



A Company Limited by Guarantee. Company Number 6729377. Registered in England.
Registered Office: Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF.
www.trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org
Contact: davidplank@hotmail.com

Cambridge South Station – Application by Network Rail for “The Network Rail (Cambridge South Infrastructure Enhancements) Order 202[X]”, June 2021

OBJECTION

Contents

Heading	Page
Introduction	3
Grounds of Objection:	3-15
Purpose of the station	3
Adverse Effects on Hobson’s Park:	4-13
- Temporary Adverse Effects on Hobson’s Park	5
- Permanent Adverse Effects on Hobson’s Park:	6
➤ Proposed shared use path to the western station building:	7
A. The part of the path from the Cambridge Guided Busway to the embankment to Addenbrooke’s Bridge	7
B. The part of the path from the embankment to Addenbrooke’s Bridge to the western station building	7
➤ Proposed pedestrian access to the western station building	8
➤ Cycle parking at the western station building	10
➤ Electricity sub-station and rail systems enclosure	11
➤ Maintenance track within the western boundary of Hobson’s Park	12

➤ Compensation for loss of Hobson's Park land – "Exchange land"	13
Adverse Effect on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve	14
Transport Context – Highways and Public Transport	14
An additional comment	15

OBJECTION

Introduction

Trumpington Residents' Association ("the Association") recognizes the need for a station to serve the growing travel needs of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) and achieve necessary modal shift from undue reliance on the private car which congests Trumpington's roads causing harm through pollution, delay to the bus service and unwanted commuter parking in residential areas. The Association's Objection is not to the station itself but to specific aspects of the proposed development which require modification or mitigation. Our grounds and proposed remedies are set out below.

GROUND'S OF OBJECTION

Purpose of the station

From its inception the station's primary purpose has been to serve the growing travel needs of the CBC. As stated to the Association in 2016, the station is -

"... primarily intended for those travelling to the Biomedical Campus, be that patients, visitors or people working on the site. However, people wishing to catch trains will be able to do so, but they will only be able to do so on foot, bus, or by bike as we are not proposing to provide any general car parking."

[Email to the Association of 6th June 2016 from Cambridgeshire County Council's Service Director Strategy and Development.]

This assurance has been repeated to us at various times, for example, "The type of station remains unchanged", and "basic principle of an essentially non-car station continues".

[Emails of 28 & 29th April 2017]

It is on this basis, and this basis alone, that the Association supports the proposed station. It is primarily a destination not an origin station which supports the permitted development of the Biomedical Campus while restraining and diminishing growing traffic on Trumpington's roads. This essential principle would be eroded to the detriment of Trumpington and neighbouring areas, should it stray from this purpose towards becoming an origin station which would draw yet more traffic on to our congested roads.

Despite our representations in the public consultations to date, Network Rail's application continues to cause concern that unacceptable mission drift is likely to occur. [TRA responses to consultation: 28 February 2020, pages 1&2, and 23 November 2020, pages 1&2] For instance, the Design and access Statement emphasizes that in addition to serving the Campus:

"The station will provide direct access to potential routes on the rail network for those in South Cambridgeshire, as well as better connections across the southern fringe of the city." (Our emphasis) [Design and Access Statement, Executive Summary, page v]

"... (Department for Transport) ... objectives that the proposed Development is to achieve: ...

- Reduce reliance on central Cambridge transport infrastructure (which we understand to mean Cambridge Station); and
- Be capable of integrating with and enhancing the opportunities presented by Thameslink and East West Rail to support development of the Biomedical Campus as part of the Golden Triangle life sciences cluster."

[Design & Access Statement, paragraph 1.5.4, page 2]

What was originally described to us as "a halt" for the Campus, is in danger of getting out of hand, with the inherent risk not only of it becoming an origin station attracting inward commuting from South Cambridgeshire to travel elsewhere but also of relieving the pressure on Cambridge Station itself by becoming a significant interchange station. **We strongly object** to these anticipated departures from the station's original and proper purpose with all the risks they would entail were they to be agreed, including demand in the future for yet more appropriation of land from Hobson's Park as the station's facilities became overstretched.

