

**NORTH EAST CAMBRIDGE DRAFT AREA ACTION PLAN CONSULTATION**

**To:** Environment and Sustainability Committee

**Meeting Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> September 2020

**From:** Steve Cox, Executive Director, Place & Economy

**Electoral division(s):** East Chesterton and Waterbeach

**Forward Plan ref:** N/a                      **Key decision:** No

**Outcome:** Approval of the County Council's response to the consultation on the North East Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan.

**Recommendation:** The Committee is invited to:

- a) Consider and approve the County Council's consultation response to the North East Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan; and**
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director: Place & Economy, the authority to make any minor changes to the consultation response prior to submission in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Environment and Sustainability Committee.**

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contacts:</i></b>	
Name:	Juliet Richardson	Names:	Cllrs Josh Schumann and Tim Wotherspoon
Post:	Business Manager, Growth & Developments	Post:	Committee Chair/Vice-Chair
Email:	<a href="mailto:Juliet.Richardson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Juliet.Richardson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:Joshua.Schumann@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Joshua.Schumann@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a> / <a href="mailto:timothy.wotherspoon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">timothy.wotherspoon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	01223 699868	Tel:	01223 706398

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The North East Cambridge (NEC) site is located between the A14 and Chesterton. The area includes the Cambridge Regional College to the west, Cambridge Science Park, and Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE), the last remaining substantial brownfield site in Cambridge containing the Waste Water Treatment Plant, rail heads and sidings, and light industrial units. See **Appendix 1**.
- 1.2 The area falls within the administrative boundaries of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. The principle of regeneration for CNFE, and intensification of use on the Science Park is established in the Councils' adopted Local Plans. The policies allocate the area for a high quality mixed-use development with a range of supporting uses, and states that a jointly prepared Area Action Plan (AAP) will determine site capacities, and the viability, phasing and timescales of development.
- 1.3 The current draft AAP is out to consultation until the 4<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The AAP will be submitted to the secretary of state following further rounds of consultation planned for 2023. The timing of this is to align with the programme for the relocation the Waste Water Treatment Plant, which mixed use development in this area is predicated on.
- 1.4 The relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant has been enabled by a successful bid for £227 Million from the government's Housing Infrastructure Fund. Anglian Water recently completed consultation for 3 potential new sites. A further 2 phases of consultation are planned before proposals are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for a Development Consent Order (DCO). Ultimately this will be determined by the Secretary of State. More detail of the project can be found at <https://cwwtpr.com>.
- 1.5 There are a number of planning policies in the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) and Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012) that relate to the area. These identify a number of sites for the provision of waste management in NEC, as well as transport infrastructure for the movement of minerals. The waste management designations and safeguarding areas seek to ensure that the future operation of these essential facilities are not prejudiced by future development. The new Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan seeks to retain these policies. An examination in public has recently ended. The Plan is scheduled to be adopted in 2021.
- 1.6 The Draft AAP has been informed by two Issues and Options consultations, the first in December 2014, and after changes to the area, a second in February 2019. Cambridgeshire County Council responded to both. Links to the relevant committee reports and responses are below. Our previous comments have been taken into account when compiling this response to the latest draft AAP.

For the December 2014 consultation, a link to the decision can be found [here](#).  
For the February 2019 consultation, a link to the decision can be found [here](#).

