

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Circulation:

Item: Residential development not exceeding 347 dwellings (comprising houses and apartments, including affordable housing), 100 bed student living accommodation for the Bell Language School and public open space, with vehicular access from Babraham Road and associated roads, footpath/cycleways and drainage infrastructure.

Application Reference: 06/0795/OUT

Location: Land to the south of Greenlands, southwest of the Bell School and west of Babraham Road, Cambridge.

Target Date: N/A

To Note: A series of notes have been prepared by the Highway Authority with regard to the Safety Audit process and how it is considered that the occupants of 4a, 6 and 6B Babraham road would use their access. These notes are attached to the amendment sheet.

The minutes from the recent Development Control Forum regarding the access point are also attached.

The Committee report refers to a legal question that has arisen with regard to the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007. The query that has been raised is: what position would Members find themselves in if they approve the junction when professional advisors against it state that it is flawed and contains dangerous design features that may result in accidents that may be fatal?

The response from the Council's Principal Solicitor is, firstly, that it is clear from looking at the report that the Highway Authority has carefully considered and commented upon those objections that are based on highway grounds, including the report submitted by Rutherfords. Secondly, that this is an outline planning application and issues relating to the access to the site will be determined in detail at reserved matters stage. In conclusion, the legal view is that the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act ("the Act") would not apply and that The Town and Country Planning functions of the Council are carried out under authority conferred by statutory provision. In the circumstances, the Council would not owe a "relevant

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

duty of care” for the purposes of the Act.

A letter has been received from the applicants confirming their position regarding the sought S106 requirements. They state that the contributions listed in the Committee report are acceptable, and reflect the outcome of extensive discussions on the subject with the local authorities and Cambridgeshire Horizons.

Representations Received:

2 Babraham Road

A late representation has been received. The representation raises concerns over the siting of the student accommodation and issues of noise and disturbance arising as a result. The student blocks should be moved to the centre of the site.

Amendments To Text: None

**Pre-Committee
Amendments To
Recommendation:** None

Decision:

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Circulation:

Item: 5.1

Application Reference: S1310/06/O & S/0054/08/O (South Cambridgeshire) & S06/0706/Out And 08/0048/Out (South Cambridgeshire)

Location: Former Monsanto Site, Hauxton Road, Trumpington, Cambridge

Target Date:

Pre-Committee Amendments To Recommendation:

Paragraph 6 The date for the satisfactory execution of the S106 agreement should read 30 August 2008 and not 31st July 2008.

SCDC Alternative Recommendation Omit Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan Policies (2003) P1/3, P7/12, P8/1, P8/3, P9/2a which following the approval of the East of England Plan by the Secretary of State on the 12th May 2008 no longer remain in force.

Cambridge City Alternative Recommendation Omit Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan Policies (2003) P1/3, P7/12, P8/1, P8/3, P9/2a which following the approval of the East of England Plan by the Secretary of State on the 12th May 2008 no longer remain in force.

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Bell School Application

Note Prepared by the County Council on Access by Residents of Nos. 4a, 6 and 6b Babraham Road

No 4a

Access from the south to No 4a Babraham Road using their existing access would involve turning left into the site in a normal simple manoeuvre.

Access from the north would involve turning right across traffic from a position within the cross hatching north of the junction.

Egress from No 4a to head north would be a simple left turn out of the site.

Egress from the house to head south would involve a right turn, passing behind the northern island at the junction.

No 6b

Currently the resident from No 6b Babraham Road reverses out onto a verge carrying pedestrian and cycle traffic, presumably reversing either south, or north to face in the direction of intended travel, sitting parallel to the kerb, or at an acute angle to it, waiting for suitable gap in the streams of traffic.

Under the operational conditions of the proposed junction, the resident would be able to wait until the northbound traffic stream is halted by the lights, and reverse out to sit in front of the pedestrian crossing, facing north, or at a slight angle to the kerb if intending to drive to the south.

If heading north, the resident would then await a green light on the northbound secondary head and proceed off in advance of the other northbound traffic.

If heading south, the resident would drive around the pedestrian island and await a suitable gap in traffic to emerge into the southbound lane.

