Cambridge Sub Region Development Options – Land use and Transport Testing

Executive Summary

Modelling has confirmed:

1. Major transport improvements are required for all development options.

2. Improvements are required to both public transport and facilities for private travel.

3. Each of the main development options has some advantages and some disadvantages in meeting social, economic and transport requirements, and could be made to work at a functional level. Additionally, modelling has suggested:

4. Specific types of transport improvements required in association with alternative development options have been identified.

5. Developments close to Cambridge have the greatest chance of being served by, and helping to support the development of, high quality public transport.

6. Provision of new homes heavily concentrated within and close to Cambridge is the most direct way of meeting the housing needs of the City, but carries the penalty of increased congestion and the tendency to concentrate additional economic activity on the city itself. Major urban expansion would result in the need for new orbital road routes.

7. On the other hand, options which limit housing growth of Cambridge whilst improving transport and housing opportunities away from the City are very inefficient at meeting housing needs and also increase costs to the sub-regional economy.

8. New settlement locations which are relatively close to the City but beyond the Green Belt, and well connected by high quality public transport, perform well in meeting housing needs.

9. Oakington appears to be a successful location in this regard. The development of a guided bus system on the Huntingdon corridor would be a significant advantage.

10. Waterbeach new settlement could also serve the needs of Cambridge well but has the disadvantage of relatively poor links to other parts of the Sub-region.

11. Great Abington could function well as a new settlement with an existing focus of local employment. However, it appears less well placed than the alternatives in meeting the specific housing needs of Cambridge.

12. Childerley Gate would be better placed in relation to Cambridge but also seems to have the propensity to encourage commuting to more distant locations.

13. The combinations of development option and new settlement location in the modelling were chosen to be complementary but there is no reason why different combinations should not be considered.

14. Market towns appear capable of accommodating further modest expansion in their own right as centres of employment and local services. However, as they grow, interactions with Cambridge will increase, underlining the case for sustainable transport improvements.

15. Options which combine a measure of residential expansion at Cambridge and development in a selected corridor of high grade transport improvements, to include a new settlement and some market town expansion, appears to offer the best balance of transport advantages.

16. In all options, problems of urban congestion in Cambridge require accessibility and ease of movement for cyclists and pedestrians.

17. CHUMMS (Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study) preferred plan of highway improvement is on-line widening of the A14. The Huntingdon Corridor/Oakington Option has been further tested using this preferred CHUMMS improvement plan. This additional modelling suggests that:

> There is no significant change in the impact on the housing pressure in Cambridge between the two CHUMMS improvement options.
>
> Employment growth in the new settlement and market towns is further encouraged by the preferred on-line widening plan.

The modal split of traffic entering Cambridge is more favourable towards high quality public transport.