## **2. North East Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan**

- 2.1 Most notable changes in the Draft AAP when compared to the Issue and Options consultation in 2019, relate to an expansion of the area. The area has been further expanded to include the Cambridge Regional College, car sales and garages off Milton Road, and Nuffield Industrial Estate. This allows the AAP to be more comprehensive and realise the potential for the area. It is also worth noting the addition of a policy to facilitate the inclusion of the proposed Cambridge Autonomous Metro.
- 2.2 The Draft AAP seeks to deliver a new high quality mixed-use city district, providing at least 8,000 new homes and 20,000 new jobs.
- 2.3 Transport is a key consideration and County Council officers have been part of studies developing an approach that caters for the intensification of use across the area and addition of 8,000 homes. To be acceptable in transport terms, the way in which people travel to, from and within the sites will need to be significantly different. The Ely to Cambridge Transport Study (2018) recommended setting a trip budget for the area. The maximum number of car journeys the local highway can accommodate. This reflects the fact the local highway is at capacity at peak times of the day. The North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Evidence Base (2019) established that trip budget, as well as identifying measures to promote non car modes. This includes utilising some of the existing high quality public transport links already in the area, and promoting active modes of transport (cycling, walking etc.).
- 2.4 The Draft AAP states in Policy 22 the follow trip budgets.  
The maximum vehicular trip budget for the Area Action Plan area on to Milton Road is:
- AM Peak: 3,900 two-way trips
  - PM Peak: 3,000 two-way trips
- For access on to King's Hedges Road, the maximum vehicle trip budget is:
- AM Peak: 780 two-way trips
  - PM Peak: 754 two-way trips
- 2.5 The proposed vision for the AAP is :-
- ‘...North East Cambridge to be an inclusive, walkable, low-carbon new city district with a lively mix of homes, workplaces, services and social spaces, fully integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods.’
- 2.6 The principles to guide new development in the area are:
- North East Cambridge must respond to the climate and biodiversity emergencies, leading the way in showing how we can reach net zero carbon.
  - It must have a real sense of place – a lively, mixed-use, and beautiful area which fosters community wellbeing and encourages collaboration.
  - It should be firmly integrated with surrounding communities – physically connected, and socially cohesive.
  - It will provide a significant number of new homes, a range of jobs for all, local shops and community facilities.
  - It must be a healthy district where wellbeing, recreation and community safety are built into its design.

- It will be planned around walking, cycling and public transport first, discouraging car use, in order to address climate change.

### 3. MAIN ISSUES

- 3.1** In general the response is supportive of the NEC Draft AAP. By expanding the AAP boundary as shown, the area can be considered holistically and planned in a co-ordinated way to maximise the areas potential.
- 3.2** Members are advised that NEC will bring forward a high level of demand for trips, and to mitigate the impact on the local highway network a new innovative approach to minimising the use of the car, and reducing the need to travel in and out of the site is needed. With the Cambridge North station and the Guided Busway in place, along with the prospect of the area being connected to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), and further connectivity to the area planned by the Greater Cambridge Partnership, it is essential that these key pieces of infrastructure are used to their maximum potential to see a significant modal shift away from the car.
- 3.3** Given the lengthy timescales for the adoption of the AAP and the number of planning applications that are likely to come forward before this time, County Council transport officers have developed a position statement to outline how we intend to deal with such applications in the meantime. The position statement does not prevent planning applications from coming forward, and seeks to deal with them in an equitable manner that doesn't jeopardise the overall direction that the plan is moving in.
- 3.4** Fen Road level crossing is mentioned in the Draft AAP, noting the barrier is down for around 30 minutes out of each hour. Being the only access to Fen Road this has a significant impact on the community that live and work to the east of the railway line. This is however outside of the AAP area. There is no provision within the Draft AAP area for an alternative vehicle crossing. (It is worth noting a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway line linking with Fen Road is proposed). The response in **Appendix 2** seeks land to be safeguarded within the AAP area until such time that it is demonstrated that a replacement for the crossing will not need to go into the NEC AAP site. This is to ensure that potential options aren't ruled out prematurely, rather than suggesting that the site should bear the cost of such a scheme.
- 3.5** Ownership of the problem is needed from a range of stakeholders, principally Network Rail the Local Planning Authorities, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as Transport Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highway Authority. Only through this joint ownership will the issue be moved forward and the issue of whether land needs to be safeguarded in the AAP area for such a purpose be thoroughly aired.
- 3.6** The Draft AAP includes 3 primary school sites. A secondary school site is safeguarded should there be sufficient need. Officers support the allocation of sites within the AAP area, subject to more certainty as to the housing mix which has a significant influence on education need. This is demonstrated in an Education Topic Paper written by county council officers to inform the AAP.
- 3.7** Within the Draft AAP BREEAM excellent is sought for non-residential buildings. In the delivery of schools this has not always proved to be the best

measure of performance for buildings. Officers very much welcome further text in policy 2 that states, “Alternative construction methodologies, for example Passivhaus, will be supported subject to early engagement with the Councils to agree the approach.” It is worth noting the County Council is looking into Passivhaus and other alternatives as a more effective tool to inform design, construction and operation.