We ask that the Order and Deemed Planning Permission, if granted, should be **on condition** that the station's purpose is restricted primarily to serving the travel needs of the staff, patients and visitors to the health and life sciences organizations located on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, with a secondary benefit to **local** residents accessed only by public transport/active travel except for people with mobility difficulties unable to use public transport, walk or cycle to get to the station. **We also ask** that the Order includes **a further condition** that no additional demands on land in Hobson's Park or other parts of the "strategic green corridor that extends from the Chalk Hills to Long Road along the Vicar's Brook/Hobson's Brook corridor", which also includes Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, will be countenanced without prior public consultation followed by application for a new TWA Order and Deemed Planning Permission. [Cambridge City Local Plan 2018, Policy 18, page 71]

Adverse Effects on Hobson's Park

The Association **strongly objects** to aspects of the application which, if granted, would harm key parts of the "River Corridor - Hobson's Brook/Vicar's Brook" which "runs approximately north-south for three kilometres and includes Empty Common and the Botanic Garden. The first stream to flow into the River Cam above Cambridge is Vicar's Brook." It is "a defining Character of Cambridge." [Landscape Character Assessment, 2003, 3.1.5, pages 28 & 41-43, which has been adopted as a material planning consideration; and Cambridge Local Plan

2018, Policy 4, Green Belt, pages 28-30] This Corridor includes Hobson's Park - and Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve which is addressed distinctly below.

It is important to note that Hobson's Park with its bird reserve and essential link in the Vicar's Brook/Hobson's Brook "wildlife corridor", was created in mitigation of the substantial land taken out of the Green Belt in the 2006 Local Plan to provide for growth in the substantial Clay Farm, Glebe Farm and Bell School/Ninewells developments - matched elsewhere in the Cambridge Southern Fringe by the Trumpington Meadows Country Park relating to the Trumpington Meadows development. Consequently, there is **very strong feeling** amongst residents against diminution of that mitigation – either temporary or permanent - to meet the Cambridge Biomedical Campus's growth needs. This feeling is firmly supported by key provisions in the 2018 Local Plan:

"Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt

... 2.51 The Green Belt preserves the unique setting and special character of the city and includes green corridors that penetrate deep into the urban and historic heart of Cambridge ... The Green Belt is one of the key elements that contribute to the symbiotic relationship between high quality of life, place and economic success of Cambridge...

2.53 Significant land was taken out of the Cambridge Green Belt in the 2006 Local Plan... (and) allocated as part of the growth strategy, which involved the delivery of urban extensions and enhancement of corridors and edges of the remaining Green Belt. Meeting the need for growth, these sites are now being delivered...

2.54... the remaining areas of Green Belt have increased in value as they are now closer to the city's edge and less Green Belt land remains to perform the unique roles played by the Cambridge Green Belt... (which) is a critical asset for Cambridge in forming the important setting for a compact, historic city and contributing to the high quality of life and place enjoyed here."

[Cambridge Local Plan 2018, pages 28 & 29]

It is in this context that Network Rail's application must be assessed.

Temporary Adverse Effects on Hobson's Park

It is unacceptable that Network Rail's application, if granted, would remove from public use for upwards of two years 35 per cent of Hobson's Park for construction purposes.

[Public Open Space Assessment, paragraph 5.1.3, Figure 2, & paragraph 5.1.6]

The Association has consistently argued that the proposed size of the western station building construction compound is excessive and should be reduced significantly, as should the extent of the proposed temporary construction area, the vast majority of which is inappropriately proposed on the western side of the railway in Hobson's Park. [TRA

Responses to Network Rail consultations 28 February (page 9), 31 August (pages 5-6) and 6 October 2020 (pages 1-2)] But to no avail to date as the "Station Compound CC3" proposed on the western side of the railway remains unchanged and much larger than the "Temporary Site Compound for Station Work, CC6" proposed on the eastern side where the main station building is to be located. Similarly, no reduction has been made in the excessive temporary construction area proposed on the western side of the railway in Hobson's Park. **We object strongly** to this.