This manoeuvre is achievable within the road widths proposed at the signal junction. The Highway Authority has tested this using nationally recognised turning circles (which tend to be generous), for a domestic car. However, the Highway Authority recognises that this is not an ideal situation and would clearly represent a change in the existing practice of the resident of number 6b. The driver also has the option to head north and then use the roundabout at Addenbrooke's Hospital to u-turn.

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

No 6

The resident of No 6 Babraham Road should be able to perform the above manoeuvres but emerging in forward gear.

Note Prepared by the County Council on the Safety Audit Process

The process of Safety Auditing highway works has been adopted as best practise by the Highway Authority.

The process is seen as a way of independently reviewing designs with a view to reducing the risk that a designer may overlook or fail to sufficiently consider the implications of a feature of the junction that affects the safety of the public.

Staff carrying out safety audits are required to hold appropriate qualifications specific to the task.

The process is carried out in several stages covering the concept and preliminary design of the junction, the detailed design, the completed works and a review of how the works are operating subsequent to installation.

Safety Audit identifies any issue that, in the Auditors opinion, may have an adverse effect upon the safety of people or animals using the works. These issues are identified as individual "problems".

The Designer of the works is still the person in control of, and responsible for, the design. The Designer must address issues raised by the Safety Audit, but is not obliged to implement changes that they consider inappropriate. The Designer must, however, be able to justify the approach that they are taking in regard to any issue raised in the audit.

Problems identified in a Safety Audit do not, of themselves, justify a recommendation of refusal of planning permission. The Safety Audit is a useful tool to the Development Control Engineer as it provides additional information upon which he can base his consultation response; he must, however, weigh up the issues raised in the audit, together with other factors, such as relevant planning history, to formulate his advice.

The review at concept and preliminary design (the stage at which most schemes are considered for planning permission) is called the Safety Audit at Stage 1. Normally this will only have basic information on the proposals, such as traffic flows and kerb alignments.

Later an assessment is made of the detailed design. This is known as a Safety Audit at Stage 2. This audit considers the scheme in much more detail than the previous audit and raises issues in regard to the details of the design. The Audit

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Team, at this stage, thus has a lot more information than is normally available at Stage 1 upon which to base its comments.

Following satisfactory completion of the Stage 2 Audit process the scheme is ready to build.

Changes to the scheme may occur on site during construction, usually due to unforeseen circumstances, such as finding statutory undertakers plant in a position, which would prevent construction of a feature of the works, as originally intended. It may also become apparent that details of the works need changing when constructed, say if a tree branch overhanging the highway obscures a sign.

These issues are addressed by carrying out a Safety Audit at Stage 3 when the Safety Audit team will visit the site and observe the works in operation. A third audit report is then prepared for the Designer to address.

Further audits are carried out at intervals of one year and three years after the works have been completed, and have settled down in operational conditions. These audits, termed the Safety Audit at Stage 4A and 4B will principally look at the design in association with the accident history of the junction.

Ian A. Dyer
Lead Development Control Engineer
(City and South)

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**Development Control Forum: Bell School Site
Joint Development Control Committee (Cambridge Fringes)
Committee Room 1 and 2, the Guildhall, Cambridge**

**Notes of a meeting on 21 May 2008 Bell School Site, Babraham Road
2.30pm to 4.00pm**

Application No: Application 06/0795/OUT
Site: Land to the south of Greenlands, south west of the Bell
School and west of Babraham Road, Cambridge

Proposal: Residential development not exceeding 347 dwellings (comprising houses and apartments, including affordable and key worker housing), 100 bed student living accommodation for the Bell Language School and public open space, with vehicular access from Babraham Road and associated roads, footpath/cycleways and drainage infrastructure

Applicant: The Bell Educational Trust Ltd

Present:

For Applicant

John Hopkins PBA Northampton
Geoff Bolton SSR Northampton

For Petitioners

Dr N A Silverston BRAG
(Rachel Crew BRAG)
James Woodburn Cambridge
Cycling Campaign
Frances Cullen BRAG

Members of Joint Development Committee

Cllr Baker – Cambridge City Council
Cllr Blair – Cambridge City Council
Cllr Blencowe – Cambridge City Council
Cllr McCraith – Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr Turner – Cambridgeshire County Council

Declarations of Interest by Members

None raised

Officers

Peter Studdert – Director of Joint Planning: South Cambs District Council
Sharon Brown – Major Development Manager: Cambridge City Council
Toby Williams - Major Sites Case Officer: Cambridge City Council

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Huw Nicholas – Cambridgeshire County Council
Ian Dyer – Cambridgeshire County Council
John Blunt – Committee Manager: Cambridge City Council

Text of Petition

The text of the petition was as follows: I believe the proposed junction on Babraham Road giving access to the proposed housing estate on land owned by the Bell Educational Trust contains many design faults that render it dangerous to all users, unfit for purpose and should be deleted from the application.