**3.8** The County Council's draft response can be found in **Appendix 2**.

## **4. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

### **4.1 A good quality of life for everyone**

The redevelopment of the area will bring many benefits including new housing and supporting infrastructure, employment and improved transport links.

### **4.2 Thriving places for people to live**

The redevelopment of the area will help support healthy and independent lives through an emerging new community and supporting infrastructure and new pedestrian and cycle linkages.

### **4.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children**

The development of the area includes proposals for new schools to serve the new community. Wider community facilities are also proposed and include provision for children.

### **4.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050**

The vision in the Draft AAP is for North East Cambridge “to be an inclusive, walkable, low-carbon new city district with a lively mix of homes, workplaces, services and social spaces, fully integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods.” Furthermore one of its principles is to “respond to the climate and biodiversity emergencies, leading the way in showing how we can reach net zero carbon.”

Policies 2-5 in the Draft AAP set how NEC responds to climate change. This includes meeting net zero carbon by 2050, a reduction in the use of water, 10% increase in biodiversity, and setting minimum standards for design and build. The policies respond with proposals to mitigate its impact, enhance natural capital and adapt to climate change. This aligns with the County Council's Climate Change and Environment Strategy's priority themes.

## **5. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

### **5.1 Resource Implications**

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Although NEC is an important part of the development strategy for the area, the costs of bringing forward options must be carefully assessed and managed to ensure the County Council's objectives are fully met.

Viability of the scheme will be an important consideration in order to ensure any development is deliverable but also contains all the important services and facilities.

## **5.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications**

*There are no significant implications within this category.*

## **5.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications**

*There are no significant implications within this category.*

## **5.4 Equality and Diversity Implications**

*There are no significant implications within this category. Note the district councils in developing the draft AAP have produced an Equalities Impact Assessment.*

## **5.5 Engagement and Communications Implications**

*The following bullet point sets out details of significant implications identified by officers:*

- *The proposals for NEC are subject to a robust consultation process. This has included consultation by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council with a range of statutory and non-statutory consultees, including Parish Councils and the local community (including local public exhibition events).*

## **5.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement**

*Members and the local community have a number of opportunities to be involved in the redevelopment of this area.*

## **5.7 Public Health Implications**

*The inclusion of health considerations forms part of the Council's response and would benefit the proposals as they move forward.*

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Officer Clearance</b>
<b>Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
<b>Have the procurement/contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Gus de Silva
<b>Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law?</b>	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan

<b>Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Elsa Evans
<b>Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Sarah Silk
<b>Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Andy Preston
<b>Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Iain Green

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
North East Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan	<a href="https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/emerging-plans-and-guidance/north-east-cambridge-area-action-plan/">https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/emerging-plans-and-guidance/north-east-cambridge-area-action-plan/</a>

## APPENDIX 1

### Draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. Plan showing North East Cambridge Proposed Boundary, homes and workplaces.

Source: Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, Page 16, Draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan July 2020.





## APPENDIX 2

### **NORTH EAST CAMBRIDGE DRAFT AREA ACTION PLAN - CONSULTATION CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION RESPONSE September 2020**

**The comments in this response are those of Cambridgeshire County Council Officers and are subject to the comment and endorsement by the Council's Environment and Sustainability Committee.**

Question 1. What do you think about our vision for North East Cambridge?

- 1.1 County officers have been involved in the development of the draft plan over the past two years. The overall approach to bringing forward the area for redevelopment is broadly welcome and its vision for an inclusive, walkable, low-carbon new city district is supported.

Question 2. Are we creating the right walking and cycling connections to the surrounding areas?

