To: Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR

July 2021

Network Rail (Cambridge South Infrastructure Enhancements) Order

I support the provision of a new station at Cambridge South, and recognise that there will be some disruption during construction.

But I object to the methodology and conclusions of the Public Open Space Assessment (Document NR19). The assessment of potential areas of exchange land (Appendix 1 of Document NR19) is flawed in two fundamental respects.

Firstly, the assessment is based on the assumption that all access to Hobson's Park is from the west side, and fails to consider access from east of the railway. Significant numbers of workers at and visitors to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (M15 in figure 2) use Hobson's Park, also residents of the Ninewells Estate (R42d in figure 2). Furthermore, users from the east side of the railway will be severely impacted by the construction of the proposed station, including complete loss of the access route via the "zig zag path" from the Ninewells Bridge during construction, and permanent loss of the recreational land nearest the railway that they use the most. The access track adjacent to the railway line (part of PL1 at figure 3) is popular with walkers and runners from the east side of the railway, contrary to the assertion in paragraph 5.1.32 in the summary of operational effects part of NR19. On the other hand, only a few park users from the west side are impacted, and only if they venture all the way to the railway. For park users from east of the railway, the land at EL4 is feeble compensation for the loss of the land on the eastern edge of the existing park, whereas the land at EL2 is closest to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and no further away than the "zig zag path" at the south end of the existing park.

Secondly, the assessment takes no account of the value of time. Exchange land that can be made available during construction is clearly preferable to exchange land that only becomes available once construction is completed. In this respect the land at EL2 is clearly preferable to the land at EL4 because adaptation of EL2 for recreational use can begin immediately that the land is acquired, whereas EL4 will be affected by construction access requirements.

It is clear that, once these two fundamental methodological flaws are eradicated, then the exchange land at EL2 is the optimal solution, not the land at EL4, as shown in this alternative version of Table C below.

MARK CHAPLIN

Revised Table C Exchange Land Assessment

EL number	Quantity	Quality	Access	Time	Total
EL1	4	2	1W 3E = 2	1	9
EL2	5	2	1W 3E = 2	3	12
EL3	5	2	1W 1E = 1	3	11
EL4	5	2	3W 1E = 2	1	10

Once the east side requirement is considered EL4 scores 2 instead of 3 for quality, and there is nothing to choose between the sites on this criterion. Accessibility is an average of separate scores for eastern and western access, with EL4 western access reduced to 3 as it is clearly not an enhancement on the current situation.