In response to our representations, Network Rail says there is not sufficient land on the eastern side of the railway to increase the size of the eastern building construction compound and provide for the temporary storage of excavated material. It says –

"Land parcels on the Campus on either side of Francis Crick Avenue have been explored for temporary use, *but it has not been possible to secure the use of these as temporary construction compounds.*" (Our emphasis) [Network Rail letter 11 January 2021, sixth page]

In other words, there *is* sufficient land on the eastern side but not the will on Network Rail's part to insist by means of compulsory purchase or otherwise that it should be provided in support of the station's construction by the organizations on the Biomedical Campus. While Network Rail is willing to compulsorily appropriate land from Hobson's Park, which is adversely affected by the proposed station, it is not willing to compulsorily acquire land from organizations on the Campus for whose benefit the station is to be built. **We object strongly** to this and to its de facto statement by Network Rail that Hobson's Park land is of lesser value than land in the Biomedical Campus – and that because it is public open space it is freer for construction use than Campus land notwithstanding the large disbenefit to the public it would entail for a significant period of time. **This is not acceptable.** The Park's status in the Local Plan described above and in the affections of residents, should give it much greater protection than Network Rail proposes.

We ask that the temporary land acquisition proposed in Hobson's Park is significantly reduced through a large reduction in the size of the western station building construction compound and in the temporary construction area. This would be consistent with the spirit of the Environmental Statement, reduce the need for the extensive "Area-specific mitigation" envisaged by Network Rail and reduce the extent now proposed of mature trees and shrubs having to be removed, including trees planted by pupils of Fawcett School nine years ago. [Environmental Statement, Landscape & Visual, 13.4 Design & mitigation, pages 13-42 & 13-43]

Permanent Adverse Effects on Hobson's Park

Despite its location alongside the railway, Hobson's Park is a tranquil place much used by families and individuals for quiet recreation, tending the allotments and observation of the flourishing bird reserve. Cycling in the park is limited and unobtrusive, making this one of

the few areas where pedestrians dominate and do not feel the need to watch out for their safety. The Association wishes this much valued quality and the overall integrity of Hobson's Park to be retained. **We object to the following permanent features** of Network Rail's application which put this at risk.

Proposed shared use path to the western station building:

A. The part of the path from the Cambridge Guided Busway to Addenbrooke's Bridge embankment

We object strongly to the alignment proposed by Network Rail for this part of the proposed shared cycle/pedestrian path from the Cambridge Guided Busway to the western station building. [Design and Access Statement, Movement & Access, pages 21, 32, & Appendix B, Parameter Plans. Also, Drawings 158454-ARC-ZZ-ZZ-DRG-LEP-000052 & 000100] This is due to its excessive and unnecessary intrusion into the Park - and the Park land it would consequently remove from public use through its creation of a barren and inaccessible strip between the existing shared use path from the Guided Busway to Addenbrooke's Bridge embankment and the proposed new shared use path. [See Drawing 000052 in particular] In addition, as the proposed path would be lit as well as the existing guided busway path, it would unnecessarily increase light pollution in a biodiversity sensitive location when a more environmentally sustainable solution is to expand the existing busway path thus allowing use of its existing lighting. [Design & Access Statement, Lighting, paragraph 6.6.2, page 43]

We propose that the existing shared use path from the Cambridge Guided Busway to the beginning of Addenbrooke's Bridge embankment is widened to provide necessary capacity at peak times, branching off to the western station building shortly before the ascent to Addenbrooke's Bridge. This proposal has been made to Network Rail a number of times but has not been taken up for reasons which have not been explained adequately. We have been told that a statutory consultee is "not supportive" of it but despite repeated requests, have not been told which statutory consultee has objected, to what and for what reason.

This is unsatisfactory. [Network Rail letters 11 January 2021, second page, and 20 April 2021, first and second pages – in response to the Association's letters of 23 November 2020 & 21 January 2021, and Email of 23 April 2021]

B. The part of the path from Addenbrooke's Bridge embankment to the western station building

Of the two alternatives the Association proposed to Network Rail for this part of the proposed path during public consultation, **we prefer** it to run from the Addenbrooke's Bridge embankment along the northern edge of North Ditch, thereby significantly reducing its intrusion into Hobson's Park and avoiding any loss of existing trees and shrubs in the north east corner of the site. However, **we note** Network Rail's reasons for not choosing this option:

(It would) “result in a greater degree of culverting of North Ditch... require the creation of an adversely steep-sided, heavily engineered embankment to the North Ditch... and probably lead to a greater number of people attempting to traverse the slope of current busway embankment, and create a worn desire line...” [Network Rail letter 20 April 2021, pages 1-2]

This is **not entirely convincing** to us, as a visual representation of what it would look like has not been shared, nor has information been given on any adverse effect on North Ditch as a result of the greater degree of culverting. **We ask** that Network Rail produces to the public inquiry a visual representation of this option together with information on the effects of additional culverting to North Ditch, and provides this to the Association and others so that a fully informed assessment can be made.