- 2.1 The site will need to take advantage of additional walking, cycling and public transport links currently being planned such as cycle routes from Waterbeach and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the GCP's Waterbeach to Science Park public transport link. Public transport to the city centre and other areas of the city will also be key to further reducing the car mode share of the site. The CPCA's plans for CAM will contribute to this offer if a tunnelled section from the city centre connects into the site and eventually incorporates the St Ives and Waterbeach extensions.
- 2.2 Connections into these links are well identified in the spatial framework however it will be critical for the detailed design of each area to ensure that a cohesive network of cycle and walking routes is created throughout the area. The section on mobility hubs in policy 19 is welcomed as a means of trying to provide sufficient flexible space to accommodate new and emerging technologies.
- 2.3 Milton Road currently severs the east and west sides of the AAP area and is an inhospitable road to cross for pedestrians, cyclists and other non-motorised users. The plan contains proposals to provide segregated crossings of Milton Road for these groups. The principle of these is supported but it is noted that much more work is required as the detailed planning of the site comes forward to work up the exact design of these and input from the highway authority will be required throughout.

Question 3. Are the new 'centres' in the right place and do they include the right mix of activity?

- 3.1 It is noted schools are located at the district centre and Cowley Road neighbourhood centre. Schools should be well connected to provide easy access. Being located within the new community means they are accessible and promote sustainable travel. The schools require good cycle and walking links from when the school opens.

Question 4. Do we have the right balance between new jobs and new homes?

- 4.1 In recognising the ambition to provide a mixed development and allow a more sustainable development reducing the need to travel. The mix provides the ability to live and work in North East Cambridge. Furthermore other uses such as retail within the site are at a level to serve the local community and not promote journeys into the area, as set out in Policy 15.

#### Question 5. Are we planning for the right community facilities?

##### Education

- 5.1 Note the housing mix can have a significant impact on the number of children and therefore the education need. The current ask for 3 primary school sites, and reserved land for a secondary school co-located with one of the primary schools is based on early housing mix proposals. Flexibility is required because it is only when the majority of residential development has gained outline planning permission, and the number of houses and mix is fixed as part of the planning permission, the County Council can say with certainty the final education requirements.
- 5.2 Education supports the allocation of 3 primary schools within the site. These will include early years provision. Being located within the new community means they are accessible and promote sustainable travel. The schools require good cycle and walking links from when the school opens.
- 5.3 A secondary school site is safeguarded within the plans, to be co-located with one of the primary schools. This is welcomed, noting it is not possible to confirm the need for new secondary school on site until such time as there is greater certainty as to the housing quantum and detailed mix. i.e A sufficient number of homes have been granted outline planning permission.
- 5.4 Acknowledging the unique built environment proposed for North East Cambridge and in relation to policy 10e, the Cowley Road Neighbourhood Centre, the need to look more radically at best use of space in a high density development is noted. The last bullet point of the policy states, "Opportunities for schools to be part of a mixed use building should be explored." It should be noted this needs to be without detriment to the quality of education provision and assurance for the securing of the building and land.
- 5.5 The draft AAP indicates the delivery of a secondary school, (should on-site provision be needed), will be at towards the end of the plan period.

"Local secondary school provision will be kept under review throughout the plan period to determine whether a secondary school at North East Cambridge is required and when it will need to be delivered. Based on the housing trajectory for the Area Action Plan, it is anticipated that if it is required, then it is likely to be delivered towards the end of the plan period."

In the programme at the end of the Draft AAP shows the secondary school being opened in the period 2035-2040. This is at a too late a stage in development to provide the Council with the requisite flexibility to plan and deliver sufficient places.

- 5.6 With regard to phasing, it is assumed secondary school provision will be required early in the development, depending on demand for places across the wider area and housing mix from early stages of the development. There may be the option of providing a temporary facility off site for a duration of time before the delivery of new secondary school facilities (if required). Should a new secondary school be required on site, the delivery of such a facility could be from an early stage of development.
- 5.7 Policy 15 Shops and Local Services. Inclusion of full day-care (education) use should be included to enable commercial providers to set up full-day care provision (Southern Fringe demonstrates the negative impact of having a shortfall of this type of commercial opportunity)
- 5.8 Policy 2 states non-residential buildings are to meet BREEAM excellent. Furthermore it states.

“Alternative construction methodologies, for example Passivhaus, will be supported subject to early engagement with the Councils to agree the approach.

The alternative to BREEAM excellent is very welcome and the County Council supports this. BREEAM excellent is not always an appropriate measure in the delivery of schools. The County Council is looking into PassivHaus as a more effective tool.

