

QUAKERS YARD STATION – PLANNING STATEMENT ADDENDUM – DESIGN EVOLUTION

This document provides further information with respect the design evolution of the Proposed Development at Quakers Yard Station (planning application reference P/23/0125). This document should be read in tandem with Section 3.2 (Design Evolution) of the Planning Statement.

Could the ramp have been orientated so that it heads west off the footbridge?

- This would require the construction of the platform and ramp in this location.
- Expanding upon Section 3.2.7 of the Planning Statement, the west/upside of the station is where the track immediately enters a sharp curve. This is where the signalling equipment and 25,000 high voltage cable route is sited; the signalling scheme at this station location is complex for the whole of the Merthyr route, therefore we could not design and construct a platform and ramp in this location – [see screenshots below](#).
- A platform and ramp in this location would also cross over the existing fisherman's walkway (this is the path that previously provided access from Tram Road Side to the south of the station to Taff Vale via the now removed level crossing – this has now been integrated into the new up platform via a ramp). A platform and ramp in this location would require substantial engineering works to realign fisherman's walkway and provide a level access to the platform.
- Constructing the platform and ramp in this location would have required the purchase of a larger area of land with the need to remove more mature trees and vegetation.

It should be noted that the previous up platform (disused and overgrown with vegetation) was demolished to make way for the new up platform south of the railway line.

Why was a ramp selected instead of a lift?

- The options selection process considered 3 options (1 - pedestrian underpass; 2 - footbridge with lift and steps; 3 - footbridge with ramp and step).
- The options selection process is summarised at Section 3.2 of the Planning Statement setting out the selection criteria and why Option 3 was selected over Options 1 and 2. Option 1 is least preferred with Option 3 deemed preferable on balance over Option 2; the Options Report concluded that Option 3 was preferred for the following reasons:
 - The cost of the footbridge (including ongoing service and maintenance costs) should be high on the list for primary consideration.
 - Potential flooding issues to Options 1 & 2 should be given their due consideration.
 - Time allocated to onsite construction and disruption to the operation of the rail network.
 - Anti-social behaviour, malicious damage, and vandalism.
 - Perceived personal safety of stations users.
 - Construction logistics and site access.
 - Familiarity of solution for design and fabrication/construction.
- Further to the information provided at Section 3.2 of the Planning Statement, a lift on the new up platform would mean that servicing would have to be done by bringing in large replacement equipment (following construction and entering into service) in the future down the track. This would have required a pre-booked rail possessions to allow materials to be transported to site.

Screenshots of Track Curve and Existing Signalling Equipment