We are pleased to note that in response to our second alternative, Network Rail’s detailed design modifies its original proposal for this part of the path, taking it closer to the southern edge of North Ditch than originally proposed - thus reducing the extent of well-established trees and shrubs needing to be permanently removed. [Network Rail Public Consultation Document, October 2020, Artist’s impression, page 5] While pleasing, this is also puzzling as Network Rail’s most recent response to our representations stated:

“We have considered your proposal ‘South of North Ditch’ and have discussed this option with the relevant local authorities who are not supportive of this option.”
[Network Rail letter 20 April 2021, second page]

No further explanation was given in response to our subsequent request to which there has not been a reply. [TRA Email 23 April 2021] **We ask** that Network Rail clarifies this statement - and to ensure necessary transparency identifies the statutory consultees who said they were not supportive of this option together with their reasons.

Proposed pedestrian access to the western station building

We object to Network Rail’s proposed use of an existing pedestrian path through the heart of Hobson’s Park to provide access for “its users” to the western station building due to inadequate provision being made to prevent the path’s misuse by cyclists. We support good pedestrian access to the western side of the station using this path as well as the proposed shared path to the north of it, but **do not accept** Network Rail’s unwillingness to ensure measures are taken to prevent cyclists using the existing path as a shortcut through the Park, which would be unacceptably intrusive – and unnecessary when a good cycle path would be available nearby. [Design & Access Statement, Access, paragraph 5.2.15, seventh bullet, pages 32-33; Drawings 158454-ARC-ZZ-ZZ-DRG-LEP-000052 & 000051, southernmost path, “Existing path regraded and resurfaced to provide level access to station concourse”]

The Association’s most recent representation to Network Rail on this matter was:

"... As our consultation response said, the proposal to "raise and realign it to level access across the station forecourt ... would be a perverse incentive to cyclists to use the path". [Page 3 of our consultation response] We see a case for pedestrians being able to use the path to access the station. The issue then has to be addressed of how best to stop cyclists using it with the resultant intrusion into the Park and damage to the path's surface. We agree that steps to the station forecourt should be avoided to facilitate use by all pedestrians, but measures must be taken at the same time to prevent or discourage use of the path by cyclists. NR says that "Hobson's Park is a public space over which Network Rail has no control." [Your third page] But NR's proposal has implications for the Park for which NR does have responsibility. Therefore, **we ask** NR to address the issue of how best to prevent use of the path by cyclists in its further work and discuss a solution with us before making a decision." [TRA letter to Network Rail, 21 January 2021, pages 2-3]

Network Rail's most recent response was:

"We maintain our position for the need to realign this section of path as we anticipate that some pedestrians will approach the station from the south west. At detailed design stage we will consider further how to mitigate any perceived damage to the path's surface by cyclists that you mention." [Network Rail letter, 20 April 2021]

Network Rail's response **misses our point**. The Association has no quarrel with the raising and realignment of this section of the pedestrian path to assist pedestrian access to the western station building, nor do we want the path to be resurfaced – precisely the opposite. This was made clear in our reply to this letter to which there has not been a response. [TRA Email to Network Rail, 23 April 2021]

Network Rail's application does not address this important point. It is essential that the detailed design of the raising/realignment of the path incorporates measures to deter its use by cyclists as a shortcut to the cycle parking at the western station building. Unless this action is taken, the realigned path would represent a significant and unnecessary risk to the tranquillity of the park and to its passive recreational users. **We ask that the Order includes a specific condition requiring action to prevent misuse of this path by cyclists to access the western station building. We also ask that no action** is taken to make the surface of the path more suitable for cyclists which would be perverse; it is a passive recreation path for pedestrians and should be resurfaced as such. The application does not propose that this path should be lit - which we support, as lighting would be an unacceptable intrusion and harmful to the Park's biodiversity. For the avoidance of doubt, **we ask** that the path should **not** be lit.

