

Land North Of Cambridge North Station Milton Avenue Cambridge

22/02771

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT TEAM COMMENTS

REF: 2053 **CASE OFFICER:** Fiona Bradley
AUTHOR: Tam Parry
DATE: 7th September 2022

HEADLINE

Holding Objection: Insufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment. The below issues related to the Transport Assessment will need to be addressed before the transport implications of the development can be fully assessed.

Proposal Description: Clarification requested

Masterplan and Connectivity: Further details required

Study Area: Accepted

Trip Generation: Further details required

Distribution and Assignment: Further details required

Junction Modelling: Not required at present

Mitigation: To be agreed.

Background

These comments are further to a Transport Assessment provided by PJA Transport Consultants as part of an application for 425 residential dwellings and 53,700sqm of commercial floorspace for Use Classes E(g) i (offices), ii (research and development), with an enlarged car park and mobility hub. The first 27,600sqm of commercial floorspace of this development is a full application, with the remainder outline and subject to reserved matters.

The planning statement refers to a total of 53,700sqm of commercial floorspace, and the Transport Assessment refers to a total of circa 65,000sqm of commercial floorspace. The application form refers to the full application being 78,812sqm and the outline application being 38,400sqm (total development floorspace of 117,212sqm). It is not clear whether all of these different figures relate to each other, and whether the figure used in the Transport Assessment is up to date. The applicant is asked to clarify how the different quoted areas in the application relate to each other, and whether the reference in the TA accurately reflects the application.

This site forms part of the North-East Cambridge Development Area and as such must be considered in the context of the wider aspirations for the area as set out in the Area Action Plan and emerging developer-led Transport Strategy. It is noted that the consultant working on behalf of this site has had some considerable input into the Transport Strategy.

National Policy Context

Comment 1 Reference is made to the relevant transport policies including the Transport Evidence Base for the NEC AAP.

Existing Local Transport Network

Walking and Cycling Routes

Comment 2 The applicant highlights that there are footway and cycleways along the CGB, Cowley Road and Milton Avenue leading between Cambridge North station and Milton Road.

Comment 3 The site is near to the Waterbeach Greenway which links Waterbeach with Cambridge North Railway station, and onwards onto the Chisholm Trail for journeys to central and south Cambridge, or the rest of the Cambridge City cycle network.

Comment 4 It is noted that the cycle route on Milton Avenue and Station Row will merge with that for the spatial plan, and could form a link between the Waterbeach Greenway route and the Chisholm Trail routes. The applicant has not made direct reference between the routes provided in the masterplan and the routes within the spatial framework plan and the movement and connectivity plan for the wider area as set out in the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan.

Local Public Transport Services

Comment 5 This is noted to be the Citi 2 and Busway B services serve the site with a bus stop that is outside Cambridge North Station. These provide peak hour services to and from Ely, St Ives, Cambridge centre and Addenbrookes Hospital.

Comment 6 Cambridge North has rail services connecting to and from Kings Lynn, Norwich, Cambridge, Stanstead Airport and London, with the Midlands and Bury St Edmunds connected via interchange at Cambridge and Ely.

Local Roads

Existing Traffic Conditions

Comment 7 The TA details the surrounding road network, and details that Milton Road between the site and Cambridge is subject to improvement works to provide cycle lanes and bus lanes.

Comment 8 The TA has considered the latest 60 months' accident record together with an analysis of any trends or clusters. The extent of the area considered is agreed. This notes that there have been 24 accidents within the study area in the last five

years, with most of these recorded as slight. Most of the accidents are on Milton Road which is subject to the improvements outlined above.

Site Access and Layout

Comment 9 Please refer to Highways Development Management comments for the highways access and layout. Changes are proposed to the Cowley Road junction with Milton Avenue, the Link junction with Milton Avenue, as well as the cycle lane along Milton Avenue.

Comment 10 It is noted that the site contains several walking and cycle routes, that link across the site and northwards towards the undeveloped land, as well as Cowley Road.

