

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992**

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURES) RULES 2004**

**NETWORK RAIL (CAMBRIDGE SOUTH INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENTS) ORDER**

**SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

**ON MATTERS OF TRANSPORT**

**GRAHAM HUGHES**

**ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE**

|                                   |                       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Inquiry Document Reference</b> | <b>[TBC]/ OBJ 8</b>   |
| <b>Author</b>                     | <b>Graham Hughes</b>  |
| <b>Date</b>                       | <b>6 January 2022</b> |

## Contents

|   |                                     |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | QUALIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE .....  | 2 |
| 2 | CONTEXT .....                       | 2 |
| 3 | SCOPE OF EVIDENCE .....             | 2 |
| 4 | THE UNIVERSITY'S CONCERNS .....     | 2 |
| 5 | DISCUSSIONS WITH NETWORK RAIL ..... | 4 |
| 6 | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....       | 4 |

## **1 QUALIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE**

- 1.1 My qualifications and experience are set out in Section 1 of my main Proof of Evidence. I hold a BA (Hons) degree in Geography/Economics, an MSc in Transport Planning and Economics, and a Diploma in Town Planning. I am a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport.
- 1.2 I have 33 years' experience working in both consultancy and Local Government, all working on highways and transport issues.

## **2 CONTEXT**

- 2.1 The University's interest which is the subject of this proof, is the Anne McLaren Building ("AMB") and its associated car parking, and an area of undeveloped land referred to as Plot 9.
- 2.2 The AMB and Plot 9 are adjacent to each other, and both are accessed from Francis Crick Avenue to the east. Both are bounded to the west by the Cambridge to London Rail line on which the new Cambridge South Station is proposed.
- 2.3 Francis Crick Avenue provides links Long Road to Hauxton Road. Both are adopted highways and lie to the north and southwest of the AMB respectively. The Cambridge to London rail line is a high-capacity line currently consisting of two tracks services running in excess of 18 hours per day.

## **3 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 3.1 My proof covers the highways and transport aspects of the proposed Scheme. It considers the current proposals from Network Rail for haul roads and access to construction sites for the proposed new station and the adequacy of the information presented by Network Rail to date.

## **4 THE UNIVERSITY'S CONCERNS**

- 4.1 Network Rail's Environmental Statement ("ES") indicates that track works and the station building works will be on both sides of the existing rail line and so compounds and haul roads will be on both sides of the existing track. This means that during the construction phase, works and access which will cause noise and vibration will be in close proximity to the AMB and Plot 9.

- 4.2 Paragraphs 17.4.3 – 17.4.24 of the ES outline the proposed approach to assessing construction impacts and mitigation based upon the proposed locations of haul roads and site compounds. This contains measures for managing the impacts during construction as a result of construction activities. In reality, the mitigation measures amount to no more than good practice and what would be adopted on any major construction site to manage impacts.
- 4.3 In my view, there is no meaningful discussion in the ES of alternatives (to the proposed access roads, haul roads and construction compounds) that have been considered and alternative forms of mitigation that could be adopted beyond good operational practice for responsible contractors to minimise impacts. I would have expected the following elements to have been assessed in the ES given the highly sensitive nature of the AMB:
- 4.3.1 identification of any alternatives that had been considered for the proposed access roads, haul roads and construction compounds;
  - 4.3.2 consideration of any further mitigation that could be applied to reduce the noise and vibration impacts to acceptable levels on key receptors such as the AMB. In particular, details of how any assessed impacts in terms of noise and vibration can be guaranteed to be maintained so the University can have confidence that the impacts will not change and potentially become unacceptable throughout the period of the construction. In this regard, I would expect to see full details of how the haul roads and construction compounds will be constructed including materials used and any measures in the construction methodology to reduce impacts and how they will be maintained;
  - 4.3.3 for the wider access network, I would expect Network Rail to identify the extent of the area where construction vehicles could cause noise and vibration impacts on the AMB, and to survey the state of the roads in that area to create a baseline condition survey. Any significant defects should, following agreement with the University, be repaired at that point. I would also expect Network Rail to prepare a monitoring regime to show how they will regularly check the ongoing state of that wider access network and how any defects will be corrected. I would expect the University to have to agree any works before they are completed;

- 4.3.4 a detailed construction management plan that explains the types of vehicles that will be accessing the site, their weight, times of arrival and routing and measures that will be taken to encourage use of smaller rather than larger vehicles.
- 4.4 Operational impacts are also included in the ES, but these are significantly less than the construction phase given that, in the short term at least, the number of train services will not increase significantly and the majority of access to the station will be by sustainable modes. It is also assumed that by the operational phase, temporary site compound land will have been returned to the landowners although confirmation of this is required from Network Rail to allay the University's concerns.

## **5 DISCUSSIONS WITH NETWORK RAIL**

- 5.1 At the time of writing this summary, no direct discussions have taken place on construction impacts and access issues with Network Rail. Accordingly, the objections contained herein have not been discussed and potential resolutions have not been put forward by Network Rail although I am aware that discussions have been held with other members of the University team and that these have touched on transport.
- 5.2 Had more detailed discussions taken place with the Network Rail team as requested, to move towards resolving the University's objections, I would have been looking for commitments to a Construction Management Plan that demonstrated when and how the haul roads and construction site compounds will be used and details of a monitoring and management regime for the wider access roads, haul roads and construction compounds. A level of detail that could satisfy the University on this has yet to be provided.

## **6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 6.1 In summary, the ES has not adequately addressed the University's concerns in relation to how the access roads, haul roads and construction compounds will be maintained and operated throughout the construction period.
- 6.2 Given the likely impacts on the AMB, the ES should have considered:
- alternative locations for the haul roads and site compounds and thus demonstrated why those chosen are the most appropriate;

- a detailed construction management plan and a monitoring and management regime for the wider access roads, haul roads and construction compounds to ensure noise and vibration impacts are minimised and kept within acceptable limits.

6.3 These points have not been considered in the Environmental Assessment and in my opinion, they should have been. Until they are adequately addressed, the University maintains its objection to the proposals.

**Graham Peter Hughes BA (Hons) MSc PGDip FCIHT**  
**Stantec**