Case by Applicants

Mr Bolton spoke about the application and outlined the planning and technical issues which were set out in appendix 1 attached.

Mr Hopkin then spoke about the discussions the applicants had held with the Highway Authority beginning in 2004 resulting in the first Draft Transport Assessment. There were two broad options:

The provision of a splitter island below the site access and the creation of a cycle way; or

Retention of the cycle way on the road, resulting in a narrower footpath.

A further variation offered (option C) was to provide a cycle way on the footpaths on each side of Babraham Road.

Discussions with the Highways Authority following submission of the application had led to preparation of the access on this basis.

Case By Petitioners

Dr Silverston presented the case for the petitioners, attached as appendix 2.

James Woodburn spoke on the case on behalf of cyclists, for the petitioners:

The Cambridge Cycling Campaign did not oppose the development, but it opposed the proposals for the access on Babraham Road.

A census of cyclists using the road demonstrated usage, including commuting and local cyclists, and the unsuitability of the proposals.

There was a case to be made for shared usage of the footpath in this instance; normally the Campaign regarded shared use as unsatisfactory.

The perceived lack of permeability through the site was also opposed

The Highways Authority Officer's comments

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Mr Nicholas gave a summary of the Authority's reasoning on its view on the access proposals and referred to the County Council's Cabinet consideration of the issue.

The current proposal was considered as viable subject to further discussion about the details of the junction.

The Case Officer's comments

Mr Toby Williams, the Case Officer's report on the current status of the application is attached as appendix 3.

Members questions and comments

Q1 Given the concerns of the petitioners on the safety aspects of the access site – is the provision of an acceptable access possible in this location?

A The Committee will need to be satisfied that an acceptable solution at this location will be deliverable.

The final detailed proposal needs to be acceptable to Members at reserved matter stage. Option C might not be the access solution offered.

Option C was seen as the response to the Highways Authority's concerns, the design was evolving to provide the best solution to the problems identified. The access had to be seen in the context of its location, the growth of Addenbrooke's and the other applications in the south of the City.

Dr Silverston said that his long association with Addenbrooke's Hospital and familiarity with the locality convinced him that the road would not be sufficient to carry the burden of the traffic and that the safety of road users was being sacrificed to provide an access.

Q2 What information would the Committee need in the officer's report, and what level of detail would be necessary to provide a basis to make a decision on the access? There was not sufficient information as yet to do so, particularly on the concerns of existing residents who would be adjacent to the access and have difficulty entering and leaving their homes.

A Members had had a site visit and the applicants would be willing to peg-out the proposed access to illustrate it more clearly. More detailed and clearer design drawings would be provided.

The petitioners concern was understood and the opposition to the junction was noted, it was hoped that a solution acceptable to all parties could be achieved.

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (CAMBRIDGE FRINGES)

11TH JUNE 2008

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Q3 Has the Red Cross Lane and Greenlands route been considered as an alternative access?

A The applicants had given that route consideration but had come to the conclusion that the solution offered provided the most acceptable alternative.

Q4 Is the suggested cycleway/footpath part of the current outline application?

A The southern footpath forms part of the application, which is still evolving. The intention was to cater for a significant flow of cycle and traffic use not only from Addenbrooke's but also from the Park and Ride Car Park.

Q5 Will the development comply with the key worker and the low cost housing requirements?

A The development and all other developments will have to comply with the 40% Affordable Housing quota.

Summing Up by the Applicant

The access point formed a significant part of the discussion in preparing the application and it is understood that the principle of the proposed access location is acceptable. It remains to resolve the design issues of the access at reserved matters stage.