Car Parking

Comment 11 The applicant proposes a mobility hub with 725 parking spaces, of which 622 are to be provided for rail users, 20 for the Novotel, and the remaining 83 for the commercial development. This will provide the existing surface car park, as well as the expected additional parking required for the railway station. The total amount of parking expected for the railway station was noted to be 600 in the Transport Assessment for the railway station. The current provision of 20 spaces for the Novotel is also not clear. The applicant has not detailed the basis of the request from the rail industry, and for the larger car park of 622 spaces. Therefore the additional spaces are not justified.

Comment 12 As part of the NEC AAP each development area has been set a parking budget. This has been set to guide the NEC AAP development, as the overall trip generation which within the NEC area could be linked to the amount of parking provided. This area has been set a parking budget of 873 spaces between the residential and commercial land uses, which has been accepted by the applicant.

The applicant proposed to provide a further 417 spaces in addition to the mobility hub within the basements of the buildings. This provision is within the parking budget for the area, and represents a parking ratio of one parking space per 157sqm of floorspace based on a development quantum of 65,000sqm of commercial development. This is in line with the NEC AAP and the Transport Position Statement.

Further to the clarification requested on the floor areas of the development, should this be different to 65,000 then the above analysis may require updating.

Comment 13 The residential development is proposed to be car free, with only parking for disabled residents and visitors.

Comment 14 The applicant has not detailed how a tenant or someone purchasing a home would be prevented from owning a car in this development, and how it can be maintained as car free. Detail on this is required at this stage of the application, to enable the accuracy of this assumption to be known. It is unclear how any potential 'overspill' of parking to other areas will be managed. This is key given that in some areas around the site there are currently no parking restrictions.

Cycle Parking

Comment 15 A total of 2191 cycle parking spaces are provided, with the amount set at the cycle parking standards of one space per 30sqm of commercial development. This is with a mixture of provision of 20% Sheffield stands, 10% for non-standard cycles and 5% at street level. This is recommended to be agreed.

Comment 16 The commercial buildings will also include lockers, showers and changing facilities which will enable and encourage employees to cycle to and from work.

Comment 17 The cycle parking for the dwellings would be provided with one space per bedroom. The parking will be in secure cycle stores, located close to the street or central garden. These should be close to the entrances to each of the buildings. The details can be agreed at the reserved matters stage, and the principals set out are recommended to be agreed.

Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

Comment 18 The applicant outlines that the trip budget that has been suggested for this development area in table 5.1. This is with 214 arrivals in the AM peak and 182 departures in the PM peak. This is also referred to in Table 2.10 of the published High Level Transport Strategy for the NEC AAP. This trip budget has been accepted by the applicant.

Comment 19 The approach taken to the vehicle trip generation for the site is taken from the amount of available car parking on the site. The office trip generation profile is taken from the North East Cambridge Transport Evidence Base Report from 2019. This is agreed. The laboratory trip profile is taken from the University of Cambridge Department for Material Sciences and Metallurgy trip profile, with a sensitivity test based on Peterhouse Technology Park. The assessment assumes that the car parking is 2.5% full at 0700 with a peak occupancy of 85% of the parking. This is as per the NEC Transport Evidence Base Report assumptions and is agreed.

Comment 20 The ground floor uses around the site are assumed to support the wider office and residential developments or the local area, and no allowance of trip generation for these sites has been made. This is agreed.

- Comment 21 The residential trip generation profile is also based on the trip rates from the NEC Transport Evidence Base report and this approach is agreed.
- Comment 22 Whilst the above methodology does set out how the trip generation to this site can be assessed, the TA does not refer to what the potential additional vehicle trip generation to the wider area could be. If parking in the surrounding residential areas remains uncontrolled, could there be the potential for employees to drive to the surrounding area and park, and then walk into the site? If there is to be an improved linkage between Milton Park and Ride and the site, could employees drive to Milton Park and Ride and then travel by public transport for the last mile to the site? The latter avoids any trip generation on Milton Road and the NEC AA trip cap, but could result in trip generation on the A14 and A10 between the A14 and Milton Park and Ride. The former could result in additional trips on the NEC AAP vehicle trip cap.
- Comment 23 The mode share basis for the trips is taken from the CB1 area around Cambridge Station which in time will be comparable to this area. The applicant has not compared the car driver mode share used with those used in the High Level Transport Strategy for the NEC AAP area, to assess whether they are consistent with the mode shares used from CB1.
- Comment 24 The non-car driver mode shares in table 5.2 assume that 22% of trips will be by train, 13% are walk or run, and 47% are cycle. Whilst these mode shares may be representative of the CB1 area, the applicant has not undertaken further analysis to demonstrate that they would be representative of this area. This would be by referring to local census data for travel to work data, or by comparing to Travel Plan Plus data for the Science Park area.
- Comment 25 The applicant has also not considered where people currently live, where they might live in the future when this development is built and whether any of the existing passenger transport routes will serve as viable options to travel to and from the site. The applicant has not detailed whether any of the residents living in the new dwellings work in the surrounding area, whose trips could be considered internal?

