

From: David Digby
Sent: Fri, 2 Mar 2018 19:50:32 +0000
To: Sav Patel; Sarah Dyer
Cc: Andy Thompson; Ella Murfet; Pram Nayak; Cath Conlon
Subject: Chisholm Trail through Mill Road Depot
Attachments: 17024_180302_Chisholm Trail.pdf
Importance: High

Dear Sav, Sarah,

We would welcome your opinion on the Chisholm trail issues being raised on the Mill Road depot development.

As you are aware, South Petersfield Residents Association, Camcycle, Smarter Cambridge Transport and various other active cycle groups are campaigning for changes to the Chisholm trail where it runs through our development.

Several queries were raised at the S&R committee earlier this week which Fiona has responded to with our support – the responses in **red** below may be useful. However, one of the critical complaints that keeps arising is the lack of a connection past B.05.

We have discussed this with Sav and Jonathan and have been told that our approach is preferred and we have consistently justified this.

The team have now produced 3 views and 2 close-up plan views of the Chisholm trail and its connections into the site to justify how permeable this connection is. We've opened up the area of trees by the rear of B.05 and made this a rest stop for users of the trail and an area of public open space. The views demonstrate how open and permeable the trail is but unfortunately they do not address the requests being made.

Could we please have guidance from you both on how you would like us to proceed?

We can open up the site to the Chisholm trail by B.05 if that is felt to be the right decision by officers. It will lead to some loss of cycle parking and raises potential pedestrian/cycle conflicts but it will satisfy one of the main demands of local action groups. Alternatively, we can stick with our current position, formally respond to the requests being made and justify why we've made the decisions we have.

If the latter, we will need members to be clearly briefed on the reasons for the decision taken ahead of committee.

Could you please advise how you would like us to proceed?

Kind regards,

David

David Digby
Development Manager

M: 07966 115088
E: David.Digby@IP-Cambridge.co.uk
W: IP-Cambridge.co.uk



From: Fiona Bryant [mailto:Fiona.Bryant@cambridge.gov.uk]
Sent: 02 March 2018 12:45
To: David Digby <David.digby@ip-cambridge.co.uk>; Pram Nayak (winterjllp@gmail.com) (winterjllp@gmail.com) (winterjllp@gmail.com) <winterjllp@gmail.com>
Cc: Cath Conlon <Cath.Conlon@cambridge.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Cycling Campaign

This is what I sent to Councillors and their response below for your information.

Best wishes,

Fiona

Mrs Fiona Bryant, Strategic Director, Cambridge City Council |
Email: fiona.bryant@cambridge.gov.uk | Tel: 01223 457325 | Mob: 07526 624340
cambridge.gov.uk | facebook.com/camcitco | twitter.com/camcitco

On 1 Mar 2018, at 21:17, Fiona Bryant <Fiona.Bryant@cambridge.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear both,

I have asked the questions about Mill Road Depot that the cycling campaign posed and the responses are below for your comment.

1. "The entrance point to the CT from Hooper St looks as though it has narrow gates on and there is concern that with a tandem or bike trailer it will be hard to turn in right handed to."

The entrance to the Chisholm Trail from Hooper Street has been widened and curved as far as the pump station site will allow to provide more room. In case the Chisholm trail application for this phase (phase 2) is not approved by the time that the apartments are finished, we have allowed gates as a temporary measure to secure the trail and prevent any antisocial behaviour along its length. When the Chisholm trail application is approved,

these will be removed entirely and the trail opened up at both ends for public use. There will be no gates at either end when the Chisholm trail is in use.

I have asked if the gates have been agreed with County – I will check this myself

2. "The one entrance from the site onto the CT in the middle of the site appears to have been blocked with trees and bike racks now"

This has apparently been the subject of many discussions with the case officer and urban design officer. Both have confirmed that they agree with our approach to include secure cycle parking between the apartment blocks to close off this access and I understand that Sav has discussed this with the Cambridge cycle campaign and explained his reasons for this.

This is partly due to the following: 1) The Chisholm trail is a high speed cycle link to the station – a central link directly into the public open spaces could lead to dangerous conflict between pedestrians and cyclists entering the trail in the path of cyclists traveling at speed (e.g. children running out from the park onto the trail), and vice versa, cyclists travelling at speed entering the public open spaces and creating a danger for pedestrians using the parks. 2) Safety was mentioned as a reason for opening these spaces up but by opening up these spaces, it could lead to antisocial behaviour in darker gaps between the buildings, presenting a threat to users of the trail. As designed, the trail is a secure pedestrian/cycle highway with no dark or hidden spaces along its length. 3) Convenient cycle parking is a priority for local people and by removing the fences, either the cycle parking would be lost or it would no longer be secure.

