

11<sup>th</sup> April 2008

Our ref: P08003

Sarah Dyer,  
Development Control,  
Cambridge City council



**Cambridge Cycling Campaign**

P.O. Box 204, Cambridge CB4 3FN  
01223 690718 (phone & fax)  
contact@camcycle.org.uk  
www.camcycle.org.uk

Dear Sarah Dyer,

**CB1 Station Area Redevelopment**  
**Objection to Planning Application Reference 08/0266/OUT**

This letter is to lodge an objection by Cambridge Cycling Campaign on matters relating to cycling and transport. The basis of our objection is unchanged in principle from that detailed in our letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> October 2006, ref M06007.

Since that letter (ref M06007), and the subsequent rejection of Ashwell's original application, we have attended a number of design meetings with the developers and their consultants. We must commend the developers for their constructive approach to consultation. A number of our original concerns have either been addressed already, or progress is being made towards a resolution. However a number remain unresolved: if they are satisfactorily addressed, then we will be happy to withdraw our objection.

We are conscious that much of the proposed work to which we refer will take place in the public highway. The developers are therefore working within constraints defined by the Highway Authority, and it is essential that the Highway Authority work constructively in partnership with the developers to produce the best result for Cambridge, and do not treat this solely as an isolated development.

***Summary of Objections:***

We present our objections in summary form because work continues towards their resolution. We expect further discussion with the developers and representatives of the local transport authority and seek resolution of outstanding issues before this application is determined.

Our principal concerns are:

**(1) Traffic Volume:**

We understand that in order to limit traffic growth, the development will contain no additional car parking spaces above existing levels. We applaud this principle; however

we believe it is inevitable that a development of this size will generate additional trips by car.

A significant volume of through traffic uses Station Road / Tenison Road / Devonshire Road without benefiting any of the local businesses or facilities. It is our view that measures must be taken to remove or minimise this through traffic in order to compensate for traffic generation by this and other nearby new developments and to ensure that improvements for cycling and walking are not compromised by lack of road space and heavy traffic.

**(2) Traffic Movements:**

We recognise that the developers have made significant improvements to the proposals relating to cycle and motor vehicle movements since their original application. However a number of our principal concerns remain unresolved and so our objection must remain. In particular, we wish to stress the following matters:

*(a) Access to the Station Area for Cyclists from Hills Road Bridge and Brooklands Avenue.*

The new proposals would allow buses travelling over Hills Road bridge towards the station to turn right into a new access road opposite the end of Brooklands Avenue. Cyclists, although allowed to use the access road, would be prohibited from making this right turn. In our view this prohibition is completely unacceptable and unworkable. Cyclists must not be treated less favourably than bus passengers and must not be put in a position where they are in effect encouraged to break the law.

An alternative route for cyclists travelling to the station over Hills Road bridge has been proposed. This would be over a new two-stage toucan crossing on the bridge and then into the station area by a new pedestrian and cycle path between the Signals building and one of the buildings of the new development. We welcome this suggestion if, and only if, certain serious weaknesses in the design can be overcome. Firstly it must be recognized that this route cannot be treated as a substitute for the right turn into the access road which will be far more direct and suitable for confident cyclists. It could however be a valuable alternative for slower and less confident cyclists who might find the right-turn manoeuvre difficult. Secondly the design of both the toucan crossing and the path into the station area need to be much improved. We have suggested improvements to the design of the toucan crossing and it appears that these are in general acceptable. Serious problems remain over the design of the path. It must provide direct, straightforward access from the end of the toucan crossing into the station area without difficult turns and without having to divert along the bridge pavement. Turns and pavement diversions would inevitably cause conflict with pedestrians. We consider that the best solution would be to move the entrance to the Signal building complex some 20-30 metres north from its present location so that it is next to the first low building of the complex. This would enable the construction of either a direct path via a short ramp from the bridge or a less direct path without a ramp from a toucan crossing located closer to the junction using the existing entrance to the current Signals car park (which is part of the area to be redeveloped).

