

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

10th January 2007

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/2055/06/CM - MILTON

**Construction of a Park and Ride Facility, New Road Junction with A10,
New Road Junction with Butt Lane, Alterations to Existing Butt Lane / A10
Junction. Construction of Passenger Facility Building, Lighting, Balancing
Ponds and Landscaping Features**

**at Agricultural land South- West of Butt Lane and A10 Road Junction
for Cambridgeshire County Council
Recommendation: Support**

Date for Determination: 23rd January 2007 (Major)

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because it is a major proposal to which representations have been received and it is a departure to the development plan. In addition, it is also for a development of strategic importance in the Green Belt, which Officers consider should be considered by Members.

Departure Application

Site and Proposal

1. This site measuring 7.6 hectares, is located at the junction of Butt Lane and the A10. To the north is Butt Lane, north of which lies agricultural fields with the village of Landbeach beyond which is characteristic of the open Fenland landscape. To the east lies Milton, where residential properties are screened by a tree belt to the A10. To the south lies the Milton landfill and to the west lies the Milton Householder Waste site. The site frontage with the A10 is also marked with a treed hedgerow and the frontage with Butt Lane by a mature hedgerow interspersed with several larger trees. The boundary with the householder waste site is screened by a tree belt. The land rises towards the south where the landfill site is located. Within the site there are two sporadic hedgerows running north-south along field boundaries. The most noticeable landscape feature is a well treed area on the north-eastern corner of the site adjacent to the A10 and Butt Lane.
2. There is a cycle and pedestrian bridge across the A10 linking Milton to the Butt Lane approach to the village of Impington.
3. The road junction with Butt Lane and the A10 is controlled by traffic lights at present. There are left and right hand filter lanes on the southern and northern approaches to the junction on the A10, while the turning out of Butt Lane onto the A10 comprises a single lane.

4. This application proposes a Park and Ride on the northern part of an agricultural field. It comprises:
 - a) 1000 car parking spaces of which 16 will be allocated as disabled parking bays and 20 parent and child spaces. Parking spaces are the standard 2.5m by 5m and access aisles will be 6m wide.
 - b) A new junction with the A10 approximately 150m south of the existing A10/Butt Lane junction. This will allow entry from the southern approach only and exit in both directions. It will have a dedicated slip road off the A10 and an island in the A10 to prevent turning from the northern approach.
 - c) A new junction onto Butt Lane approximately 60m south of the existing A10/Butt Lane junction. This will allow entry and exit in both directions, although cars will have to navigate through the car park to be able to cut across from the A10 southern approach to Butt Lane, thereby encouraging cars to use the traffic lights instead. The footway/cycleway along Butt Lane will be retained.
 - d) Improvements to the A10/Butt Lane junction will involve retention of the existing signals with minor modifications to accommodate the scheme, prohibition of turning from Butt lane to the A10 southbound, minor widening and an island.
 - e) A building approximately 16m diameter and 8m high. This will provide a waiting and information area, toilets and a small office for staff. This building will be built using sustainable materials and will incorporate sustainable energy sources.
 - f) Two balancing ponds.
 - g) Areas of landscaping.
5. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment. A letter received from the County Council dated 27th November 2006 confirms that the wind turbine depicted on the illustrative drawings will be the subject of a separate planning application.
6. It is proposed that the site will provide a replacement park and ride facility for the existing site at Cowley Road, which has been allocated within the Cambridge City Development Plan for re-development to provide a sustainable, mixed-use extension to the city.

Planning History

7. Part of the site where it joins the A10 was subject to planning application ref. **S/1252/76/O** which refused permission for the erection of petrol filling station. Similarly application ref. **S/1251/76/O** also refused permission on the land for erection of petrol filling station, garage showroom and workshop.

Planning Policy

8. **PPG2:** Green Belts sets out the approach to be taken to Park and Ride sites within the Green Belts:

Paragraph 3.17: "The countryside immediately around urban areas will often be the preferred location for park and ride schemes. In many instances, such

land may be designated as Green Belt. The Government's commitment to maintaining the openness of the Green Belt means that when seeking to locate park and ride development, non-Green Belt alternatives should be investigated first. However, there may be cases where a Green Belt location is the most sustainable of the available options. Park and ride development is not inappropriate in Green Belts, provided that:

- a) a thorough and comprehensive assessment of potential sites has been carried out, including both non-Green Belt and, if appropriate, other Green Belt locations, having regard to sustainable development objectives, and the need to be flexible about size and layout;
- b) the assessment establishes that the proposed Green Belt site is the most sustainable option taking account of all relevant factors including travel impacts;
- c) the scheme will not seriously compromise the purposes of including land in Green Belts;
- d) the proposal is contained within the local transport plan...and based on a thorough assessment of travel impacts; and
- e) new or re-used buildings are included within the development proposal only for essential facilities associated with the operation of the park and ride scheme.