The applicant has not detailed how many employees might work in the buildings and what the approximate number of employees could be living in each part of the surrounding area could be.

The applicant has also not considered where the future strategic transport is to be implemented, and therefore what proportion of the future trips to the area will be able to benefit from these measures, and also what proportion of new employees to the area will be able to use this infrastructure, and therefore what the additional journeys by each mode could be, as well as the potential mode

share of trips could be to the development. This has not been related to what the potential capacity of the public transport and cycle network will be in the future, so as to demonstrate that this will be able to cater for the demand from this site.

In summary the applicant has not detailed where people will live in the future, and how any strategic transport measures to be implemented will enable this development to achieve its ambitious car driver mode share projections, and therefore to meet the objectives of the NEC AAP trip budget approach and its high level transport strategy.

- Comment 26 The Travel Plan that supports the application does not consider in detail how travel enhancements and demand management measures, and future monitoring for this area will help the site to be able to adhere to its strict trip budget.
- Comment 27 The trip generation for the dwellings has been taken from the Transport Evidence Base and the mode shares from adjusted census data. The residential development is a car free development, and so there are very few forecast car trips to and from the development. This is agreed.
- Comment 28 The applicant has applied the sensitivity test to the trips for the laboratories using the trip profiles from Peterhouse Technology Park. This shows that the peak hour trip generation is higher than for the University of Cambridge Department for Material Sciences and Metallurgy trip profile. Overall for the site trips the applicant shows in table 5.12 that the vehicle trips to the site are within the trip budget for the site. This is noted, notwithstanding the comments above.

Capacity Assessment

- Comment 29 It is agreed that this application does not require to do junction capacity assessments. This is due to the trip generation for the site potentially being within the trip budget subject to appropriate mitigation measures. However, should the further analysis within the trip generation show that the trip budget for the site could be exceeded, then junction modelling may be required.
- Comment 30 The flows for the Milton Interchange have been proposed by the applicant. These are not agreed and are subject to the further details on the trip generation being agreed.

Proposed mitigation and Accessibility

- Comment 31 The Transport Assessment (para 6.4.4) identifies several measures that could benefit the site and would enable the site to achieve its high non car mode share. Some of these measures are also outlined within the NEC AAP Transport Evidence Base.

Whilst many of these suggestions are supported, the applicant has not gone into detail as to exactly how the suggested measures would operate or directly benefit the site. Further detail is required in this respect. As previously stated, the acceptance of any proposed measures will be dependent on the mitigation being specifically linked to the origin of trips travelling to and from the site.

Comment 32 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan details the overall amount of financial contribution which should be sought from developments within the NEC AAP for the wider transport infrastructure for the NEC area. Whilst the applicant expresses a willingness to work within this approach to agree a contribution towards this infrastructure, (which is welcomed), further discussion is required with the Local Planning Authority to ascertain the level of the contribution. The additional detail requested will help to determine this.

The development is expected to increase the number of pedestrian, cycle and public transport trips to the site, and the Transport Evidence Base determines that with the additional infrastructure in the area that is identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, then it is possible for the additional development to be bought forward.

Conclusions

The Transport Assessment does not contain sufficient information for the Transport Assessment Team to identify the nature and level of intervention(s) that would be required to mitigate the impacts of the proposal to a satisfactory and acceptable level.