

**Project Name** Cambridge science Park

---

**Subject** Local Plan Repls

---

**Reference** 25319

---

**Date** January 2026

---

## 1 LOCAL PLAN REPS

### 1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 KMC are appointment by Trinity College to provide transport planning advice in respect of Cambridge Science Park (CSP).
- 1.1.2 The purpose of this note is to provide comment on key documents associated with the draft Local Plan for Greater Cambridge.
- 1.1.3 At this stage the note is prepared to inform the client team and not for external purposes.

### 1.2 Site allocations: Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge

- 1.2.1 Whist we accept that investment in Active Travel and public transport is required, the delivery of housing is not essential to enabling CSP to grow.
- 1.2.2 Some people may choose to live proximate to CSP within North East Cambridge (NE Cambridge) and there are clear advantages in their doing so, but the numbers that might be assumed within NE Cambridge cannot be so great that without this, growth cannot occur.
- 1.2.3 Point 3; clarify what the 320k sqm of commercial growth is in addition to. What baseline does the policy assume?

#### Active travel and public transport first

*c) 'Be located within 5 minutes' walk of high-quality public transport and active travel routes'*

- 1.2.4 This distance is unlikely to be achieved across the entire NE Cambridge area. Convenient access to public transport and active travel routes is agreed, but the application of a 5 minute walk as an absolute, risks lessening the advantages of transit corridors already in place by forcing additional routes to be provided. People are willing to walk for longer for higher quality services

on public transport. As it stands, the policy also disregards the role of cycling to public transport by only referencing walking.

### Cycle parking and micro-mobility infrastructure

- 1.2.5 The requirement that development must exceed a minimum standard for cycle parking is confusing and will result in uncertainty over what level might be acceptable.
- 1.2.6 We agree that Travel Plans and Transport Assessment should justify provision.
- 1.2.7 There is no consideration of provision across Sheffield stands and two-tier stands which is often cause of debate and query, particularly with members of the planning committee. The Local Plan should use this opportunity to clarify the authorities' position.

### Wider connectivity requirements

*iv. Milton Road (underpasses or bridges connecting District Centre and Science Park).*

- 1.2.8 The need for or ability to physically accommodate a grade separated crossing (likely bridge) across Milton Road is not proven. This approach disregards design guidance which should prioritise active travel above vehicles. The current policy approach will lead to negative placemaking implications and risks introducing barriers to movement, inconvenient less direct routes and lowering overall connectivity. The policy should be less prescriptive towards grade separation and allow the ability for crossings of any type to be brought forward as proposals.

### Last-mile delivery

*a. Hubs (up to 1,500m<sup>2</sup>) should be located at Cambridge Science Park Local Centre and near Milton Road.*

- 1.2.9 The ability to provide this facility and enforce its use is limited. Deliveries are already coordinated across individual delivery companies. The provision of a hub within CSP will do nothing to reduce trips to CSP, only within. It is considered that the wider approach to consolidated through planned hubs elsewhere, with last-mile deliveries is a more workable solution that could reduce trips towards Cambridge and specific areas such as CSP and NE Cambridge.

### Trip budgets

- 1.2.10 The term should be made clearer and include reference to vehicles i.e. Vehicular Trip Budgets. This is to avoid confusion that movements across other modes might be capped. The explanation that these are applied to specific peak hours can remain outside the term.
- 1.2.11 The principle of CSP operating within peak hour Vehicular Trip Budgets is agreed and should enable growth by facilitating the majority of increased associated movements through other travel modes.

- 1.2.12 The figures provided in the policy are based on an Evidence Base that is dated and relies on assumption relating to existing and forecast development, especially within CSP that are not clearly defined.
- 1.2.13 Vehicular Trip Budgets should be defined as those associated with the site to enable use of planned and future Park and Ride and Travel Hub facilities that are already and will continue to be part of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge.
- 1.2.14 The overall approach advocates reductions in vehicle trips associated with CSP so that other developments with NE Cambridge can benefit from this in order for those developments to come forward. This strategy proposed by the authorities recognises the important role CSP has to play to enable growth in NE Cambridge and accordingly, suitable Vehicular Trip Budgets should be defined and appropriate allocation of development within CSP allowed.
- 1.2.15 Trinity will work with the authorities to define appropriate Vehicular Trip Budgets for CSP.