Question 6. Do you think that our approach to distributing building heights and densities is appropriate for the location?

- 6.1 Note the densities and heights of buildings. The site is one of the last brownfield sites to be developed in Cambridge, and is very well connected. Therefore there is sufficient provision to allow for a high density, urban quarter of the city to be located at NEC.

Question 7. Are we planning for the right mix of public open spaces?

- 7.1 Open spaces should allow for a range of ‘occasional’ events that will help support community activities and sporting events. The use of open space by all ages needs to be considered and where appropriate facilities to promote their use provided. Policy 8 captures this in part but could be more explicit to ensure this is not overlooked when designing open spaces.

Question 8. Are we doing enough to improve biodiversity in and around North East Cambridge?

- 8.1 It is noted in Policy 5 development proposals will be required to deliver a minimum of 10% net gain in biodiversity value. The policy outlines the approach to delivering this. The policy has been informed by a site wide ecology study (2020). It is important developers view the 10% Net gain as a minimum and take opportunities to exceed this where possible.

Question 9. Are we doing enough to discourage car travel into this area?

Trip Budget and connectivity

- 9.1 The vehicular trip budget approach to managing traffic within and in the vicinity of the site is welcomed and fully supported. Technical work demonstrated that the highway network in the vicinity of the area already operates at capacity in the peak periods and the development of the site in the traditional manner of predict and provide would not be acceptable. The shift towards 'decide and provide' – in essence deciding what transport characteristics the site should have and providing the means to achieving that - lends itself to this trip budget approach. Whilst dealing with the highway capacity issue, it importantly helps the site exploit the existing and planned sustainable transport links that will connect it to the wider network and will ensure that the detailed planning of the site will be around walking, cycling and public transport first.
- 9.2 The site is already well connected through the presence of Cambridge North station, the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway and its proximity to the Milton Park and Ride and the detailed planning of the site will need to exploit these existing links.

#### Parking

- 9.3 One of the tools available to assist with the delivery of the site within this trip budget is that of parking control through the limited provision of car parking within the NEC area. The parking policies are welcomed and there is evidence from elsewhere in Cambridge that a strong approach to parking control, coupled with a range of travel alternatives can help encourage a significant shift to more sustainable modes. However, it is recognised that due to the fragmented nature of land ownership on the site, some sites will be able to make quicker progress towards the stretching parking standards than others due to, for example, the complexities of long term leases. The trip budget approach gives enough flexibility that developers can come forward with other measures including aggressive travel planning (which could include the use of car clubs) to ensure that their proposals remain within the vehicular trip budget, however a robust monitoring framework will be required to ensure that development does not continue if the trip budget is breached.
- 9.4 It is anticipated that due to the phased nature of parking reduction, coupled with the increasing offer of travel alternatives, aggressive travel planning measures, and a strong monitoring framework, the impact of parking reduction will be able to be well managed. It is however accepted that on a fringe site such as this, there will be the opportunity for parking to overspill into surrounding areas. If this happens and becomes a problem, areas that lie within Cambridge City could be considered for residents' parking schemes, the restrictions of which could be enforced by Civil Parking Enforcement. However, if this happens in areas that lie in South Cambridgeshire, a residents' parking scheme could not currently be introduced as the district is not covered by these powers.
- 9.5 Any move towards this will need to be initiated by South Cambridgeshire District Council as there are financial implications to Civil Parking Enforcement. However given the increasing number of major new developments and fringe sites that are being developed in the district, it is an issue that South Cambridgeshire District Council may wish to explore early in the plan period. It could provide an additional tool with which to help control

any potential side effects of parking restrictions within new sites, should they arise.

#### Cambridgeshire Guided Busway

9.6 It is acknowledged and understood that the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, along with Milton Road, the A14 and the railway presents a barrier to opening up the NEC site to wider communities, especially to the south. The rationale for wishing to incorporate additional crossing points of the Busway is understood and from a connectivity point of view this principle is supported. However, as identified in the supporting text of the plan, the challenges of implementing additional crossings should not be underestimated. The Busway has the status of Statutory Undertaker afforded it by the Transport and Works Act Order under which it was constructed. Any changes to the Busway corridor will need to be considered at a higher health and safety level than a highway as incidents in the area would be investigated under the jurisdiction of the Health and Safety Executive. This would involve a potentially lengthy legal process with no certainty at this stage of success.