The proposal to prohibit cyclists travelling to the station along Brooklands Avenue from crossing directly into the new access road is equally unacceptable and unworkable and could, we believe, be readily remedied by removing the proposed controlled pedestrian crossing at the mouth of the access road. The volume of traffic that will be using the access road is not sufficient to justify a controlled crossing at this location.

*(b) Station Road Cycle Lanes*

We consider that these should, as proposed, be at least 1.7 metres wide and that they should have red surfacing. We also consider that they should be mandatory with a twenty-four hour prohibition on all parking with a single permitted exception to allow temporary parking by special buses brought in to carry rail passengers when train services are cancelled. No car parking and no additional bus stops should be permitted anywhere along Station Road and the existing bus stop outside Murdoch House should be relocated to the new bus boarding area. The Station Road cycle lanes should be continuous on both sides of the road. Current arrangements at the War Memorial junction with Hills Road are unsatisfactory for cyclists coming out of Station Road. A single vehicle exit lane should replace the current arrangement in which there are two vehicle exit lanes and no cycle exit lanes.

*(c) Devonshire Road*

When the station area has been developed many more pedestrians and cyclists will use Devonshire Road. To reduce through motor traffic and to slow down the traffic that remains in order to create a safer and more attractive environment for residents, pedestrians and cyclists, we favour the creation of a short length of narrowed roadway usable by only one motor vehicle at a time and with cycle by-passes at either side. If well designed this would provide better protection for cyclists entering and leaving both the cycle bridge and the route linking Devonshire Road with the station area.

*(d) 20mph Zoning*

A 20mph zone is proposed for the station area and we strongly support this. We consider that it should be extended to cover the whole of Petersfield to link up with the planned 20mph scheme for Mill Road.

*(e) The Ramp from the Station Cycle Bridge*

We welcome the commitment of the developers to provide a new ramp to give cyclists using the bridge much-needed improved access to the station area. Of the proposed options for the ramp, in our opinion Option C seems to be the best. However we have made various suggestions for modifications and were told that a revised design would be produced. We must reserve our position until this revised design is made available. Among our concerns are issues of width and provision for pedestrians with pushchairs, wheelchairs and wheeled luggage who will not be able to use the steps.

*(f) Provision for a Future Pedestrian/Cycle Route alongside the Railway (the Chisholm Trail).*

We need additional evidence that nothing in the plans will in any way obstruct the possibility of a future pedestrian/cycle route alongside the railway heading towards the spare arch under Mill Road bridge.

**(3) Cycle Parking:**

We understand that the main multi-storey car and cycle park will form a separate, detailed application. It is however essential that we can be confident that the access arrangements for cyclists are adequate, that sufficient floor space has been allocated to accommodate the required 3000 cycle spaces, and that the type and distribution of stands is acceptable. Our objection must stand until sufficient information is made available to assess the quantity and quality of the provision.

In addition to the multi-storey cycle park for station users, we must be confident that the number and distribution of cycle parking spaces for the individual businesses and residences within the scheme meet the Cycle Parking Standards and are appropriate for

their situation. In order to assess the adequacy of the access arrangements to all areas of aggregated cycle parking, the requisite information must be provided at the outline stage when issues of access are determined.

We have particular concerns about proposals to make extensive use of high-density two-level cycle stands for this development. Such stands may not be suitable for the kinds of bicycle used in Cambridge which often have wide baskets and child seats. They can be awkward to use without getting oil and mud from the bicycle onto the cyclist's clothing. Most important of all, they may be impracticable for use by child cyclists, the elderly and disabled cyclists. We are doubtful about whether they save space because wider access alleys are essential. Our position is that simple appropriately-spaced Sheffield or A Frame stands are the best provision for Cambridge. However we welcome further discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of two-level stands and have drawn the attention of the developers to locations elsewhere in the UK where such stands are in use. We are calling for an urgent trial of a group of two-level stands on part of the existing station cycle parking area.

In conclusion we would stress that all cycle routes throughout this development should be in accordance with up-to-date national guidance in relation to such issues as width, gradients, visibility splays, etc.

Yours sincerely,  
on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign,

James Woodburn