Summing Up by the Petitioners – against the application

The residents' concerns centre on the existing heavy use of the road by all categories of users and the impact of another junction, which they felt did not address the safety issues.

There were also individual concerns about safe access and egress from existing houses on Babraham Road adjacent to the proposed access.

Final Comments of Chair

The Chair reminded members and others of the offer of a site visit.

Key points

- The site is allocated for residential development in the adopted Local Plan, and Policy 9/5 (n) confirms access to the Bell site from Babraham Road.
- The principle of the main vehicular access to the site being from Babraham Road in the position of the existing playing fields access, is established as part of the Southern Fringe Area Development Framework (ADF), which has been approved by City Council.
- The masterplan for the development of the site has therefore been prepared in accordance with this and the other development principles set out in the ADF.
- Prior to the submission of the planning application, extensive consultation took place over a period of 2½ years with the highway engineers at Cambridgeshire County Council, concerning the form and design of the proposed junction with Babraham Road, having particular regard to safety and capacity issues.
- As part of the outline planning application, all detailed matters including access are reserved for later approval. The submitted junction design is therefore preliminary in status and does not represent the final design solution. The detailed junction design will be subject to further planning and technical approval.
- The preliminary access design has however been prepared in a sufficient level of detail to demonstrate the feasibility of accommodating an acceptable junction layout within the space available – i.e. within the limits of public highway land and land controlled by the applicant.

Why the existing playing field access is proposed as the point of vehicular access to the proposed development, and not an access point further to the north through the Bell School grounds, as suggested by some local residents and others.

- The site was promoted for residential development through the Local Plan on the basis that the vehicular access would be from Babraham Road. This was accepted in principle by the Highway Authority and the Local Plan Inspector did not dissent from this. The principle of this access point has also been confirmed by the approved Area Development Framework (6.2 Key Development Principles). The planning application for the development of the site is therefore based on this vehicular access point. In the circumstances, the applicant is not required to demonstrate why potential alternative access points have not been proposed.
- Notwithstanding the above point, there are sound planning and highway reasons for rejecting the suggested alternative in principle:
 - Firstly, the part of the Bell School grounds in question is identified as a Protected Open Space in the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and contains many trees, some of which are covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The construction of an access road in this location would have a substantial adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would significantly conflict with Local Plan policies 4/2 and 4/4. When the development site was being promoted through the Local Plan process, City Council officers strongly advised at an early stage that vehicular access in this location should not be pursued for environmental reasons;
 - Secondly, a vehicular access point in this location would be extremely disruptive to the functioning of the Bell Language School as it would sever the school buildings from the pavilion and existing tennis and basketball courts, thereby creating operational and security problems for the Trust. It would also severely constrain the ability to provide the replacement sports facilities sought by the Council. The formation of an access road in this location would also considerably harm the setting of the Language School by removing a significant area of its landscaped grounds, which is very important to the character and ambience of the property.

- Thirdly, because of the location of the existing Babraham Road – Worts' Causeway junction, any potential vehicular access junction at this location would need to be opposite Worts' Causeway, providing a crossroad in form and traffic signal controlled. As crossroads need to accommodate more potential conflicting movements than T-junctions, this junction form would provide lower capacity and provide an additional significant constraint to the network.

Summary of key principles of the access road junction layout design and the alternatives designs put forward (Options A and B with submitted application August 2006, and Option C submitted later in April 2008 following further liaison with Cambridgeshire County Council)

- Comprehensive Transport Assessment and access highway design process undertaken;
- A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was undertaken and a full and satisfactory Designer's Response was accepted by CCC;
- Extensive consultation was undertaken with CCC, residents and other key stakeholders in relation to the access proposals;
- CCC have confirmed in principle acceptance of a signal junction at the location proposed;
- Design considerations and criteria; (use of design standards and guidance / process for acceptable departures);
- In addition to addressing CCC and the Safety Auditors comments, the design has also satisfactorily addressed the various third parties / residents concerns;
- Everything tabled, assessed or encountered to date has shown and confirmed that the access proposal is wholly viable.