9.7 As such, a developer or other body could not unilaterally implement or design in the crossing points identified in the spatial framework as set out in this policy. Policy 15(e) should be reworded to read as:

“Opportunities to introduce further crossing points should be actively explored, in particular those identified on the AAP Spatial Framework.”

9.8 Early engagement with the Busway team is encouraged to identify a way forward with this.

#### **Question 10. Are we maximising the role that development at North East Cambridge has to play in responding to the climate crisis?**

10.1 The vision in the Draft AAP is for North East Cambridge “to be an inclusive, walkable, low-carbon new city district with a lively mix of homes, workplaces, services and social spaces, fully integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods.” Furthermore one of its principles is to “respond to the climate and biodiversity emergencies, leading the way in showing how we can reach net zero carbon.”

10.2 Policies 2-5 in the Draft AAP set how NEC responds to climate change. This includes meeting net zero carbon by 2050, a reduction in the use of water, 10% increase in biodiversity, and setting minimum standards for design and build. Policy 3 states an Area Action Plan wide approach to energy and associated infrastructure should be investigated and, where feasible and viable, implemented. The policies respond with proposals to mitigate impact, enhance natural capital and adapt to climate change. This aligns with the County Council’s Climate Change and Environment Strategy’s priority themes.

#### **Further Comments**

##### Transport

11.1 In a broader context, it is noted that the status of the document is such that it does not carry any weight or commitment in determining planning applications. Given the lengthy timescales for the adoption of the AAP and

the number of planning applications that are likely to come forward before this time, County Council transport officers have developed a position statement to outline how we intend to deal with such applications in the meantime. The position statement does not prevent planning applications from coming forward and seeks to deal with them in an equitable manner that doesn't jeopardise the overall direction that the plan is moving in.

#### Fen Road Level Crossing

- 11.2 The position in the plan regarding the Fen Road Level Crossing is noted, as is the fact that a number of responses were received by the Shared Planning Service on the issue. Whilst acknowledging that it shouldn't be the sole responsibility of the AAP to resolve the current issues experienced by users of the crossing which are largely caused by the way in which the rail industry operates its level crossings, there is a wider issue of facilitating the growth in rail capacity along this stretch of the rail network. While development on North East Cambridge will drive additional rail patronage into and from Cambridge North station, it is growth across the Cambridge sub-region and county / neighbouring areas that combined is likely to lead to demand for more trains on the line. North East Cambridge, in common with other large development sites immediately adjacent to stations on the line will be a significant contributor to this demand. Furthermore, with the strict vehicular trip budget that North East Cambridge will have, it is imperative that future increases in rail capacity aren't constrained through a lack of strategic planning. In the longer term if the crossing issue isn't resolved it will hamper the ability for extra rail capacity to be provided on this part of the rail network and could frustrate plans to accommodate growth of the local economy more widely
- 11.3 In order to ensure that increased rail capacity can be delivered on this part of the rail network in the future, there is a need to start exploring what long-term alternatives to the Fen Road crossing might be acceptable. Although the level crossing lies outside the AAP area, North East Cambridge could provide one of these alternatives.
- 11.4 If future work identified that alternative access were needed, and that a bridge or underpass of the railway between North East Cambridge and Fen Road was the preferred option, land in the North East Cambridge site for such a link would need to have been reserved for this. It is therefore considered that until such time that it is demonstrated that a replacement for the crossing will not need to go into the NECAAP site, land should be safeguarded for this purpose. This is to ensure that potential options aren't ruled out prematurely, rather than suggesting that the site should bear the cost of such a scheme.
- 11.5 Ownership of the problem is needed from a range of stakeholders, principally Network Rail the Local Planning Authorities, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as Transport Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highway Authority. Only through this joint ownership will the issue be moved forward and the issue of whether land needs to be safeguarded in the NECAAP area for such a purpose be thoroughly aired.