Paragraph 3.18 For larger-scale schemes local planning authorities must give particular attention to sub-paragraph (c) above. All the criteria in paragraph 3.17 should also be applied when considering proposals for expansion of existing sites. Approval of park and ride development in a particular location does not create any presumption in favour of future expansion of that site. All proposals must be considered on their merits.

Paragraph 3.19 In all cases, the layout, design and landscaping of the scheme must preserve, so far as possible, the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt. Particular care will be needed on matters, such as floodlighting, which are essential to the safe operation of park and ride schemes but which may be visually intrusive unless carefully designed. Local authorities should make full use of planning conditions or obligations see paragraph 3.14 and Circulars 11/95 and 1/97.

Paragraph 3.20 Park and ride development which does not satisfy the criteria in paragraph 3.17 should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

9. **RPG6: East Anglia (2000)** identifies in paragraph 4.4 one of the key principles behind developments such as that now proposed:

If East Anglia is to accommodate its development needs in an environmentally acceptable and sustainable way existing trends will need to be modified. Developments for housing, jobs and services will need to be much more closely integrated with each other and much more closely related to sustainable transport provision. The main urban centres will need to play a major role in accommodating growth and good access to public transport will be necessary.

10. **The Second Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (2006 – 2011)** adopted in March 2006 includes the relocation of the Cowley Road Park and Ride as one of its urban area objectives.
11. **Policy P1/2** – Environmental Restrictions on Development of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (The Structure Plan) restricts development in the countryside to that which is essential to the rural location. It also restricts development where there is an unacceptable risk to the quality of ground or surface water; where the best and most versatile agricultural land would be significantly affected; to prevent sterilisation of workable mineral deposits; where there could be damage, destruction or loss to areas that should be retained for their biodiversity, historic, archaeological, architectural, and recreational value.
12. **Policy P1/3** – Sustainable Design in Built Development of the Structure Plan requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development which minimises the need to travel and reduces car dependency and provides a sense of place which amongst others responds to the local character of the built environment; is integrated with adjoining landscapes; creates distinctive skylines, focal points, and landmarks; includes attractive green spaces and corridors for recreation and biodiversity; conserves important environmental assets of the site; and makes efficient use of energy and resources.
13. **Policy P9/2a** – Green Belt of the Structure Plan and **Policy GB2** – General Principles (Green Belt) of the Local Plan set out the extent and purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These policies establish development types that are acceptable within the Green Belt, including changes of use and developments that are required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries, or other uses appropriate to a rural area.
14. **Policy GB6** – Access to the Countryside - Footpaths, Bridleways and Cycleways of the Local Plan states that the Council will, in partnership with the County Council, investigate the opportunities to improve and maintain access to the countryside through the maintenance of existing rights of way and the provision of new footpaths, bridleways and cycleways, including circular routes.
15. **Policy P6/1** – Development Related Provision of the Structure Plan and **Policy CS1** – Planning Obligations of the Local Plan permit development only where the additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by the proposals can be secured, which may be by condition, legal agreement or undertaking.
16. **Policy P6/4** – Drainage of the Structure Plan requires all new development to avoid exacerbating flood risk locally and elsewhere by utilising water retention areas and other appropriate forms of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the disposal of surface water run-off. SuDS may include such methods as swales, soakage lagoons, reed beds, retention ponds, filter strips, infiltration and permeable paving. In designing SuDS, agreement must be reached between the Environment Agency, Local Planning Authorities, Anglian Water, relevant Internal Drainage Board and the developer regarding the adoption and maintenance of such systems. Where appropriate, developers will be expected to make financial provision towards the long term maintenance of the system through a Section 106 agreement.

17. In addition to the above policy, **Policies CS3 – Foul and Surface Water Drainage, CS4 – Ground Water Protection, CS5 – Flood Protection and EN45 - The Water Environment of the Local Plan** seek to ensure that new developments provide adequate drainage and do not compromise water quality.
18. **Policy P7/2** – Biodiversity of the Structure Plan seeks new developments that conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of the areas which they affect. Landscape features of major importance to wild fauna and flora will be retained, managed and enhanced. Where damage is unavoidable agreements will be sought to re-create features on or off-site. This is reiterated in **Policy EN12 – Nature Conservation: Unidentified Sites of the Local Plan**.
19. **Policy P7/4** – Landscape of the Structure Plan and **Policy EN1** – Landscape Character Areas of the Local Plan state that development must relate sensitively to the local environment and contribute to the sense of place, identity and diversity of the distinct landscape character areas. In paragraph 7.14 of the supporting text it adds:

Where development is intrinsically unsuited to the character of a particular area it should be resisted. Proposals for prominent structures will only be permitted if they are essential in the countryside and if the location, siting and design minimise adverse impact on the environment. Special attention needs to be paid to:

 - a) the need to integrate proposals with existing landscape features to conserve and enhance local character;
 - b) the scale of the development, its siting, design and the materials and colours used, which must be in sympathy with the surroundings.
20. **Policy EN3 - Landscaping and Design Standards For New Development in the Countryside of the Local Plan** states that in those cases where new development is permitted in the countryside the Council will require that (a) the scale, design and layout of the scheme (b) the materials used within it, and (c) the landscaping works are all appropriate to the particular 'Landscape Character Area', and reinforce local distinctiveness wherever possible.
21. **Policy EN5** – The Landscaping of New Development of the Local Plan requires trees, hedges and woodland and other natural features to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development. Landscaping schemes will be required to accompany applications for development where it is appropriate to the character of the development, its landscape setting and the biodiversity of the locality. Conditions will be imposed on planning permissions to ensure the implementation of these schemes.
22. **Policy EN15** – Development Affecting Ancient Monuments or Other Archaeological Sites of the Local Plan seeks to protect, preserve and enhance known and suspected sites and features of archaeological importance and their settings by requiring, where possible, assessment and retention in situ of remains, or if not possible, a programme of excavation and recording remains prior to the commencement of development by a suitably qualified individual.

23. **Policy P8/1** – Sustainable Development - Links between Land Use and Transport of the Structure Plan requires new development that:
 - a) is located in areas that are, or can be made, highly accessible to public transport, cycle and on foot;
 - b) is designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car;
 - c) provides opportunities for travel choice;
 - d) provides for the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;
 - e) provides appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety.
24. **Policy P8/2** – Implementing Sustainable Transport for New Development of the Structure Plan and supported by **Policy TP1** – Planning for More Sustainable Travel of the Local Plan require new development to make provision for integrated and improved transport infrastructure to increase the ability to move by cycle, public transport and on foot. Travel Plans are required to accompany new non residential developments as a means of reducing car dependency and promoting alternative modes of travel.
25. **Policy P8/8** – Encouraging Walking and Cycling of the Structure Plan states: ‘The capacity, quality and safety of walking and cycling networks will be increased to promote their use, minimise motorised travel and to realise health improvements. All new development must provide safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle environments including adequate cycle parking, and contribute towards the wider encouragement of cycling and walking’.
26. **Policy P8/9** – Transport Investment Opportunities of the Structure Plan identifies transport schemes that are required in order to meet the strategic requirements and needs of major developments and includes new park and ride provision for Cambridge.
27. **Policy TP5** – People With Disabilities and Limited Mobility of the Local Plan requires suitable provision to be made in new developments for the safe and convenient access for people with limited mobility or those with other impairments such as of sight or hearing.
28. **Policy ES2** – Road and Footway Lighting of the Local Plan requires road and footway lighting to have no light spillage above the horizontal.
29. **Policy ES4** – Air Quality of the Local Plan requires appropriate modeling to be undertaken where a development will significantly increase traffic flow to allow comparison with the Council’s air quality strategy.
30. **Policy ES6** – Noise and Air Pollution of the Local Plan seeks to minimise the impact of noise and pollution resulting from new development. The policy specifically refers to industrial, commercial or recreational activities, however the issues will be similar in determining this proposal.

Consultation

31. The County Council, as the determining Planning Authority for this application, has undertaken consultations. Copies of responses they received have been forwarded and are summarised below:

32. **Milton Parish Council** has a strong objection to the proposal on grounds relating to:
- a) Safety of pedestrians and cycle routes at the access / egress in Butt Lane where vehicular traffic cuts across the route serving these. It suggests that this access be moved to the rear of the car park to avoid this.
 - b) No provision for cyclists and pedestrians within the site, where they will have to negotiate car park roads. It suggests that crossings should be provided.
 - c) A “park and cycle” phenomenon now takes place. Cyclists and pedestrians will conflict with the busy road system if this layout is to be accepted. It should be reconsidered to encourage cyclists and pedestrians to use the park and ride site, not discourage them.
 - d) Ideally the bridge over the A10 should be upgraded and extended to beyond the access into / from Butt Lane. As a minimum the raising of parapets on the bridge are essential.
 - e) The plans have been rushed through and not enough consideration has been given to the traffic implications and safety of all users.
33. **Histon Parish Council** strongly objects to the proposal for a number of reasons:
- a) Modelling for the design layout is based on 750 car parking spaces but there is capacity for 1000.
 - b) Modelling does not take into account the changed junction at the A10/A14 or extra traffic generated and as a result it would therefore become an “attractor.”
 - c) If relocation proceeds the Council would require a red light camera to identify drivers jumping the lights.
 - d) Lights should be timed to avoid rat running.
 - e) The footbridge and cycle route are not integrated in the least and are felt to be extremely dangerous.
 - f) The site is unsuitable and design changes reflect attempts to “get the best out of a bad job.”
 - g) The development represents poor value for money, with the County Council’s reasons for this choice being anchored around cost level.
 - h) Drainage issues, with two outfalls, no. 13 drain is already taking water from Arbury Park and is critical and, in terms of possible capacity, giving great concern.
 - i) Lack of Flood Risk Assessment.
 - j) Sustainability within the Green Belt environment.
 - k) No cycle way is provided from the site to Impington, therefore will not be accessible for non-car owners in Impington. The footbridge should be upgraded and cycle route extended up Butt Lane.
 - l) Inadequate cycle provision.
 - m) This is not an integrated transport solution.

