

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

INQ

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990

TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2004

THE PROPOSED NETWORK RAIL  
(CAMBRIDGE SOUTH INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENTS) ORDER

---

NOTE 5  
RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS

---

1. This Note summarises the Representations received for the CSIE Project and, where relevant, Network Rail's responses. It does not address the representations which have since become objections, as these have since been conditionally withdrawn or are addressed fully in Network Rail's evidence.
2. The Representations received in relation to the Project are as follows:
  - a. **REP01** Richard Wakeford
  - b. **REP02** Joseph Saunders
  - c. **REP03** Sav Patel
  - d. **REP04** Great Shelford Parish Council
  - e. **REP05** Mark Chaplin – *this representation became OBJ25*
  - f. **REP06** National Grid
  - g. **REP07** Historic England
  - h. **REP08** CCiC – *this representation became OBJ23 (since conditionally withdrawn)*

- i. **REP09** SCDC – *this representation became OBJ24 (since conditionally withdrawn)*
  - j. **REP10/SUPP06** Janet Swadling
  - k. **REP11** Mr Meed
3. As detailed below, Network Rail has contacted all the representees. With the exception of Mr Meed, none have provided a material response.
  4. Representations which later became objections have been addressed in Network Rail’s evidence and are not addressed in this Note.

### **REP01 Mr Wakeford**

5. Mr Wakeford, Life Fellow at Hughes Hall, Cambridge, made a representation concerning:
  - a. The adequacy of the station building and facilities given the additional demand likely from East West Rail
  - b. The possibility of integrating CSIE Project and EWR so as to avoid additional costs and
  - c. Unnecessary land take from Hobson’s Park both during construction and operation.
6. Network Rail responded in writing on 7 September 2021 and on 21 January 2022 (**INQ41**) as follows:
  - a. The station had been designed in line with HM Treasury Green Book standards for passenger demand, which includes projected demand up to 2043. Peak times have been subject to dynamic pedestrian modelling to ensure that passengers can travel safely through the station. This modelling included alternative scenarios with a significantly higher growth, including an allowance for East West Rail services.

- b. The CSIE Project has been designed to ensure that it does not preclude options for EWR. However, the projects are subject to separate investment decisions, and the proposed TWAO is only for the CSIE Project and not EWR. EWR is in any event not formally committed for delivery.
- c. The proposed land take in Hobson's Park has since been considerably reduced, following input from the contractor.

## **REP02 Mr Saunders**

- 7. Mr Saunders, a resident of Trumpington, raised questions in the following areas:
  - a. Excessive extent of land being taken in Hobson's Park;
  - b. Retaining public access to the maintenance track parallel with the rail tracks; and
  - c. Clarifying that the "potential footbridge" in the exchange land would be provided.
- 8. NR responded in writing as follows on 17 August 2021 and with a further follow up on 20 January 2022 (**INQ42**) as follows:
  - a. The proposed land take in Hobson's Park has since been considerably reduced, following input from the contractor.
  - b. The maintenance access running south alongside the tracks will not be a permanent feature but is a right of access that Network Rail is seeking powers to secure to enable future maintenance of the realigned railway infrastructure. Network Rail does not propose to install a permanent track / roadway through the agricultural field.
  - c. The potential footbridge in the exchange land was subject to negotiation with the landowner and the Hobsons Conduit Trust, and Network Rail has since committed to providing it.
- 9. The matters raised in REP02 have also been covered in the evidence of Messrs Barnes (NRE 1.2), Jones (NRE 8.2) and Pearson (NRE 9.2).

### **REP03 Mr Patel**

10. Mr Patel, an associate at Strutt & Parker, raised the following questions.

- a. Impact of building Cambridge South Station on local stations on the network and the potential for an increase in people choosing to leave their cars at local stations;
- b. Where demand for the station will come from and if it will be via local train stations; and
- c. Has there been any consideration for supporting an increase in local station car parking?

11. Network Rail responded in writing on 17 August 2021 (**INQ43**) as follows:

- a. The demand modelling in the business case for the proposed station incorporates changes of demand at other stations, including those in the local area. The Transport Assessment work does not consider how any additional passengers may choose to access other stations. To do so for all stations affected (i.e. all those that would be serviced by services which call at the new station) would be a major undertaking and is not typically done for projects of this scale.
- b. How passengers access other stations on the network has not been modelled in the Transport Assessment. Demand modelling carried out for the business case does however include expected station origins and destinations for passengers who use Cambridge South.
- c. It is not proposed that additional parking at local stations be delivered as part of the Project. Station car parks are looked after by the relevant Train Operating Company (TOC) and are typically expanded where a suitable site exists and a commercial case can be made.

### **REP04 Shelford Parish Council**

12. Shelford Parish Council was concerned *“over the potential impact the temporary roadway (for construction traffic will have on an ancient*

*monument*", which is understood to be the Scheduled Ancient Monument SM4.

13. Network Rail responded on 17 August 2021 (**INQ44**), confirming that it was working closely with Historic England and the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment team to ensure that all mitigation proposed is acceptable and noted in relevant planning conditions. The impact of the temporary roadway (both in terms of the roadway itself and the additional construction traffic) on the Scheduled Ancient Monument was further explored in live evidence with Ms Wylie and in her proof (NRE7.2).
14. For reference, her evidence is that the Scheduled Ancient Monument will be impacted by the construction of the temporary roadway as it could impact the remains roughly 30cm below the surface (but this will be mitigated by subjecting the area to investigation prior to construction, and preserving the remains by record); and that the construction traffic itself will not have any substantial impacts beyond that, as the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument makes very little contribution to its overall significance (see NRE7.2, [4.1.3] (overall summary), and [5.2.7] to [5.2.11]).

#### **REP06 National Grid**

15. National Grid wrote to confirm they have no assets in the area, and have no objection to the proposed TWAO. Network Rail responded thanking National Grid for their response (**INQ45**).

#### **REP07 Historic England**

16. Historic England wrote, welcoming the opportunity for early engagement, to explain they did not consider substantial harm to result to the Scheduled Ancient Monument, and to propose a minor change to the title of condition 11 of the deemed planning application. Network Rail acknowledged the response and raised a minor query, which HE subsequently clarified (**INQ46**). As explained in evidence by Mr Pearson, the change sought has been adopted.

## **REP10/SUPP06 Janet Swadling**

17. Janet Swadling, a resident of Great Kneighton, supported the principle of the station, but was concerned at the following points:
- a. That traffic, and disruption to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, should be minimised;
  - b. Cycles should be discouraged from using Hobson's Park, and cycling spaces should be provided on the East side of the station, not the West side;
  - c. Tree planting: *"Environmentally, I would like to see a lot more trees planted asap in the park for the climate benefits but also to enable them to mature to screen the station when completed"*
  - d. Would welcome a meeting with local resident's groups.
18. Network Rail responded on 17 August 2021 (**INQ48**), indicating that it would be happy to facilitate a 'drop-in' session with residential neighbours when further detail on construction methodology and mitigation was available, and inviting Ms Swadling to confirm she was happy to be the point of contact for facilitating such a session. No response has been received.

## **REP12 Mr Meed**

19. Mr Meed had biodiversity concerns in relation to the compounds south of Addenbrooke's Road.
20. Network Rail has repeatedly and constructively engaged with Mr Meed. His representation was passed on to Mr Guy Stone (NRE12.2) who contributed to Network Rail's most recent response, sent on 24 January 2022 (**INQ47**). Mr Meed's position is now that it is *"all is much clearer now and I'm greatly reassured"*.
- a. In relation to the compounds south of Addenbrooke's road, Network Rail has confirmed that it is not seeking any rights over the particular plots Mr Meed was concerned with.
  - b. Surveys have been made (and further surveys are proposed) of the populations of water voles, and Network Rail is planning on managing

and enhancing the marginal habitats along Hobson's Brook where it falls within the scheme boundary. This will aim to provide higher quality habitats for water vole foraging and burrows.

- c. On preservation of hedgerow habitat for farmland birds, the reduction in hedgerow would be re-instated following the works and underplanted with species rich grassland. Further scrub habitat would be created within the triangle of land where the Rail Systems Compound is proposed and in the exchange land that is also adjacent to the brook. Wetland features and species rich grassland will also be incorporated into this area. Offsite habitat creation will be required nearby to ensure the 10% biodiversity net gain target is met. These will also include scrub and grassland habitats that will benefit farmland birds. Measures are in place to reduce visual and noise disturbance to farmland birds through hoarding and monitoring of noise and nest localities for corn bunting and skylark during construction.