TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURES) RULES 2004

INQUIRY INTO:

THE PROPOSED NETWORK RAIL (CAMBRIDGE SOUTH INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENTS) ORDER

REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

ON MATTERS RELATING TO TRANSPORT

Elliot Page, Director of Transport at Stantec, BA Hons, MCIHT, CMILT

ON BEHALF OF CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

Inquiry Document Reference	OBJ-6/W3/4
Author	Elliot Page
Date	18th January 2022

Contents

1 INTRODUCTION 2

2 STRATEGIC CASE FOR THE PROJECT NRE11.2 2

3 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT NRE2.2 3

4 CONCLUSION 6

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Elliot Page, and I am a Director of Transport at Stantec UK Limited (formerly Peter Brett Associates LLP). This rebuttal proof of evidence has been prepared in respect of transport matters and in response to evidence produced by Mr Lewis Wingfield (Strategic Case for the Project **NRE11.2**) and Mr Geoff Hilling (Traffic and Transport **NRE2.1 and NRE2.2**). However, where I have not addressed points made in the evidence produced by Network Rail ("**NR**") this should not be taken as my accedence to it. Further in the event that NR or, any of the objectors produces rebuttals or further evidence, I reserve the right to comment on this.

1.1 My qualifications and experience are as detailed in my proof of evidence (**OBJ-6/W3/2**). My evidence is given on behalf of Cambridge University Hospitals ("**CUH**") and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

2 STRATEGIC CASE FOR THE PROJECT NRE11.2

2.1 Paragraph 9.8.3 of Mr Lewis Wingfield's proof of evidence seeks to address CUH concerns over the use of MOIRA for forecasting demands for the Scheme. The clarifications are welcomed.

2.2 CUH does not object to the use of MOIRA and accept that it is a software package widely used in the rail industry. However, I have a specific concern around its use in combination with elements of the Atkins Transport Needs Study which appear to conflict. This concern has not been addressed and has been highlighted specifically in my main proof (see paragraph 6.5 *ff*).

2.3 Table 6.2 of the Transport Assessment suggests that 81% of trips to the station would be 'Destination Demand Return Trips' which means that in the morning peak around 81% of trips would likely be arrivals i.e. they are coming into the area via the station and then returning later in the day via the station. This assumption is based on the findings of the Transport Needs Study and has been used as part of the methodology used to calculate demand and distribution. However, Table 6.6 utilises MOIRA to disaggregate demand for peak hours and results in 337 trips arriving and 382 departing (47%/53%).

2.4 The consequences of the above are that if my concerns are correct then modelling demands (particularly pedestrian) may be underestimated in terms of their tidality.

2.5 Paragraph 9.8.4.8 confirms that LEGION modelling of the gate line has been undertaken. This is welcomed and is best practice. It is stated 'that the station can accommodate a far higher passenger number (than the OBC forecast) of a least 6.0m per year, contingent on a small change to the planned ticket gate line.' However, if my observations above are correct and that the tidality modelled may not reflect the 'Destination Demand Return Trips' nature of the station, then the LEGION modelling would need to be rerun to demonstrate that acceptable Levels of Service at the gate line are achieved.

3 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT NRE2.2

3.1 Paragraph 2.1.11 Mr Geoff Hilling's proof of evidence states that 'as part of ongoing design development, the station highway access has been moved to the south to accommodate the major junction modifications proposed as part of the CSET scheme at the Francis Crick Avenue/Guided Busway junction.'

3.2 This is shown in Figure 2.4 and is included in Appendix H3 (Proposed Station Access Layout) to his Proof. Whilst this amendment reflects a more coordinated approach with CSET it is not reflected in the Deemed Planning Drawings in support of the request for a planning direction (**NR13**). CUH requests clarity from NR as to the location of the access and is of the view it should be consulted in relation to this.

3.3 The revised access is now marked as a left-out junction meaning that traffic flows will assign differently to the network and requires traffic to U-turn at the Robinson Way roundabout to depart via the Addenbrookes Road. This reassignment has been captured in updated traffic modelling (Appendix H4) and this is welcomed.

3.4 Paragraph 2.1.7 confirms the precise split of cycle parking will be addressed through detailed design. This is welcomed and CUH requests that they are consulted during the detailed design of the forecourt.

3.5 Paragraph 8.1.9 states that 'The station access road off Francis Crick Avenue would be integrated within the existing signalised Francis Crick Avenue/CGB junction Method of Control (MOC). The access road would be provided directly south of the junction and would introduce a new junction arm with traffic signal modifications.' This statement is not consistent with the assertion in Paragraph 2.1.11 which states the access has been moved to the south which would also see the access become a 'priority junction' with Francis Crick Avenue and would no longer be part of the signal

plan of Francis Crick Avenue/ Robinson Way and the Cambridge Guided Busway. Clarification on this point would be welcomed.

3.6 Paragraph 9.1.29 states that 'Network Rail will continue to engage with the Trust to provide any necessary assurances it requires to protect blue light routes.' This is welcomed by CUH.

3.7 Paragraph 9.1.31 states that 'NR is determined to continue to liaise with CUH including on the operation of the ANPR system, to ensure that the Campus would not become a through route.' This is welcomed although the parameters for penalty notices do not appear to be fully appreciated by NR.

3.8 Paragraph 9.1.76 states that 'I have been advised that the ANPR cameras are set with timings of a journey where vehicles travelling straight through the Campus at 30 mph or more (the speed limit for the site is 20 mph) are issued with a ticket by Cambridgeshire Police. Vehicles stopping at the station to drop off or pick up passengers will therefore not generate a ticket'. My understanding is that this is incorrect.

3.9 As set out at paragraphs 3.22 and 3.23 of my main proof of evidence (**OBJ-6/W3/2**), and paragraph 6.6.3 of Carin Charlton's proof of evidence (**OBJ-6/W1/2**), vehicles are photographed as they enter and exit the campus, with times recorded to evidence drivers that are using the campus roads as a through route. I remain of the view that a significant number of drivers may, after picking up or dropping off passengers at the station, continue through the campus as a part of a through route to another destination. If the correct information as to the campus road restrictions is not adequately provided in and around the station, drivers may stay longer on the forecourt or in the campus in order to use the site as a through route but avoid receiving a penalty via the ANPR system. Such behaviours could result in more traffic using the campus network and have an adverse impact on CUH ability to carry out their business and the operation of the blue light routes.

3.10 Therefore, whilst CUH welcomes that no changes to the ANPR configurations are proposed, it requests a comprehensive information and signage strategy is provided to reinforce the objectives around the implementation of the ANPR system. The ANPR was required under the s106 agreement associated with planning permission 06/0796/OUT to prevent through traffic and to avoid a negative impact on the campus. Alongside the information and signage strategy the commitment to monitor and

manage driver behaviours on the forecourt (consistent with Page 140 of Appendix H1 to Geoff Hilling's proof of evidence) is welcomed.

3.11 Paragraph 9.1.39 states that NR and the Greater Cambridge Partnership are negotiating a protocol to manage the interfaces between the Scheme and CSET. This is welcomed but CUH wishes to be consulted on the protocol prior to agreement due to the interface with CUH operations and the implications for campus traffic.

3.12 Paragraph 9.1.42 states that the station forecourt has been designed to accommodate pedestrian and cycle movements to and from the station, including passengers interchanging with CSET. This is welcomed although the assessment work supporting this statement has not been provided.

3.13 Paragraph 1.1.9 of the Summary Transport proof (**NRE2.1**) states that a Stakeholder Group is to be established but this would be to 'co-ordinate construction planning and temporary traffic management for the CSIE Project, CSET, CUH and other construction activities on CBC'. This is welcomed and would address my previous comments on monitoring construction activities. However, as that group is limited to construction activities it does not address CUH concerns regarding the operational phase of the station, and therefore CUH maintains its request for NR/TOC to join and attend the existing Travel and Transport Group as discussed at paragraph 4.21 of my main proof of evidence (**OBJ-6/W3/2**).

3.14 Paragraphs 9.1.45 to 9.1.50 look to address CUH's concerns that pedestrian modelling has not been undertaken of the access and crossings in combination with other transport schemes. Paragraph 9.1.47 states that 'A Viswalk microsimulation has been undertaken to assess the impact of the additional pedestrian, cycle and public transport demands on the key crossing across the southern arm of the Francis Crick Avenue/Guided Busway junction.' This is welcomed although no supporting material or details of that modelling work has been provided. CUH would expect that the Viswalk model includes all crossings on this junction and seek confirmation on this point.

3.15 There are a number of references to the temporary Diversion of NCN11 for construction activities being not required. This is welcomed.

3.16 Appendix H1 to Geoff Hilling's proof of evidence, addresses comments raised by AECOM on behalf of Cambridge Medipark Limited. Page 140 of this Appendix states that a Monitor and Manage approach to the forecourt will be undertaken and will be the responsibility of the TOC. CUH welcomes this commitment.

3.17 Page 141 of Appendix H1 to Geoff Hilling's proof of evidence also states that issues around on-street car parking and the CBC car parks is addressed in the Transport Assessment. As set out in my main and summary proofs of evidence (**OBJ-6/W3/2** and **OBJ-6/W3/1**), car parking operates close to capacity and whilst staff car parking is managed through permits, visitor (including patients) parking is not controlled, and the opening of a new station has the potential to adversely impact the supply of CUH visitor spaces. Whilst the opening of the Scheme will result in the shift of some staff and visitor car trips to rail, the benefit of that shift, in terms of car parking capacity and its requirement to cater for planned growth, would be reduced if that capacity was then to be backfilled by users of the station.

4 CONCLUSION

4.1 The overall principle of Cambridge South Station is strongly supported by CUH. However, I remain of the view that the assurances and commitments sought as set out in paragraph 7.2 of my Proof of Evidence (**OBJ-6/W3/2**) are required to address the potential transport impacts of the proposed development.

4.2 I am satisfied that if these commitments are made, CUH will have confidence that unforeseen adverse impacts can be identified swiftly and mitigated accordingly.