- n) There is a lack of renewable energy sources, something which should be encouraged in a public building as proposed, although detail of the building is inadequate in the plans.
34. **Impington Parish Council** objects to the proposal, although copies of papers setting out its objections have not been received, the Planning Officer at the County Council has advised verbally that these were almost identical to those received from Histon Parish Council and summarised above.
35. **Senior Countryside Officer (Cambridgeshire County Council)** comments:
- a) Welcomes the sustainability features proposed, although there should be a strong commitment to undertaking these, as the County Council should be leading by example.
 - b) In the supporting documents the measures to ensure that the building copes with projected impacts of climate change are referred to as 'adaption' however 'mitigation' refers to those measures which aim to reduce the contribution of a project to climate change (e.g. renewable energy). Notwithstanding the proposals are welcomed.
 - c) In order to facilitate an appropriate level of cycle access across the A10, a significant upgrade of the footbridge (and paths to and from as necessary) would be highly recommended. This is necessary to create a dedicated route allowing safe and convenient access for both cyclists and pedestrians from Milton directly to the waiting room and cycle parking area i.e. to negate the need to compete with (or hold up) traffic on the A10 on within the Park and Ride itself.
 - d) The use of native species within the landscape proposals is welcomed, as it will benefit biodiversity. The scheme could be enhanced further by the inclusion of artificial measures for biodiversity such as nest boxes, log piles suitable for mammals and rockeries for reptiles. In terms of site management the potential conflict between the management of water bodies for biodiversity and flood attenuation needs further consideration. The choice of wetland habitats will need to reflect the potential impact of climate change and the long-term validity of developing wetlands of interest.
 - e) A habitat management plan should be required by condition.
 - f) Use of the site beyond its function as a park and Ride should be considered at an early stage. For example other sites have picnic benches, informal paths and interpretation boards.
 - g) More detail of the covered cycle racks is required and public lockers should be provided within the main building where people can store items such as wet weather clothing and helmets.
 - h) Educational opportunities within the site are welcomed.
 - i) Very little reference is given to actual measures that will be put in place to reduce potential wildlife impacts during construction and how existing features will be protected.
 - j) A 1:100 year flood plus 10% allowance has been allowed, but elsewhere the standard has been plus 20% for attenuation of storm water run-off.
36. **Old West Internal Drainage Board** has no comment at this stage.

37. **The Senior Archaeologist (Cambridgeshire County Council)** confirms that the Environmental Statement (ES) has been discussed with its officer and that it is understood that an evaluation is underway. Further advice will be available once this is completed.
38. **Natural England** has no objections subject to the development being carried out in strict accordance with the details of the application. It also advises:
- a) An Environmental Action Plan be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and undertaken.
 - b) The proposals to mitigate during construction are welcomed.
 - c) There is a small area of unused orchard in the northeast corner of the site. Instead of dense tree and shrub planting the orchard should be restored and additional plantings of local varieties of fruit trees included in order to make a distinctive feature of the site and in accordance with the Biodiversity Action Plan.
 - d) The methodology statement for protected species is acceptable.
 - e) If the development works are to be phased protected species should be reviewed in order to ascertain if changes have occurred.
 - f) All developers on site should be briefed by an ecologist on the areas of interest in the site e.g. to ensure areas to be excluded from vehicle movements.
 - g) It is essential that groundwater and local watercourses are protected from pollution in both the short and long term. The Environment Agency should ascertain if the proposals follow their pollution prevention guidance.
39. The **Environment Agency** notes that the application falls within flood zone 1. It notes that the ES goes some way to address the increased run-off from the site. It does not however fully address the details of surface water disposal or detail previous discussion which should be included within the ES. On the basis that it has held discussions with Atkins, it recommends conditions requiring submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme prior to commencement of works on site and a scheme for the ownership and maintenance of the surface water system. In addition it makes a number of points including amongst others:
- a) The storage system must be able to accommodate the 1 in 100 year critical storm. It should be noted that the 10% allowance for climate change is in relation to rainfall, as per Atkins calculations; a 20% allowance should be added on storage as an alternative. They are yet to agree the Greenfield run-off rate.
 - b) It is likely that the receiving watercourse is awarded to SCDC and their Drainage Manager should be consulted.
 - c) Foul drainage or trade effluent should be discharged to a public foul sewer.
 - d) The Agency does not object to the principle of SUDS for drainage and treatment of surface water runoff from car parks, however due to the large number of cars and also as buses carry a greater risk than cars due to the

size of their fuel tanks, a method of pollution control should be implemented in the surface water drainage system. This could be in the form of a closure valve for emergencies. There should be no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

40. **Access Officer (Cambridgeshire County Council)** comments:

- a) The scheme should be designed to meet the needs of disabled people, even if this requires favourable treatment.
- b) The layout of parking spaces and pedestrian routes to the building should be laid out to minimise surfaces being shared with vehicles. Where this must occur the surface should indicate pedestrian priority.
- c) BS8300 indicates that 6% of all parking spaces would be an appropriate portion of the bays for holders of Blue badges, however until such times as accessible buses can be guaranteed on this route, it may be appropriate to start with 4% and monitor the occupancy rate.
- d) Consideration should be given to the purpose of the bridge from Milton Village as its design should be inclusive.
- e) Consideration should be given to a kerb height of 250mm where boarding and disembarkation is planned to occur.