### Parking

- 1.2.16 The policy states that car parking across NE Cambridge within employment sites should be reduced. In part, this is to facilitate parking in undeveloped sites in NE Cambridge. CSP has established car parking provision that has been subject to review and agreement over many years and across numerous planning applications. A s106 legal agreement is in place that defines the number of spaces within CSP, directs towards a reduction in spaces towards a defined number.
- 1.2.17 There is no indication of numbers should be provided at CSP. Regardless the policy suggests an approach that requires a significant reduction in car parking at CSP.
- 1.2.18 The approach will have serious commercial implications and will not be supported by the numerous long-leaseholders on CSP.
- 1.2.19 It should be that car parking provision is managed by operators to ensure that defined, CSP Vehicular Trip Budgets are met. Rather than an arbitrary cap to car parking, the Vehicular Trip Budget approach provides the constraint to highway effects that the proposed cap on car parking seeks to achieve.
- 1.2.20 The reasoning for suggesting a need to separate the access points to CSP and prevent connectivity through the park is not clear. Adopting this approach will have consequences on the overall Masterplan for CSP, making aspects such as delivery movements and share transport connectivity less convenient.
- 1.2.21 Preventing through movements is likely to have unintended consequences on the highway network where instead of drivers accessing CSP from the most direct point of access, they must instead move further around the highway network in order to reach their destination. If nothing else, this change in driver behaviour is likely to negatively impact the Trip Budget approach advocated in the policy.

## Monitoring and management

- 1.2.22 We support the approach towards monitor and Manage, particularly where the policy directs proposals to come forward alongside the principle of Vehicular Trip Budgets.
- 1.2.23 CSP already has monitoring in place and will continue to develop and utilise this as part of future growth proposals.

### Figure 17

- Access from Kings Hedge's Drive to CPS not shown.
- Loop road should connect to King's Hedges Drive
- Active Travel Crossings on Milton Road. Busway crossing should be positioned correctly and arrows show movement across Milton Road. CSP access arrows across.
- Object (?) to the northerly active travel links which elsewhere is referred to as an underpass. Not viable and neither CSP or St Johns has the ability to accommodate this without compromising the wider site and sterilising significant areas. Alternative crossings are available.
- Active travel crossing of the A14 at the railway line is not clear is this is deliverable or necessary given Jane Coulson Bridge and Green way in this area.

## 1.3 Site Allocations Topic Paper

- 1.3.1 2.13; 320k sqm of growth possible according to CCC. Clarify how they reached this decision when the level in the NECAAP evidence base is lower.
- 1.3.2 Essential we understand which developments are assumed as baseline so that we can determine the additional growth.
- 1.3.3 2.14; Reference to three development scenarios. Need to understand what the baseline is.
- 1.3.4 What were the outcomes of these scenarios? Are they acceptable?
- 1.3.5 All of these suggest potential for much higher growth than the published evidence base (NECAAP and CCC Position Statements)
- 1.3.6 2.17; inconsistency across scenarios.
- 1.3.7 Position statement tests a different set of scenarios to either the emerging policy or scenarios identified in 2.14.

## 1.4 Local Plan Policies

### Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity

- 1.4.1 Support: No significant concerns with this policy which provides general and agreeable approach to transport strategies which we can largely support.

### Policy I/TH: Travel Hub facilities

- 1.4.2 Support: Policy clearly embeds Travel Hubs and Park and Ride facilities as part of the transport strategy for the Local Plan. Therefore development proposals should not be penalised for suggesting use of such facilities as part of site-specific strategies.

### Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles

- 1.4.3 Support and comment: The approach towards a vision-led approach to parking provision and justification of provision through a Transport Assessment is supported. The policy should make clear that any references to the application of standards in deriving numbers are indicative and any numbers can be justified through a vision-led Transport Assessment.
- 1.4.4 The opportunity to confirm the authorities' position on provision of Sheffield stands and the proportion of cycle parking should be taken.
- 1.4.5 The policy includes a range of standards against land uses. Whilst it seems these relate to cycle parking, this should be clearer. The position on car parking should also be made known.

### Policy I/SD: Servicing and last-mile deliveries

- 1.4.6 No comment.

### Policy I/CM: Construction management

- 1.4.7 No comment.

## 1.5 Infrastructure documents

- North East Cambridge Area Action Plan: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan – Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)
- New Strategic Allocations Assessment - Transport Mitigation Measures
- CCC NE Cambridge Position Statement

- 1.5.1 The documents above all present a range of infrastructure that may be brought forward to support the Local Plan.
- 1.5.2 The measures contained in each are inconsistent making it impossible to understand what infrastructure is being progressed. Aspects such as delivery partners vary across documents.

- 1.5.3 As an example, the type of crossing of Milton Road is mostly referred to as a bridge or underpass but other documents reference simply crossings. At the busway crossing, an at-grade solution is identified but for Cowley Road grade separation is mostly referred to.
- 1.5.4 Development scenarios are identified and this is consider to be important.
- 1.5.5 The baseline assumed and elements that are considered as growth above a set baseline is not defined. It is essential we understand this to understand the growth that is assumed.
- 1.5.6 No conclusion is drawn over each scenario or clear direction of how this relates to the infrastructure proposed.
- 1.5.7 Trinity agrees that investment in transport infrastructure should occur in NE Cambridge and will work with the authorities to determine appropriate provision.