Cycle parking at the western station building

The Association **strongly objects** to the proposal to provide 500 of the 1,000 total cycle spaces, including obtrusive two-tier racks, plus up to 50 spaces for gauge cycles, at the western station building. [Design & Access Statement, Figure 4.2, Access and movement masterplan, page 25; and Network Rail letter 11 January 2021, fourth page] This is an **unwarranted intrusion** into Hobson's Park - and would encourage cyclists to misuse the Park's existing passive recreation paths rather than sticking to the dedicated cycle paths, thereby disrupting the tranquil space to which we attach great value. As the Association said in our response to the second public consultation:

"The Association has consistently argued that "The main cycle access points should be on the east side of the railway accessed from Francis Crick Avenue". [TRA Response to Consultation, 28.02.20, page 5] This is consistent with our position that the eastern station building should be the main part of the station to suit its prime purpose to serve the Biomedical Campus; and to minimize harm to Hobson's Park, which it should be recalled is provided in compensation to the community for the loss of amenity arising from the Southern Fringe developments, it being unconscionable that this community compensation should be eroded in the interests of more development. Therefore, we are opposed to the suggested 50:50 split of the proposed 1,000 cycle parking spaces between the east and western station buildings, and ask that a significantly lower number than 500 is provided at the station's western building thus restricting the land take and reducing the demands of cyclists on the Park." [TRA 23 November 2020 letter in response to Network Rail consultation, page 4: See also TRA Consultation Response 31.08.2020, page 4]

The intrusive nature of the proposed cycle parking is shown in Drawing 158454-ARC-ZZ-ZZ-DRG-LEP-000081, and in Figure 5-11 of the Design & Access statement, "Example of a landscaped cycle parking canopy with controlled lighting". [page 35] A structure of this nature is **entirely unacceptable** in Hobson's Park. It is notable that the Design & Access Statement's observation that the "Hobson's Park Entrance" to the station "aim(s) to sit discreetly in the corner of the Park" makes no reference to the appearance of the cycle parking about which there is nothing that is "discreet". [paragraph 6.4.3, page 41]

Network Rail's response to our rejection of this proposal notes that:

"Our draft Transport Assessment predicts that around a quarter of the station users would come from residential areas to the west and three quarters from the east. However, more cycle users are anticipated from the west. We are restricted by the amount of space available on the east - the southern embankment of the Guided Busway bridge will need to be modified to provide space for cycle parking. The 'split' will be reviewed as the design develops at the next stage. Land on the east side of Francis Crick Avenue is committed for development by others and is not available to us." [Network Rail letter 11 January 2021]

This response is **not acceptable** in two regards. First, the assessment that more cycle users may come from the west than the east is solely a transport judgement which does not give due weight to the value and importance of Hobson's Park to the local community and the disruption which significant cycle movement through the Park would produce. Second, it is argued that because land on the eastern side of the railway "is committed for development by others", this somehow trumps any case made for protection of Hobson's Park. This is **unacceptable**. It reflects and underlines the point made above about the relative lack of value which Network Rail's application in practice attaches to Hobson's Park land – in contradiction to the requirements of the Local Plan. [Page 6 of this letter]

We ask that the number of cycle spaces to be provided at the western station building be reduced to 300 or less plus 20 spaces for gauge bicycles, and that two tier racks should be avoided to protect Hobson's Park's valued environment.

Electricity sub-station and rail systems enclosure

The Association **strongly objects** to the proposed location of an electricity sub-station and rail systems enclosure/compound in the southern part of Hobson's Park south of Nine Wells Bridge in an unduly visible position when viable alternatives exist. [Design & Access Statement, paragraph 5.1.3 & Figure 5-1, page 31; and Drawing 158454-ARC-00-ZZ-DRG-EEN-000076]

In response to Network Rail's October 2020 public consultation, we made the following comments:

"Despite the intended screening this would intrude unacceptably on the view towards White Hill, destroy the existing tree plantation, harm the significant biodiversity which currently exists, and place an unacceptable use immediately next to Hobson's Brook.

The area is populated by hares which, as explained in our earlier comments, is a rapidly diminishing species due primarily to intensive agricultural methods. [See the Association's comments on the scoping of the Environmental Impact Assessment dated 31 August 2020, page 6] It is important that harm to this population is kept to a minimum. This stretch of Hobson's Brook with its overhanging bushes/rushes provides cover for coots - and for herons to fish.

