

**Cambridge South Station – 21/02957/COND 22 (Cycle Parking) - Application to discharge the condition**

**Trumpington Residents' Association**

**Statement to the Joint Development Control Committee, 16 August 2023**

We support the station as a destination station for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. It will help to reduce the traffic on our roads as the Campus develops.

Hobson's Park on the western side of the station is a "tranquil place" in a busy area; the Planning Inspector confirmed this. We have tried to limit the station's impact on our Park and to get the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to live up to its responsibilities in delivering the station.

Despite this, a 20 to 30 metre wide strip is effectively being taken out of the Park from the Guided Busway to the station on the western side of the railway – this being the gap between the new shared use path to the station and the shared use path to the Campus alongside the Guided Busway. And the largest of the construction compounds is in our Park – until 2025.

We objected at the Public Inquiry to Network Rail's proposal for cycle parking spaces not only because it took space out of the Park but also because hundreds of cycle movements each day through the Park on the new shared use path threatens the very tranquillity which we value.

Also, as the destination of this destination station is the Campus, why is it proposed to have so many spaces on its western side forcing cyclists to leave the station and cross Addenbrooke's Bridge on an already very busy shared use path to get to their destination in the Campus? This did not make sense to us – and still does not.

Network Rail has not made its case for 1,000 spaces evenly split between the east and the west. This is not a product of the Transport Assessment that Network Rail refers to – but an assumption made in that Assessment. Also, the trip destination information which the Transport Assessment does contain supports a 30/70 split west / east, not 50/50.

The application also conflicts with the recommendation made by the Planning Inspector following the public inquiry which cast doubt on the need for 1,000 spaces in total – particularly the 500 proposed on the western side. It also conflicts with the Secretary of State's decision which followed the Inspector's recommendation.

Network Rail undertook at the Public Inquiry to carry out further studies to inform the decision about the number of spaces at the station and their east/west split, a fact recorded in their Closing Statement and in the Inspector's Report. Yet the application makes no mention of these further studies or their findings. Therefore, the application is incomplete.

It is for these reasons that we object to this application and ask the Committee not to agree it in the form proposed but to place a limit of no more than 300 cycle parking spaces in the western station building.

If, in the event, a total of 1,000 spaces proves to be necessary, the Cambridge Biomedical Campus should provide the land necessary to allow additional spaces on the eastern side of the station. We do not buy the argument that there is not sufficient land. Anyone looking down on the station site from Addenbrooke's busway bridge can see the amount of undeveloped land within the Campus immediately adjacent to the station and nearby. The owners of that land should be pressed to provide the land necessary for 200 extra spaces. It is after all in their interests – the station is being provided primarily for their benefit.

Network Rail seeks to bring in arguments on the proposed design of the station in aid of its cycle parking application. Yet it is Network Rail that has chosen to base its design on 500 spaces in the western station building which the Planning Inspector made clear was probably an over-estimate as was the 1,000 spaces total. A conclusion with which the Secretary of State agreed.

For Trumpington Residents' Association

ENDS

This statement is additional to the written representations we have made on this application which the Committee is asked to consider carefully. Please see:

- Objection letter dated 19 June 2023
- Email dated 7 July 2023
- AND Letter dated 8 August 2023