Smith Stuart Reynolds
20 May 2008

Dr Silverston's SPEECH TO JDCC

21 MAY 2008

Mr Chairman

My name is Neville Silverston. I'm a retired general medical practitioner. I'm also Chairman of the Babraham Road Action Group (BRAG) which was established in 1998. I founded the medical rescue service MAGPAS 37 years ago and hence my interest, indeed, my obsession, with road safety. I attended 3½ thousand accidents in MAGPAS before I retired.

BRAG is opposing the location, design and geometry of the proposed access to this housing estate which we believe to be located at a stupid and very dangerous location on Babraham Road when there are other suitable and safer locations and these were set out in the Inspector's Report following the Public Inquiry in 2006.

Babraham Road is the main trunk road south out of Cambridge. It is **without any doubt the** most beautiful entrance into the City from any direction.

SLIDE 1 (Babraham Road in sunlight)

Here is a satellite view of Babraham Road.

SLIDE 2 (Satellite Picture including P & R site)

One of the unique features of Babraham Road is that it has to accommodate a large number of people – mainly hospital staff, who leave their cars at the Park & Ride and walk and cycle to work. Over 400 bicycles are left overnight at the P & R.

BRAG has carried out 4 surveys of these people at the peak morning and evening hours. These revealed that between 250 and 300 cyclists and pedestrians walk/cycle along Babraham Road every morning and evening. About 13% of cyclists don't use the combined footpath – they cycle on the road.

BRAG drew the Highway Department's attention to these statistics which, amazingly, they hadn't surveyed and we pointed out that, with the expansion of Addenbrooke's 20:20, the number of site employees will increase from its present 7K to 18K within 10 years. Extrapolating from these figures, it can be anticipated that the number of cyclists and pedestrians coming from the P & R will increase to 800 – 1,000 twice a day and that the single footpath on the access road could not possibly cope with this mass of people. The Case Officer, I believe, proposed a second Toucan Crossing 100m to the south to compensate for this ridiculous deficiency in the junction design. Many residents strongly oppose this second crossing leading into a field bridleway alongside and across a City Wildlife Site and thence into the estate. It is proposed to be 5m wide and highly illuminated.

SLIDE 3 (Second Satellite picture)

(Show the access track)

Here is the applicant's plan of the proposed junction

SLIDE 4 (Junction Plan)

EXPLAIN IT!

It has had numerous reincarnations since its first design in 2001. This is the last one submitted by the applicant only last month.

Now to our main criticisms of the junction design. I appreciate that members of the JDCC are not highways engineers and usually rely on the advice given them by Officers on the CCC Highways Department. But I want you to think independently and you will soon appreciate that all you need to understand the serious shortcomings of this junction and its inherent dangers is simple commonsense – not rocket science.

(Point to Eastern pathway)

I have been knocked flying once and hit a further two times by cyclists. In winter they are blinded by car headlights coming over the rise.

SLIDE 5 (Cyclist overtaking group of pedestrians)

Present situation showing cyclist overtaking pedestrians. Note the position of the street lightposts.

SLIDE 6 (Junction Plan)

The 1.7m grass verge has been removed and the through carriageway is right adjacent to the footpath. No buffer for minor collisions or errors.

POINT TO TINY TACTILE PAVING

SLIDE 7 (Group of people waiting)

SLIDE 8 (Junction Plan)

POINT TO TURNING LANE

Turning lane is only 3m wide and 17m long

SLIDE 9 (Coach)

SLIDE 10 (Fire Engine)

SLIDE 11 (Refuse Cart)

SLIDE 12 (TNT lorry)

SLIDE 13 (Junction Plan)

1. Through lane is only 3.3m wide
2. Pinchpoints – Dr Woodburn
3. No intervisibility at the stop lines

PROBLEM OF NO'S 6 AND 6b

SLIDE 14 (Plan of road at entrance to 6. Show tactile paving)

Point out that leg is on wrong side of tactile area and only one button

SLIDE 15 (View up my drive from garage)

SLIDE 16 (View of people waiting at top of drive – my reversing)

SLIDE 17 (Frances exiting)

She can't see vehicles in access road waiting to exit because of fence.

SLIDE 18 (My car at top of drive showing position of tactile paving etc)

The occupants of 6b, visitors, delivery vehicles and tradesmen have to reverse through pedestrians waiting area and then reverse on to the main carriageway – even backing on to the access road. The previous grass verge on which to turn has been tarmaced over.