41. **Architectural Liaison Officer (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)** comments:

- a) The restriction of right hand turns from Butt Lane into the A10 could result in road rage type incidents where through traffic is in conflict with vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists using the site.
- b) The passenger facility should include a room for security staff.
- c) 24 hour CCTV link to the Guildhall should be considered in conjunction with 'help' points throughout the site.
- d) The perimeter must be marked by robust fencing of a minimum 2 metre height to deter entry from surrounding fields or roads.
- e) Planting must not impede natural surveillance with ground cover not exceeding 0.9m high and trees not exceeding 2.2m high. Thorny plants should be used to prevent the creation of hiding places.
- f) The Safer Parking 'Park Mark' should be sought.

42. South Cambridgeshire District Council consultees have responded as follows:

43. **Landscape Design Officer** comments:

- a) As much of the existing hedgerow as possible should be retained, gapped up and perhaps layed.
- b) The balancing pond at the front of the site is too industrial in appearance, it could be made aesthetically pleasing to fit in with the surrounding landscape and create a 'presentation' front to the entrance of the high quality building and to the site.
- c) Planting within the parking area is woefully inadequate and will not alleviate the large expanse of parking area. There will be insufficient

shading and the sparseness of the planting will mean that they will be liable to drought and scorching.

- d) The balancing pond at the rear of the area could include more variety and steepness of the slope to improve wildlife use.
 - e) More detailed landscaping drawings will be required as the scheme progresses.
44. **Trees and Landscape Officer** has no objection as there are no trees present on site and the boundary treatment has been discussed with the Landscape Design Officer.
45. **Arts Development Officer** comments that the development is large enough to fall within the scope of the District Council's public art policy. No plans or proposals for the inclusion of public art are evident in the application. Locally, there is an example of good practice at Madingley P&R and it would be expected that similar artist interventions in the design of the architecture, furniture, surface treatments and lighting be seen at this development. A plan showing how this is to be achieved is required.
46. The **Drainage Manager** notes that an award drain borders the western side of the site. Under the Council's land drainage byelaws, no planting, fencing, hedging, buildings or other obstructions will be allowed within 5 metres of the top of the award drain. No increase in the rate of flow of the Award drain will be permitted without the prior consent of the Council.
47. The **Ecologist** comments:
- a) The site assessment identifies a possible old orchard in the eastern vegetated compartment. Old orchards are a Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan habitat for conservation, furthermore the SCDC Biodiversity Action Plan recognises this local importance and seeks their management and replacement. PPS9 seeks the restoration of important features for biodiversity. It is strongly requested that this retained area within the scheme is planted with a selection of fruit trees to replace this once important local habitat.
 - b) The contents of the ES are accepted in respect of the surveys for protected species and the mitigation measures for the construction process. Conditions should be used to secure the implementation of the Ecological Management Plan for at least 10 years. The provision of nest boxes around the site and a limited number upon the building should be sought (The risk of bird collision with the turbine are considered to be negligible).
 - c) The risk of bat collision with the turbine is considered to be low. However, information in this respect is currently very low. The Cambs. Bat Group could be liaised with to see if research opportunities could be investigated. Horizontal spinning blades may pose less of a threat. Perhaps Cambridgeshire County Council could seek information on this alternative design as little is known about this area?
 - d) The water features have a rather regimented appearance. Further details are needed on the final designs of these features. Their inclusion is however very encouraging.

- e) Consideration should be given to the use of dropped or sloping kerbs near to the water features in order to avoid resulting in the trapping of small animals such as amphibians.
48. The comments of **Environmental Health** are awaited and will be reported verbally.

Representations

49. Ten written objections have been received. These raise a number of issues that are summarised below:
50. **Traffic/Highways:**
- a) The wrong location has been selected, the Park and Ride would be better if re-located to Landbeach Road, Milton where improved access for pedestrians and cyclists, less interference with Butt Lane traffic, especially HGVs from the landfill, prevented rat-running through Histon and Impington, allowed simple cycle routes from Milton and Waterbeach, many of which are already in place, and saved the Council (CCC) a huge amount of money, if Council owned land is used.
 - b) Butt Lane is narrow and dangerous, with many sharp bends. It is not a suitable location for development that will increase traffic using it and is already dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.
 - c) It will be the only Park and Ride for Cambridge that is accessed via a country lane and not a main road.
 - d) The proposals ignore the fact that it will be quicker to access the Park and Ride via Butt Lane, having driven through the village, than it will be to queue on the A14 and A10.
 - e) The siting will encourage more rat-running through Histon and Impington.
 - f) The proposals will increase traffic on the A10 and result in much greater queues on the A10 and A14 at peak times.
 - g) No additional traffic calming on Butt Lane is proposed, despite indications at pre-application consultation stage that this would be provided.
 - h) Entry/exit onto Butt Lane should be scrapped.
 - i) The traffic survey is fundamentally flawed in that it ignores the fact that Butt Lane will become a destination in itself, therefore traffic will increase.
 - j) Fig. 3.6 of the traffic survey states that traffic using Butt Lane will be zero.
 - k) Plans are based on the current usage of the Cowley Road Park and Ride and does not take into account the particular differences between the two sites i.e. it is not based upon the site itself.
 - l) There is no safety audit or cycle audit.
 - m) Traffic lights at the junction with Butt Lane and the A10 should be replaced with a roundabout, as is the case at Cambridge Research park and Donarbon sites that are safely used.
 - n) The internal road layout will encourage “racers” to meet here.

