

## 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