Despite its location between Nine Wells Bridge and the railway line, this is a tranquil spot which is not suited to and would be **unacceptably harmed** by the proposed location of this facility. We **ask** that an alternative, less harmful location is found for it... Less harmful locations than the current proposal under or in the immediate vicinity of Nine Wells Bridge do exist which would not be costly, and should be assessed. A further alternative for the transformer sub-station alone could be on the east side of the railway adjacent to Nine Wells Bridge embankment, in an area between the embankment and the new CSET busway screened by the Greater Cambridge Partnership's proposed landscape woodland. We are willing to share our

local knowledge of these or other options. [TRA Consultation Response letter of 23 November 2020]

Network Rail's subsequent answers to this point **fail to address adequately** our alternative proposal that these facilities be located "under or in the immediate vicinity of Nine Wells Bridge":

"We have explained the need for permanent infrastructure on the west side (of the railway) ...Hares are not protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and therefore do not warrant specific mitigation under that legislation. They are a priority species under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act and therefore will be considered in our EIA..." [Network Rail letter 11 January 2021, fifth page]

"We have carefully considered alternative options for the proposed location of the power supply point and maintain our position that the option proposed is the correct solution... We will provide a further 10m clearance around the enclosure to allow for landscape planting to provide some level of screening... Our design is now frozen ahead of our application for a Transport and works act Order." [Network Rail letter of 20 April 2021, third page]

At no point has it been explained to the Association why the proposed location is "the correct solution" and is preferred to the alternative location we have proposed so that we may assess the conclusion reached. This is **not satisfactory**.

We ask that Network Rail's proposal that an electricity sub-station and railway systems enclosure be located as shown in Drawing 158454-ARC-00-ZZ-DRG-EEN-000076 is **rejected** and a suitable alternative location "under or in the immediate vicinity of Nine Wells Bridge" be identified for either or both elements. We appreciate the effort Network Rail has made to screen the two rail facilities with landscaping - but this is a strategically important view from Trumpington towards White Hill which forms the first part of the Gog Magog Hills stretching away from Cambridge city edge towards Magog Down, Wandlebury and beyond. A less obtrusive location should be identified to leave this view undisturbed.

Maintenance track within the western boundary of Hobson's Park

Network Rail's application claims that there are:

"... dedicated maintenance/emergency vehicle tracks... along the eastern *and* western edges of the (Hobson's) Park. Both tracks are accessed off the public highway from Addenbrooke's Road...The *western maintenance path* heads northwards along Hobson's Brook before turning east and parallel with the Cambridge Guided Busway spur into the Cambridge Biomedical Campus until it reaches the site of the proposed station." (Our emphasis) [Design & Access Statement, pages 9-10, Figures 2-7 & 4-2 on pages 10&25; and Drawing 158454-ARC-ZZ-ZZ-DRG-LEP-000041]

*There is **not** an existing western maintenance/emergency vehicle track within Hobsons Park, nor was one included in any of Network Rail's public consultations. The Association **objects strongly** to the creation of a western maintenance/emergency vehicle track as an unwarranted intrusion into and loss of Park land. There used to be a temporary construction haul road in this location on the eastern side of Hobson's Brook from Addenbrooke's Road to the old haul / farm bridge across the Brook opposite Pinnington Close and the new Clay Farm Community Garden. But this was removed by Countryside Properties when its construction purpose was complete. It is now awaiting full restoration as Hobson's Park land, and is not available for the purpose Network Rail has in mind. There is also an informal pedestrian path of cut grass from the old haul bridge to the Guided Busway, which is also on the eastern side of Hobson's Brook; and another informal cut grass path from the Busway entrance to the Park to North Ditch, but these are not maintenance tracks nor should they be. Network Rail has not explained why a western track is thought necessary. **We ask that the mooted western maintenance track is removed from the application and excluded from the Order.***

Compensation for loss of Hobson's Park land – "Exchange land"

We strongly support the compensation proposed by Network Rail for the permanent loss of 20,349m² of land from Hobson's Park and 303m² from the grounds of Long Road Sixth Form College in the appropriate form of a 20,842m² extension to the southern part of Hobson's Park. As well as providing access to this space, the proposed "private accommodation bridge crossing Hobson's Conduit" is intended also "to facilitate the closure of ... (the Duke's and Websters) level crossings" which at present provide access for the maintenance of certain rail infrastructure. [Public Open Space Assessment, pages 1-3 & 5; Design & Access Statement, Fig 4.3, page 26, and paragraphs 5.1.2 & 5.3.5, pages 31 & 34; and Drawings 158454-ARC-00-ZZ-DRG-EEN-000076 & 000041]