51. **Pedestrian and cycle access**

- a) A footbridge linking directly to the site is required.
- b) The existing footbridge is totally inadequate and dangerous. The parapet fences need raising due to their danger, especially to children.
- c) Cars are likely to park in Butt Lane and cross the bridge, further increasing dangers to pedestrians and cyclists.
- d) Greatly increased numbers of people will be using the bridge and funding for an entirely new bridge should be sought with some urgency.
- e) The access point on Butt Lane will be dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians having to cross it.
- f) Crossings on Butt Lane and the A10 need to be provided.
- g) Cyclists are expected to go over the A10/Butt Lane footbridge, which slopes down at the precise point where motorists are turning left to enter the Park and Ride site from the A10 southbound and motorists and HGVs from the Butt Lane eastbound. This is a blind corner and few drivers will expect to see cyclists crossing their path.
- h) The proposed siting will generate a significant number of cyclists and pedestrian trips along the A10 and A14 roundabout from the Park and Ride site where they will be at considerable danger on such a fast road.
- i) There is a similar danger to cyclists and pedestrians who will be forced onto the A10 to and from Landbeach and northernmost parts of Milton village.
- j) It is essential that a safe, adequate cycle route between the Milton Park and Ride and the Jane Costain bridge be provided as the High Street is already full to capacity and cannot be recommended.
- k) The surface of Mereway should be improved in order to encourage pedestrians and cyclists to access the Cambridge Science Park and Cambridge Regional College via this route.
- l) There is a lack of detail regarding the cycle parking facilities, security of these and the number of spaces proposed (40) should in fact be closer to 80 with as many as possible covered.
- m) It is essential that Eastbound cyclists heading for the A10/Butt Lane footbridge or the Park and Ride be guided onto the proposed shared use path as early as possible in order to avoid conflicts. There should be a red tarmac cycle path across the front of the entrance to the landfill site and the park and ride and completed well before the Park and Ride opens. N.b. This refers to a proposed cycle link secured by sec106 attached to planning permission S/1017/06/F for re-development of Mereway Farm.

52. **Strategically important landfill void**

- a) The scheme is for land that is of strategic importance due to its location in relation to the existing landfill site. This development affects a strategic landfill void in the medium term, as identified in the Minerals and Waste Plan and, as such, the development could in the future be considered to be "sensitive receptor" that could result in the closure of the site. The

emerging plan includes policies to safeguard minerals and waste site in order to avoid such occurrences.

53. **General**

- a) The car boot sale that is held weekly at the existing Park and Ride site should not automatically be re-sited on the new site, as it will impact upon residential properties.
- b) There is no reference to proposals by Cambridge United to relocate adjacent to this site, which would impact upon traffic.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

54. The key issues in considering these proposals are the impact upon the Green Belt, disabled access, access for cyclists and pedestrians, traffic, landscape, ecology, drainage, sustainability, crime, strategic landfill opportunities, air quality, noise, pollution and public art. In addition, additional uses such as the car boot sale that takes place at the existing site and the relocation of Cambridge United football club have been raised through representations.

Green Belt

55. The County Council has undertaken an assessment of possible sites for the relocation of the Park and Ride facility at Cowley Road. They consulted on these options earlier this year. The site now proposed was considered to be most suitable, in that it was the least visually intrusive, located on a major transport link and not too far from the existing site. The County Council, having undertaken consultations, proposed this site and undertook a number of public consultation exercises.
56. The site is reasonably sustainable, in that it will be possible for existing users of the park and ride to continue using this service and will encourage additional users as it (arguably) will be easier to access than Cowley Road, to link to existing pedestrian and cycle routes, and does not impact upon important heritage or wildlife assets. The building on the site is proposed to incorporate renewable energy and sustainable materials and construction techniques.
57. In terms of Green Belt objectives the site will unavoidably have a significant visual impact. This can be reduced by careful consideration of landscaping, lighting, signage, and by keeping the built structure to the minimum height and size required to serve its purpose. Unfortunately the application is not particularly detailed in relation to landscaping and some concerns have been raised through consultations. Amendments would be required in order for these issues to be addressed including, amongst the more general landscaping concerns, revised detailing of the balancing ponds. The advantage of the site proposed is that the land rises towards the south due to the landfill site, screening it from the wider landscape. When viewed from the northern approach it will be viewed against this backdrop. Therefore while there will undoubtedly be a loss of openness it will be reduced to some extent as a result.
58. The relocation of the Park and Ride is included within the adopted Local Transport Plan, although a specific site is not identified.

59. In terms of assessment against Green Belt policy, the five requirements set out in PPG2 are not entirely met, however the Cambridgeshire Growth Agenda does inevitably require that some development outside of the existing built areas is necessary. This agenda has led to the land on which the Park and Ride facility is currently located having been allocated for redevelopment. A new facility will be required and this in itself can be considered 'very special circumstances' which would outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt.

Disabled Access

60. A number of issues have been raised which require addressing in order to ensure that appropriate access for disabled users is incorporated. These include the recommendations of the County Council's own Access Officer. These recommendations include minimising shared surfaces and where these are inevitable having surfaces that clearly indicate pedestrian priority, consideration of the number of disabled parking bays (up to sixty may be required), and kerb heights at embarkation and disembarkation points. The issue of the pedestrian footbridge is covered later in this section.

Access for Cyclists and Pedestrians

61. Much concern has been raised over the implications for cyclists and pedestrians not only using the site but also those using the existing routes.
62. Outside of the site the proposals include a new access point off Butt lane, this dissects a well used public footway and cycleway linking the villages of Milton and Histon and Impington, for example by students at Impington Village College. The proposals show a traffic island at the centre of this junction, which will enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross one lane of traffic at a time. This is by no means an ideal arrangement considering the likely levels of vehicular traffic and, at the minimum, the County Council should consider some means of slowing cars down such as rumble strips or raised tables.
63. The proposals include a path linking from the footbridge directly to the waiting area, crossing two of the internal roads. Although the Design Statement indicates different materials will be used for such crossings it is unclear from the drawings how these are to be treated. This preferably should be addressed prior to permission being granted, or as a minimum by condition.
64. The documents supporting the application indicate that it is unlikely that many cyclists and pedestrians would access the site from the A10 approaches. This is a reasonable conclusion, although not all cyclists restrict themselves to designated paths, and in practical terms there is little that could be done to overcome this.
65. A crucial aspect of pedestrian and cycle access however, both along the Butt Lane frontage and to the site itself, is the existing footbridge over the A10. This is currently unsuitable for its purpose, in that the height of the parapets is below what is considered safe and is too narrow. The County Council has indicated informally that funding is not available at this time for improvement of the bridge. Notwithstanding, this is a vital part of the scheme if people are to be encouraged to walk or cycle from Milton to the Park and Ride rather than drive. Local concerns are supported and the scheme should include detailed proposals for the upgrading or replacement of the bridge and funding

sought to provide these improvements if the scheme is to genuinely achieve sustainable and integrated access.

66. The existing cycleway on Butt Lane is limited in length. Planning permission S/1017/06/F in relation to Mereway Farm, Butt Lane included a section 106 requirement for an extension to the cycle path westwards towards the Farm. Officers have been involved in on-going discussions with the owners of this site who are concerned that the permitted scheme is not financially viable. Several subsequent applications have been made, which have been refused and a current application is yet to be determined. While the extension to this path is clearly desirable there is no certainty that it will be provided due to the uncertainty surrounding that site.
67. This raises the further possibility that the Mereway should be improved to accommodate a cycle path that would enable links to Cambridge Science Park and Cambridge Regional College. However this would have to be explored with the County Council's Archaeologists due to its historic significance as a former Roman road and with the Countryside Access Team. On plan it appears that there is relatively little between the route through Milton and the Mereway in terms of distance, although the latter would avoid traffic in Milton.
68. As these issues have not been fully explored within the application documents it is recommended that the Council undertake a Cycle Audit of the scheme as proposed prior to determination in order to ascertain if adequate measures have been incorporated.
69. Within the site the proposals are not sufficiently detailed in relation to the cycle parking provision. These form an integral part of the scheme and full details are required, particularly as forty spaces are to be under cover. Similarly, provision of lockers for storing cyclists belongings is a sensible and reasonable requirement.

Traffic

70. The traffic modelling methodology appears to have been based upon existing flows on the A10 and Butt Lane. It uses up-to-date trip data from the existing Park and Ride. It is impossible to know precisely what the traffic generation for such a particular site will be but this data is the closest that can be obtained. The data takes into account the new location and traffic growth forecasting.
71. The issue of rat-running on Butt Lane is addressed. However the effectiveness of traffic calming in Impington and the deterrent of lengthened waiting times at the Butt Lane traffic lights, particularly when there are problems on the A14, is not specifically addressed. It is stated in the Transport Assessment that the scheme has been designed in such way that it would not encourage further rat-running and that the capacity of the junction will be improved. However it does not seem to address the increased traffic levels on Butt Lane from users of the Park and Ride itself. Traffic levels along the road has a real impact upon residents through increased noise, pollution and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. This should be addressed by the County Council prior to the application being determined including undertaking a safety audit.

