



Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF
Contact: davidplank@hotmail.com

10 July 2018

David Atkinson
Temporary Development Management Officer
Cambridgeshire County Council

Dear David,

Trumpington Park & Ride – Extension - Planning application C 5001/18/CC

The Trumpington Residents' Association (TRA) objects to this application.

We accept the case for a limited number of additional spaces at Trumpington Park & Ride (TP&R) and strongly support the provision of additional Park & Ride spaces at a new site at M11 Junction 11 but object to specific aspects of this application as stated below.

- 1. Hours of operation:** The application proposes to extend the hours of operation to 24 hours a day for all aspects of the P&R, i.e. bus services and use of bus layover bays as well as car parking and cycle spaces. [Planning Statement, paragraph 3.12] At present, according to the County Council's website, the permitted hours for buses and use of bus layover bays is 07.00 – 18.30, though we note that some buses operate earlier and later than this. No justification is given for this proposal which has not been the subject of prior consultation with interested residents and groups. We do not object in principle to some extension of the present hours of operation for buses. However, TP&R is in the middle of a large and growing residential area and we do object to very early and very late hours of operation on any day and particularly at weekends. We also object to 24-hour use of bus layover bays on any day given the associated nuisance. The TRA proposes that this matter be made the subject of a specific condition which requires the applicant to consult with residents and community groups such as the TRA, preferably on a proposal modified in light of our comments, prior to making a reserved matters detailed application.
- 2. Additional bus & coach bays:** The application proposes five additional bays at the bus interchange "in the verge area between the existing bus bays and parking to the south". [Planning Statement, paragraph 3.10] No justification is given for this proposal in the application nor was one advanced during the pre-application consultation. It would appear that, if carried out, the proposal would in practice remove most if not all of the green space which currently separates the existing bus bays from the car parking spaces to the south together with the landscaped bund which separates the walkways from the access road from the A1309 to TP&R's internal roundabout. The applicant should be required as part of a reserved matters application to justify this proposal, make clear its intended purpose, assess the likely usage of the additional bays and at what hours, and propose appropriate landscape mitigation measures.

3. **Landscaping:** We appreciate the attention the applicant has given to the replacement of landscaping to compensate for current landscaping removed or altered to accommodate the additional car parking spaces. However, there are a number of detailed aspects on which we have concerns.
- a. *First*, we are concerned that complete removal of the existing bund and vegetation adjacent to Trumpington Meadows Primary School car parking and multi-use games area “to create a relatively flat surface between the new parking and boundary fence” will not provide a sufficient buffer for the School. [Planning Statement, paragraph 3.5]. This proposal should be reconsidered to ensure that an adequate buffer zone and screening including trees is provided to the MUGA in particular.
 - b. *Second*, we accept the need to cover over the attenuation pond to create additional parking spaces, but we are very concerned about the loss of the water area, which will be to the detriment of residents and wildlife. The applicant should be required to identify how they will mitigate against the loss of the feature, either within the site or in the nearby area such as the Country Park.
 - c. Our *third* concern relates to the removal of existing trees proposed in various parts of the application. [Planning Statement, paragraph 7.47] The applicant should be required to give an assurance that all trees removed will be replaced with an equivalent number in other locations – or, if for good reason this is impractical, the applicant should be required as part of a reserved matters application to demonstrate that every effort has been made to replace as many trees as possible including precise detail of the number of trees to be removed and replaced.
 - d. The *fourth* concern relates to the proposed removal of half of the bund between the existing attenuation pond and access from the A1309 which, if we understand the proposal aright, contributes to the screening of TP&R from the residential properties on the eastern side of the Hauxton Road and the new to be built properties in the southern part of Trumpington Meadows. As part of a reserved matters application, the applicant should be required to demonstrate that the screening would continue to be adequate and, if this cannot be shown, to propose appropriate remedial measures.
4. **Safety:** Two safety concerns are not identified in the application:
- a. A current concern arises at the pedestrian crossing over the bus access road from Hauxton Road to the P&R’s internal roundabout which is used by local residents to enter and leave the P&R. We note that the alignment of the path is to be moved a short distance but are concerned that the sight line will still be poor for both pedestrians and bus drivers and should be improved, or other means of alert put in place to ensure that pedestrians do not all of a sudden find themselves in the path of an oncoming bus or other vehicle as happens at present. This risk has been limited to date by the relative infrequency of buses using this access. However, its use is likely to increase over time particularly if the additional bus bays are approved.
 - b. The second concern relates to the fencing which surrounds the attractive landscaped area in the middle of the bus circulation roads between the TP&R buildings and the current bus bays. This is too low to deter pedestrians from straddling the fence to cross the circulation roads more directly without using the designated routes. Evidence of this may be seen in the well-worn path across the landscaped area. This is a risk. It might be argued that this is evidence of a desire line which should be accommodated. But it is difficult to see how this could be done safely. The

fence should be raised or other means adopted of stopping these potentially dangerous movements.

It is proposed that these concerns are addressed with the applicant and, if necessary, made the subject of a condition.

5. **Construction:** The Construction Environmental Management Plan seems a robust document, if fully implemented. There are two important aspects which require clarification. *First*, it is not entirely clear that there will be no night working, which is an important issue for the TRA. Paragraph 1.3 appears to make this clear by specifying construction hours as Mon – Fri 07.00 – 19.00 and Sat 07.00 – 13.00. However, paragraph 6.4 states “Where night works are taking place ...”, and the table on page 14 under “Adjacent construction site” states “... and avoid night time working where possible.” We propose that no night time working should be a condition of any permission that is given. We also propose that early morning working should not be permitted on Saturdays to avoid nuisance to adjacent residential properties, with a start at 08.00 rather than 07.00. And *second*, while the proposed construction phases look sensible, their timing and the order in which they are to take place is not specified; indeed, the map states that “The phases are not in any particular order.” [Page 19] We suggest that this should be clarified as part of any permission so that there is clear information about what is planned to happen when and within what overall timescale.
6. **Lighting:** The application does not make clear whether two recommendations in Skanska’s helpful Lighting Assessment will be taken up. These recommend consideration of a “dimming and switch off” “dependent on the night time usage”, and the installation “of internal / external light baffles where required to reduce the visual impact of the lighting outside the car park”. We support both of these with the qualification that dimming may be more appropriate than total switch off given 24-hour access to the car and cycle parking.

Otherwise the TRA is supportive of the application and appreciates the assurances given in relation to traffic impacts, lighting and noise during and after construction. [Respectively, Planning Statement, paragraph 7.15 supported by Mott MacDonald’s Transport Assessment, page 1; Planning Statement, paragraph 7.20 supported by Skanska’s Lighting Assessment and recommendations, pages 8/9; and Planning Statement, paragraph 7.43]. We are also reassured by confirmation from the planning case officer that the application entails no net loss of cycling spaces as a result of their welcome improvement.

David Plank
Trumpington Residents’ Association
davidplank@hotmail.com

cc Councillors Donald Adey, Zoe O’Connell, Katie Thornburrow
cc Timothy Watkins
cc South Trumpington Parish
cc Stacey Weiser, Cambridge PPF