We ask that the "Potential future footbridge" shown at the eastern end of the exchange land is provided by Network Rail as part of the development and that this is **made a condition** of the Order and deemed planning permission. Without the additional footbridge the exchange land would be a cul-de-sac with one access only. This would not best facilitate the passive recreational use of the exchange land and would be a safety hazard in an isolated area at risk of anti-social behaviour.

Network Rail also **needs to make clear** how maintenance vehicles and personnel would access the railway infrastructure presently served by the two level crossings, using the proposed accommodation bridge and exchange land. Would the proposed field access at the southern edge of the exchange land be used for this purpose, so that maintenance vehicles would only cross the exchange land from the accommodation bridge to the field access? We assume this is the case and ask for reason of clarity.

Adverse Effect on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve

We **strongly object** to the adverse impact on and risk to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve during construction of the station when it would most definitely not be the case that –

“The setting of Nine Wells local nature reserve, its listed monument, and the Scheduled (site of White Hill Farm) monument are preserved.” [Design & Access Statement, paragraph 3.4.14, page 22]

Despite our strong representations in the public consultations, Network Rail is still proposing to locate the station's main construction compound (CC1) at “a minimum” of only 30 metres from the Reserve. As National Cycle Network Route 11 is to be temporarily diverted around the perimeter of the compound during construction of the station, the minimum distance may be even less. **This is not acceptable**. The Reserve is a fragile environment surrounded by potential risks including not only the proposed station but also the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambridge South East Transport Scheme whose dedicated busway and active travel path are to be constructed at the same time between the railway line and the Reserve. [TRA public consultation response letter 13 November 2020, page 10, and letter to Network Rail, 21 January 2021]

Network Rail's responses to date do not alleviate our strong concern. [Network Rail's letters of 11 January 2021, tenth page, and 20 April 2021, fourth page] We were assured in Network Rail's responses that –

“... proposals to protect Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve will be detailed within the Code of Practice that will form part of an appendix to the Environmental Statement within the Transport and Works Act Order application. You will have access to this documentation during the “Order Period” in order that you may comment further.” [20 April 2021 letter]

There is no reference to protection of the Local Nature Reserve in “Code of Construction Practice – Part A”, and Part B, which is referred to on page 2 of Part A, has not been found on Network Rail's website. It would be **unsafe** to proceed without robust measures in place.

We ask that the minimum amount of land between station construction compound CC1 and Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve **is increased significantly** to reduce this unacceptable level of risk; **and that a condition** is attached to the granting of the Order and deemed planning permission requiring Network Rail to include necessary provisions in the Code of Construction Practice that are satisfactory to Cambridge City Council and the Hobson's Conduit Trust as the responsible bodies.

Transport Context - Highways and Public Transport

The new station needs to have a good bus service to ensure it is accessible to all. But the application does not include measures to overcome the deficiency in this regard evident

from the Association's involvement with the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambridge South East Transport Scheme (CSET). At present it is proposed that there will be only one stop on Francis Crick Avenue for ordinary buses – and that this will be on the southbound not the northbound carriageway where the station will be located. Nor is there any guarantee that the dedicated CSET guided busway stops on Francis Crick Avenue will be available for use by ordinary bus services. **We object** to this unsatisfactory situation **and ask that the Order includes a condition** that adequate bus stops are made available on both carriageways of Francis Crick Avenue to serve passengers wishing to enter or exit the new station. [Design & Access Statement, 2.3 Transport Context, page 8, Public transport & Highways, page 9, and Access, paragraph 5.2.8, page 32]

An additional comment

It is **irritating** to local residents to see occasional references in the application to "Great Kneighton". This is a Countryside Properties' marketing concept without local lineage or respect. We are Trumpington and proud of it, and **ask** that we are addressed as such. [For example, Design & Access Statement, paragraph 2.4.4, page 13] **We ask** that in future documentation all references to "Great Kneighton" are replaced with "Trumpington".

Prepared by David Plank

For Trumpington Residents' Association

30 July 2021