

Agenda Item No: 6

TRUMPINGTON PARK AND RIDE, GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP PROPOSALS

To: **Economy and Environment Committee**

Meeting Date: **14th September 2017**

From: **Executive Director Economy Transport and Environment**

Electoral division(s): **Trumpington, Sawston and Shelford.**

Forward Plan ref: **Not applicable** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To consider proposals by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (City Deal) to expand provision at Trumpington Park and Ride.**

Recommendation: **The Economy and Environment Committee is recommended to agree that Greater Cambridge Partnership should develop and implement proposals for expansion of parking and other provision at Trumpington Park and Ride.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contacts:</i>	
Name:	Bob Menzies	Names:	Councillors Bates and Wotherspoon
Post:	Service Director Strategy and Development	Post:	Chair/Vice-Chair
Email:	Bob.menzies@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	lan.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Timothy.wotherspoon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 715664	Tel:	01223 706398

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Board will be considering a report on the Western Orbital, and in particular options to expand parking and other provision at the Trumpington Park and Ride site at their meeting on 20th September. As the site is owned and operated by Cambridgeshire County Council the approval of this Committee is being sought to permit the GCP to develop, promote and ultimately to implement their proposals.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 The GCP have been assessing issues and options around the western side of Cambridge as part of the Western Orbital project. This work has included assessing demand and options for additional Park and Ride capacity in this area. While the work has considered potential new Park and Ride sites it has also identified opportunities to provide additional capacity at Trumpington P&R site, which could be implemented more rapidly.
- 2.2 The site has a total of 1340 car parking spaces at present and current peak occupancy of the site is 85%. The site is partly in green belt and close to proposed and existing residential developments. GCP have assessed projected increases in demand for Park and Ride at Trumpington as being dependent on levels of growth and restrictions on parking at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus in line with planning requirements. The projections do not include other linked City Deal initiatives such as demand control measures as part of the City Centre Access scheme. On all scenarios the existing capacity will be insufficient by 2022.

	Scenario 1 Growth only	Scenario 2, accounting for CBC parking restrictions
2017 (base)	1139	1139
2022	1414	1623
2027	1484	1847
2031	1531	1998

- 2.3 For the Trumpington site itself there are 2 types of expansion approaches. The first approach does not involve new structures or significant engineering interventions, but seeks to more intensively utilise the existing site through ground level expansion. The second approach involves new infrastructure at the site (either above or below ground). The second type of approach, given the level of investment, would be evaluated in comparison with the option of an entirely new P&R site.
- 2.4 Specifically at the existing P&R site a number of options exist for expanding capacity:
- Option 1: Increase the ground level provision of parking spaces
 - Option 2: Provide decking for additional spaces above ground level
 - Option 3: Provide additional spaces below ground
- 2.5 Options could be combined to achieve maximum increases in spaces.

- 2.6 Option 1 could be achieved by
- a) increasing the overall number of spaces within the existing parked area by redesign of the car park (reducing the allocated size of parking bays),
 - b) increasing the existing parked area (within the footprint of the overall site) by converting landscaped areas into car parking or
 - c) expanding at ground level outside the existing footprint. It is considered that this option is not viable due to proximity of housing development by the site.
- 2.7 Work done to date on Option 1 has focused on b) because a) will require specific car park redesign services and further assessment of the overall impacts on user safety and comfort in using the site. However in the next stage of work it is proposed to request that car park design specialists undertake a review of potential measures to increase density of parking.
- 2.8 The work has identified potential to increase ground level spaces by 299. This would involve loss of existing landscaping at the site although potentially further new landscaping could be introduced in the redesigned site.
- 2.9 Option 2 (decking) will be considered either in addition to or instead of Option 1b. Decking is an established method of increasing car parking space. Given the adjacent proximity of residential properties and priority for speedy implementation it is assumed that only single story deck is preferable at this site. However double deck structures could be considered although these would need a bespoke design and potentially require a more fundamental redesign of the surface level car parking.
- 2.10 The Trumpington P&R site has a number of adjacent residential properties and a school. In addition there is impact on the ground level space due to the need to provide ramps. As such the extent of areas suitable for potential decking is limited but it is considered that 424 spaces could be provided.
- 2.11 Given potential visual impacts of Options 1 and 2, and following representations from the Local Liaison Forum, the option of underground parking has also been considered. Again consideration of access ramps will also constrain the extent of underground parking. Underground parking may be designed to be fully underground (with associated ventilation) or to be designed to allow for natural ventilation, in effect by allowing the car park deck to sit slightly above the ground.
- 2.12 All options involve buildability challenges in terms of ensuring operation of the existing P&R provision during construction, although ground level expansion has significantly less conflict with the main P&R site.
- 2.13 As part of the general uplift in demand for the site, additional provision for school and long distance coaches is also proposed in line with plans previously developed by the County Council.
- 2.14 All of the above are set out in more detail in the report to the GCP Board. The GCP Board will meet all the costs involved in developing and implementing these proposals, will undertake full public engagement and consultation and will secure all necessary planning permissions and other approvals.

- 2.15 The work will be led by County Council officers working on behalf of the GCP and will therefore be done to the standards that the Council would use if undertaking the work itself. Once the works are complete the additional capacity will be operated and managed by the County Council as part of the normal site management.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The proposals support economic growth and development.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

All costs related to the development of proposals, consultation and implementation will be met by GCP

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

GCP will be responsible for all permissions and approvals.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

GCP has already undertaken community engagement and will be responsible for all future engagement and communications.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Paul White
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona Macmillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt Ham
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Eleanor Bell
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

Source Documents	Location
Draft Report to GCP Board 20th September 2017	Room 322, Shire Hall, Cambridge .