

CAMBRIDGE STATION TO LEISURE PARK FEASIBILITY STUDY

Note to Members of Cambridge City – East and South Area Committee

From: Paul Rawlinson Project Manager- Cycling Projects, Cambridgeshire County Council

Date: 26/06/2015

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Cambridge Station to Leisure Park on Hills Road feasibility study evaluates opportunities to reduce the journey time on foot for people traveling from Cambridge Central Station to the leisure complex.
- 1.2 The purpose of the study was to evaluate options for improved access to reduce journey time for pedestrians, for users with impaired mobility and for users with pushchairs.
- 1.3 The brief was to map existing journey times and compare them with the journey times of each option. Options were given an estimated cost, distance and time savings.

2.0 OUTCOME OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

- 2.1 The Study took place during December 2014 to February 2015 and included site visits to measure distances and evaluates potential options.
- 2.2 The present route from the station, shown below, would take approximately 12 minutes 40 seconds on foot, at a pace of 4km/h. However, for pedestrians capable of using the existing stairs, journey time would reduce to 11 minutes 7 seconds from the station.

Drawing 1 - Current Route from Central Station to Cinema Doors



- 2.3 The following options were considered: See **Appendix 1** for route options
 - A new bridge over the railway joining the CB1 development east of the Cambridge Signal Box with the multi-storey car park along Clifton Way (Option 1)

- A new bridge from Hills Road just north of the Busway underpass to Clifton Way, alongside The Junction nightclub (Option 2);
- A new ramp from the top of the existing stairs along Hills Road south of the railway bridge, extending over the access to the hotel car park at the end of Clifton Way and heading towards the Leisure Park (Option 3A);
- A new ramp from the top of the aforementioned stairs, running along the existing Hills Road retaining wall and returning upon itself before finishing near the base of the existing stairs (Option 3B);
- A new lift provided at the location of the existing stairs, as proposed elsewhere as part of Project Cambridge (Option 3C)
- A new built-up ramp immediately south of the hotel (Option 4).

2.4 The following indicative cost estimates have been determined. These could increase by about 30% if there are buried services that need to be moved or if railway possessions take longer than anticipated.

Option	Description	Cost
1	Bridge between Signal Box to multi-storey car park	£3.3 million
2	Bridge between Hills Road Busway Bridge to The Junction	£3.3 million
3a	Ramp over car park access to Cinema building	£1.6 million
3b	Ramp along Hills Road wall	£1.3 million
3c	Lift access provision at existing steps	£0.5 million
4	Ramp access south of Hotel	£0.1 million
DN	Do Nothing	£0

2.5 Travel time difference is identified in the table below. The two times in the current travel time cells cover walking all the way round, see drawing 1 above, or using the stairs on Hills Road bridge.

Option	Current travel time	Option Travel time	Time Saving
1	12m 40s / 11m 7s	9m 8s	3m 32s / 1m 59s
2	12m 40s / 11m 7s	11m 35s	1m 55s / +28s
3a	12m 40s / 11m 7s	11m 33s	1m 57s / +26s
3b	12m 40s / 11m 7s	11m 56s	44s / +49s
3c	12m 40s / 11m 7s	11m 15s	1m 25s / +8s
4	12m 40s / 11m 7s	12m	40s / + 53s

3.0 Conclusions

- 3.1 None of the options from 1 to 3b would be considered to offer a significant reduction in journey time for pedestrians, nor a significantly improved route for the significant cost of construction. Note option 1 includes a lift from the car park and the time waiting for this could reduce any time savings
- 3.2 Option 3c could benefit users with impaired mobility, wheelchair users or users with pushchairs with the installation of a lift alongside the existing stairs on Hills Road Bridge. However, whilst the capital cost may seem justifiable, there would be ongoing operation and maintenance costs to bear. In the small hours a lift may be at increased risk from vandalism or misuse.
- 3.3 Option 4 provides very little time saving benefits and could increase in costs substantially if buried services need to be relocated.
- 3.4 In general the improvements to CB1 have provided better access to the Leisure Park any benefits from the above options have been reduced to a point where they may no longer be significant enough to justify further development. The conclusion is that the do nothing option is the preferred outcome