72. The Transport Assessment indicates that the capacity of junctions have been taken into consideration and improvements to signalling and junctions will minimise the impact upon the A10 and Milton roundabout.
73. The layout has been designed to discourage drivers from using the site as a short cut from the A10 to Butt Lane. This is to be achieved by the internal circulatory system and will mean that drivers have to navigate the parking areas in order to access Butt Lane, thus encouraging the use of the traffic lights instead. The gyratory system has been designed to allow cars to access the A10 via the site from Butt Lane, and this part of the internal road system will be a 30mph road.

Landscaping

74. Several issues in relation to landscaping must be addressed if the impact of the scheme on the landscape and wildlife is to be minimised. These include a requirement for a detailed scheme including planting, addressing the design of the balancing ponds, strengthening the existing hedgerows and reinstating the orchard. And this is a full planning application the detailed design of the layout and balancing ponds in particular must be addressed at an early stage and preferably prior to determination, as the internal layout may alter as a result of such changes.

Ecology

75. The scheme should incorporate the recommendations of Natural England, the Countryside Officer and our Ecologist. While on the whole the scheme is welcomed these recommendations include dropping kerbs, re-designing ponds, briefing developers on the ecological sensitivities of the site so that they can be avoided during works, a management plan for a minimum of ten years, reviewing ecology within the site if the development is to be phased, and orchard re-planting.

Drainage

76. The proposed balancing ponds appear to be acceptable for attenuation of surface water and meet the Environment Agency and our own requirements subject to the recommended conditions relating to the submission of detailed schemes for surface water drainage, foul drainage, pollution control measures and 5 metre clearance of the Award Drain.

Sustainability

77. The proposal is not essential to the rural location and as such is not in accordance with the development plan. Notwithstanding, its location has been justified as being the best option for relocation and in other aspects is deemed to be sustainable subject to addressing the issues relating to cycle and pedestrian access, use of renewable energy sources and sustainable materials as indicated in the plans. In addition there appears to be scope for educational opportunities, which could be enhanced if the recommendations of the Countryside Officer for interpretation boards and for example introducing walks through the site are taken up.

Crime

78. While the recommendations of the Constabulary are generally supported, the recommendations for boundary treatments and landscaping will require careful consideration as part of the overall landscaping scheme. High fencing could be visually intrusive if not introduced in a way that is also sensitive to the appearance of the area.

Strategic Landfill Opportunities

79. The County Council must consider the impact of this scheme upon its own policies for dealing with waste.

Air Quality, Noise and Pollution

80. The Environmental Impact Assessment includes studies of the impacts of the proposals in terms of air quality, noise and pollution. Comments have not been received from the Council's Environmental Health Department on these and therefore Members will be updated at Committee if issues are raised regarding these matters.

Public Art

81. South Cambridgeshire District Council has a policy of encouraging public art within major developments. The recommendations of the Arts Development Officer are to be supported and it is recommended that the County Council liaise with him to ensure that appropriate provision for art is included in the scheme.

Other matters

82. The possible use of the site as a car boot sale would require separate planning permission. An application would consider the possible impacts and assess such proposals on their merits. The proposals make no indication as to whether it is envisaged that it is intended to relocate to this site.
83. Similarly, the mooted relocation of Cambridge United Football Club to land adjacent to this site would also have to be considered upon its planning merits should an application be made.

Recommendation

84. No objection in principle subject to further work being undertaken prior to planning permission being granted and conditions as summarised below:
- a) Detailed landscaping proposals.
 - b) Design of balancing ponds.
 - c) Disabled parking provision.
 - d) Details of surfacing for paths.
 - e) Details of kerb heights at bus stops.
 - f) Detailed proposals for upgrading or replacement of the existing footbridge over the A10.
 - g) Introduction of speed reducing measures such as rumble strips or tables at the new access to Butt Lane.
 - h) A safety audit.

- i) A cycle audit.
- j) Consideration of links to Mereway.
- k) Details of cycle parking provision.
- l) Details of facilities for cyclists such as lockers.
- m) Consideration and mitigation of the impact on the villages of Histon and Impington of increased traffic on Butt Lane.
- n) Orchard re-planting.
- o) Ecological Management Plan secured for a minimum of ten years.
- p) Dropped kerbs at bus stops.
- q) Review of ecological impacts if development is to be phased.
- r) Detailed surface water drainage scheme.
- s) Foul drainage scheme.
- t) Pollution control in relation to water supplies.
- u) 5 metre clearance of the Award Drain.
- v) Use of renewable energy and sustainable materials.
- w) Interpretation boards and walks.
- x) Public Art provision.
- y) Any further requirements recommended by Environmental Health in respect of noise, air and ground pollution.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- PPG2: Green Belts
- RPG6: East Anglia 2000
- Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning File Refs: S/2055/06/CM, S/1252/76/O, S/1251/76/O

Contact Officer: Melissa Reynolds – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713237