SLIDE 19 (Stage I Audit)

SLIDE 20 (Wheel tracks of Matthews exiting)

The occupants in No 4a have a nigh impossible challenge exiting their drive and wishing to turn right on to the through carriage way.

What do the Officers of the HD really think about this junction?

SLIDE 21 (Exchange of emails between Huw Nicholas and Ian Dyer)

SLIDE 22 (Email from Mr Nicholas to the applicant)

I have sent all members of the JDCC independent reports from Cambridgeshire Police Road Safety Unit, Cambridge Road Safety Advisory Council, David Rutherford and Cambridge Cycling Campaign. They all independently make serious criticisms of various aspects of the junction design.

SLIDE 23 (Police Report)

SLIDE 24 (Cambridge Road Safety Advisory Council)

Lastly, Mr Chairman I would draw your Committee's attention to the 40 - 60 emergency ambulances travelling unimpeded along Babraham Road.

SLIDE 27 (Ambulance coming over rise)

SLIDE 28 (Ambulance down Babraham Road)

SLIDE 29 (JUNCTION PLAN)

SHOW LARGE ISLAND

In short, Mr Chairman, your Committee should without any hesitation and in the interests of road safety refuse this application on the grounds that the access junction is dangerous to all users and not fit for purpose. You'll have blood on your hands.

**Member Briefing Note for Development Control Forum (DCF)
21 May 2008: The Bell School Site**

This is a short briefing note in relation to the DCF that is arranged for 21 May in relation to the Bell School Planning Application.

The application seeks outline planning permission for residential development not exceeding 347 dwellings, 100 bed student living accommodation for the Bell Language School and public open space, with vehicular access from Babraham Road and associated internal roads, footpath/cycleways and drainage infrastructure.

The application has been subject to considerable objection from local residents. One of the main issues relates to the proposed point of access from Babraham Road and the implications of its likely design in terms of highway safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

All detailed matters are reserved for later approval, although various illustrative detailed layouts of the junction with Babraham Road have been prepared in order to demonstrate that access to the development can be provided in a safe and acceptable manner (options A, B and C). The final details of the access are a reserved matter and will be considered at a later stage.

An access in this location is shown in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Development Framework. The point of proposed access utilises an existing track from Babraham Road that runs between two residential properties nos. 4a and 6. All of the illustrative access options include the widening of Babraham Road to incorporate a signalised junction and the provision of two Toucan crossings. The first crossing is over the proposed access road into the development. The second crossing is over Babraham Road in the form of a two-stage crossing with a central island immediately to the south of the proposed access point. There are various alterations to pathways and shared used pedestrian/cycle paths.

Numerous third-party technical objections have been raised to the various illustrative access options, which include, but are not exclusive to: the lack of a pathway on the south side of the access; sub-standard intervisibility; the creation of pinch-points for cyclists; the necessity for a two stage crossing; and dangerous access arrangements for properties 4a, 6 and 6b Babraham Road. In particular, 6b Babraham Road has a tight turning head within its grounds that results in the occupier reversing out onto the existing verge. Occupiers of 6 and 6b would have to access and egress from their properties over a shared area of tactile paving. The applicants have attempted to address the lack of a footpath on the south side of the access by proposing an additional 3m wide pedestrian/cycle link into the south of the site, which follows an existing permissive path, to the south of 16 Babraham Road together with another Toucan crossing.

As a result of the objections, other potential vehicular access points have been suggested by third parties. These include running a vehicular access through the Bell School grounds to create a new 4-arm junction with Wort's Causeway and running a vehicular access to the south of the site to create a roundabout with Granham's Road. However, the Bell School grounds is designated as protected open space under policy 4/2 of the Local Plan and has numerous TPO'd trees within it. An access at this location would sever the Bell School

grounds. An access to the south of the site would be over green belt land that is owned by the County Council. Neither option has been explored in any detail by the applicants.

Attached is the latest illustrative option C put forward by the applicants, together with the latest version of the masterplan. Option C is currently the subject of plans out for formal consultation. The County Council will be present at the DCF to address technical questions and advise with regards to the various options put forward and concerns raised. There is no formal Officer recommendation with regards to the application, which is targeted for the 11 June Joint Planning Committee.