The approach has been well thought out and CIP has the agreement of officers. We noted these points in our covering letter submitted last Friday but will reiterate them with further detail on the trail access from Headley Street to be submitted shortly in agreement with officers.

I have said that, given you only met with the group on Tuesday I didn't think planners had spoken to the cycling campaign. I am checking this. Whilst planners may be acting with the best intentions and this may be the right thing for the site I am concerned that the changes are just made with no reference to us and in particular in the light of the press release sent out when there was one entrance.

3. "The entrance at the YMCA end looks very very narrow for two way bike traffic and will have bikes mixing with cars exiting or entering the basement car park"

Can you explain how this will work please/

We will be submitting a close-up plan of this improved access this afternoon/tomorrow and will produce a view to demonstrate how permeable this access is. In the originally submitted design, the basement ramp extended further out and did create a fairly narrow access for cyclists to the trail. In the revised basement ramp design, submitted last Friday,

the ramp is pushed further under block B.02 and the access significantly improved for pedestrians and cyclists. By incorporating a flush kerb and wide footway, they can easily gain access to the trail without coming into conflict with cars accessing the basement.

4. "Both ends of CT appear blocked with gates"

I cant believe this is the case but can you confirm please?

As explained above, this is a purely temporary measure in the event that the County Council's application for the trail is not approved when the apartment blocks are completed. We need to keep the trail secure to prevent antisocial behaviour or misuse of the trail before it is in active use. Any application from the County Council will include boundary, lighting and material details that will confirm the final design for the trail and these fences and gates will be completely removed.

These are the others

1. They believe the car parking ratio is 0.8 instead of 0.65

Parking for residents is 0.65. There is some additional parking allocation for the YMCA and visitor parking for the residential and community uses but parking for the residents of the development is restricted to 0.65. Even at this level, Highways have requested justification as to why the parking levels are below the local census data for surrounding streets. It is worthwhile noting that from the public comments received on the application, there are just as many objections on the basis of there being too few parking spaces as there are saying there are too many! Many are concerned that there is too little parking which could cause overspill onto surrounding streets, or that disabled people need access to a car and it is unfair not to provide sufficient spaces. Officers think our current proposal is balanced and appropriate.

2. They asked if a duct could be built into all the houses with garages/parking spaces for electric charging (might this be possible?) *All houses with internal garages (23no.) have active car charging spaces, meaning they have the equipment installed and ready to charge. 10% of the basement spaces have active charging and 40% have passive charging, meaning these ducts are in place. We have also allowed sufficient substation capacity to enable all of these passive spaces to be used should demand arise, which is in excess of what has been requested. Where we are unable to duct is in the private front gardens where parking spaces sit outside the front of the properties – this is more complicated.*

3. Have you thought about offering people buying the houses the choice of garage or additional room? *We can consider whether this is possible but Hill have found it very difficult to sell houses without parking spaces in similarly convenient locations in Cambridge. It seems to be an expectation of the market that houses come with parking spaces.*

4. If you discount the CT space, the green space on site is below 25%.

We have checked this. If you discount the Chisholm trail, the open space does fall from 28% to less than 25%. However, the SPD clearly included the Chisholm trail in the open space calculation deriving the target of 20-25% open space. We have followed the precedent set by the SPD and delivered an uplift on this to 28% reflecting the increase in unit numbers.

5. If the basement car park spaces aren't taken up can you offer them to local people

The basement parking to apartments ratio is low since we reduced the basement extent in early pre-app discussions and following the first public consultation. Houses and maisonettes will be allocated a parking space and spaces for the affordable housing will be distributed by the City Council. The remaining parking spaces for private housing will be offered at a premium, firstly to the larger 2 bed flats and wheelchair users, then to 1 bed flats, then to studios. We anticipate very high demand for these parking spaces but if after the development is fully occupied, there are spaces left over, we could consider selling these to local residents.

Best wishes,

Fiona

Mrs Fiona Bryant, Strategic Director, Cambridge City Council |
Email: fiona.bryant@cambridge.gov.uk | Tel: 01223 457325 | Mob: 07526 624340
cambridge.gov.uk | [facebook.com/camcitco](https://www.facebook.com/camcitco) | twitter.com/camcitco

Best wishes,

Fiona

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived