

From: [James Littlewood](#)
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Cc: [Sarah Nicholas](#)
Subject: RE: Cambridge South Station Design Principles [GATELEY-GHAM.FID61625]
Date: 22 February 2022 17:34:02
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Joanna, thank you for this, which we have now reviewed. Our response is below:

P5 3.3.1 states that “The proposed Development will balance local community requirements with infrastructure and functional asset requirements by engaging with key residents, business, community groups and recreational users and site operators within the local area to enable better co-ordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community”.

P5 3.3C states that, under “Consider community opportunities” that “Design of the station will take into account community feedback to drive a design in keeping with the local context and priorities”.

However, in my cross examination of Network Rail they confirmed that the Design Guidelines had been drawn up without any community input (they have been drawn up by architects working for Network Rail and City Council officers) and without asking for the views of the users of Hobson’s Park. Therefore, it is clear that 3.3.1 and 3.3C cannot be achieved without further work on the part of Network Rail to ascertain community aspirations, so that they can be considered as part of the design process.

In my proof of evidence, I highlighted that toilet facilities are one of the most requested services for park users. Access to toilet facilities enable more people to use parks (especially those for whom toilet access might be a problem) and it enables people to use parks for longer (increases the dwell time) – in other words they make parks more inclusive (another aspiration of the Design Principles). Toilets are usually not provided in parks because of the costs of maintaining them, which is why they have not so far been provided for Hobson’s Park.

In my proof of evidence, I explained that the community aspiration was to have access to toilet facilities at the station, this does not necessarily mean providing an additional toilet or an additional building. A toilet facility would also benefit people who might be waiting to meet/greet rail travellers.

As compensation to the community for the temporary and permanent impacts on their park, we would expect to see some community benefit achieved from the west station building and we would like this commitment to be included in the Design Principles or as a planning condition. In our view this should be access to the station toilets, but we would be happy for Network Rail to survey park users to ask their views in order to inform the design.

I would be grateful if you could share this with relevant parties.

Kind regards

James Littlewood - Chief Executive
ceo@cambridgeppf.org