

CAMCYCLE



Cambridge Cycling Campaign

The Bike Depot
140 Cowley Road
Cambridge CB4 0DL

01223 690718

contact@camcycle.org.uk

www.camcycle.org.uk

Rebecca Claydon, Case Officer

Re: 21/00264/FUL ('B2/F2' at Cambridge Station)

Cambridge City Planning

The Guildhall, Market Square

Cambridge CB2 3QJ

March 15, 2021

Dear Ms Claydon,

Camcycle is a volunteer-led charity with over 1,550 members that works for more, better and safer cycling for all ages and abilities in the Cambridge region.

We appreciate the work that has been done to ensure the accommodation of the Chisholm Trail within the site footprint according to the requirements of Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20, except for the part within the surface car park. We do have some remaining objections under policies 80 and 82 of the Local Plan, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, and we also want to ensure that continued detailed design is performed in accordance with LTN 1/20. Furthermore, it is especially important to protect the future expansion of cycle parking facilities for the station by making passive provision for conversion of the multi-storey car park into an extension of Cycle Point; the applicants have repeatedly stated it will be possible while failing to provide any details of how they are providing for it.

Protecting the Chisholm Trail

- We are not satisfied that the Chisholm Trail will be adequately protected, as required by policy 80, if the land is used for car parking (as shown in Figure 3 of section 4.2 of appendix C of the Transport Assessment) for some period of time before the county finishes building the scheme. We believe that there will be resistance to losing the car parking spaces when the time comes. Therefore, it is much less likely to be a problem if the land intended for the future Chisholm Trail link is reserved at this time for that purpose. The land should not be used for car parking, or an explicit condition should be agreed that the land marked on a referenced plan will be made available for a cycle route on request by the County Council.
- Along the route of the proposed Chisholm Trail south of the site, as shown in drawing MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5061, the bollards behind One the Square will need to be realigned because the gaps are narrower than 1.5m due to their oblique angle with respect to the Chisholm Trail. The gaps should be 1.5m when projected onto a plane that is perpendicular to the route of the Chisholm Trail, in accordance with LTN 1/20. This should be noted in the details of imple-

mentation. We would also like to be involved in the design of the 'cycle friendly' traffic calming measures on Mill Park Road (shown as 'Mill Place' on the diagram).

Preparing for a future expansion of cycle parking

The applicant has claimed the multi-storey car park could be (partly or wholly) converted into a cycle park in the future. We are very concerned that the applicant has not left passive provision for this conversion nor for a connection to the existing cycle park. The design of the first floor of the car park, on page 30 of the latest Design and Access Statement, does not show any space where a future bridge connection could be put through. We object under the National Planning Policy Framework policies 7 and 104(c) as well as LTN 1/20.

NPPF 7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

NPPF 104 (c). Planning policies should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development

LTN 1/20: 11.3.4. Spare capacity should always be provided to cater for growth and turnover. The effect of new infrastructure should also be factored into any decisions about planned reserve capacity of cycle parking facilities.

To resolve this objection, details should be submitted showing a reasonable indication of how this conversion would take place, how it has been provided for, and how it would be connected to the existing cycle park. That connection should at least involve a bridge between the buildings to allow people to circulate more easily to find available cycle parking spaces.

Details of the Devonshire Road cycleway link

- Details of the access controls, including layout and dimensions, for the Devonshire Road cycleway link still need to be provided – we would like to ensure that this is carried out in accordance with LTN 1/20 and also in consultation with local stakeholders such as ourselves, in order to help minimise the risk of serious injury to cyclists trying to negotiate any bollards.
- Page 9 of the Landscape Report mentions a 'feature etched metal screen to conceal cars' that is shown adjacent to a bend in the Devonshire Road cycleway link. Not enough detail is shown about whether this metal screen affects the forward visibility or dynamic envelope of the cycleway. We would like to ensure that there is at least 0.5m buffer between the metal screen and the edge of the cycleway, as specified by LTN 1/20 Table 5-3 'Additional width at fixed objects'. This could be achieved by shifting the cycleway slightly south, if necessary.

Cycling in Station Square

Notwithstanding the proposed route for the Chisholm Trail, running behind One the Square, we would like to ensure that the existing routes into Station Square serving the shops and the station itself will

remain available for cycling for those who need them. These desire lines are not shown in the diagrams discussed by section 4.10 of appendix C of the Transport Assessment. Nevertheless they will continue to be used for access, at the very least, because they are the most direct routes to those local destinations.

To be clear: the diversion of the route of the Chisholm Trail around the back of One the Square does not comply with the directness principle of LTN 1/20. However, we have accepted it as a compromise given the constraints of the site as it is today, the dangers of the mini-roundabout, and the compliance with LTN 1/20 of the details of the proposed route apart from directness. We are disappointed that the site was not better planned from the beginning but would like to move forward with what is achievable under the current circumstances and see the aforementioned issues resolved.

Cycle parking for B2

Design and Access Statement section 4.2.2 shows that 'guest cycle parking' for B2 is being off-loaded into the existing station cycle park, in a room currently used for staff cycle parking. We object under policy 82 that this is overloading an existing facility.

Yours sincerely,
On behalf of Camcycle,

Matthew Danish,
Trustee.