood to have recently bought number 4A Babraham Road, and the Bell proposers need to discuss with the developer if additional land might lead to a more acceptable access.

(7) The junction envisaged in the report is a simple priority right turn. As with the Granhams-Babraham road junction, bollards on the left hand side may be required to prevent unsafe undertaking. However on one website of TRL who retail PICADY it states that "... when there is no actual right-turn lane ... PICADY always uses an 'effective' right-turn lane, whether one physically exists or not". From previous Bell submissions, now withdrawn, the same Appendix B with the same PICADY results were shown regardless of whether the design had 'no right turn lane', a 'right turn facility' or even 'a nearby passing bay'. How can one have any faith in critical computations of traffic flow when the computer turns out the same answer regardless of the real life input?

---