



Our response to revised Cambridge Station Area planning application 18/1678/FUL

Submitted 10 May 2019

The adjustments to the Devonshire Road cycle route link and the addition of a Zebra crossing of Station Road are welcome; however, the bulk of our comments have not been addressed.

We additionally object that the changes to the Devonshire Road cycle route link shown in Revised Landscape D&A Statement of 18 April are not reflected in the Ground Floor Plan of 25 April. The latter document needs to be updated.

On page 12 of the Landscape D&A Statement of 18 April, a diagram shows the type of kerbs and paving used around the site. The Devonshire Road cycle route link is shown with '0-6mm upstand' at the southern end and '25mm upstand' at the northern end. We object to these choices on the grounds of highway safety: kerb upstands increase the risk that people cycling will catch their wheel in the wrong way and fall to the ground. Both interfaces must be flush with the surrounding surfaces, with no upstand.

Examining the F2 Construction Phase Car Park Arrangement of 25 April (drawing MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5015) we see that walking and cycling traffic is directed onto a shared-use pavement in front of B2. We object to this arrangement because (a) there is no dedicated space for pedestrians, (b) the shared-use pavement is narrow and will be filled with street furniture and trees, (c) doors may open unexpectedly into this space. Instead, over the duration of F2 construction, we propose the following interim layout of the 6.5m-wide section be considered: a 3m carriageway for driving and cycling northbound, a 1.75m one-way cycleway southbound, and a 1.75m dedicated footway.

The applicant has laid out a rationale in the document 'Station Car Park Requirement' for keeping the current number of car parking spaces in a new multi-storey car park. However, we find this explanation unconvincing. Abellio had agreed to provide an extra 1,000 cycle parking spaces; however, they were successfully able to talk DfT into releasing them from that franchise obligation, even though doing so has harmed their Local Plan Policy 80 sustainable transport commitments. Therefore, it is quite clear that these franchise obligations can be adjusted when desired. Furthermore, the income gained from office development on that site would be higher than that of a car park, as it is a higher-value land use. At the end of the document, the applicant makes a claim that the car park could be converted into a cycle park 'as we have shown' but we have not found the evidence for this assertion in the documents uploaded. Therefore we maintain our objection to the multi-storey car park under Policy 80, as it enables and encourages motor traffic into the congested city centre.

We have had some discussions with the applicant's transport consultants regarding a potential answer to the lack of safe and convenient cycle routes across the station square and F2/B2 area. The opening of two new access points onto the station square adds another complication to the question of where the cycle route might cross Station Road, as well as having a negative effect on people walking in the square. There may be the beginning of a compromise solution in progress.

However, this remains at an early stage and unresolved as of now, and therefore our previous objections stand.

The covering letter refers to a 'Highways Technical Note Response to Residents' but it is not uploaded to the portal. Please upload that document so that we may evaluate our outstanding objection with regard to the modelled vehicular flows on the mini-roundabout.