

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#); [Brenda Taplin](#)
Subject: Cambourne to Cambridge - web query
Date: 12 November 2025 23:49:49

Dear Joanna,

I hope it is appropriate to contact you with this question about the Cambourne to Cambridge Order Public Inquiry. I have been following the inquiry closely and with interest, but have had no previous formal involvement. From statements made earlier at the inquiry I believed that due to lack of prior engagement it would not be possible to make a representation to the inquiry, however comments made yesterday morning suggest that this may in fact be possible.

With that in mind I have one point that I think should be drawn to the attention of the Applicant and to the Inspectors. I do not think it is necessary for me to make this point in person, but I would be happy to if that would be useful. I think that the point could be adequately made in a note of approximately half a page (indeed the short summary below would probably be adequate, but may benefit from some additional context).

I believe that there is a significant deficiency in the transport modelling that has informed many of the assessments and decisions that underpin the scheme. I think it would be sensible for the Applicant to be given the chance to address this deficiency while the inquiry is ongoing.

To briefly summarise, I believe the required validation for the CSRM2 F-series model has not been performed (or at least it has not been presented). This is essential because the validation report for the full F-series model (core document CD1-25.08) shows that the model fails significantly for a key link relevant to the C2C scheme (SATURN link 91029-91031 which gives model output of 1541 PCUs vs observed 1061 PCUs). This link models flows for the eastbound A428, between A1303 and M11-A14, during the AM (i.e. it is one of the most important links in terms of possible impact of the scheme).

For the earlier version of the CSRM2 model this information was provided, e.g. as given in CD1-20.02 for the D-series model, finding that "The modelled flows at various points along the A428/A1303 corridor were compared to the observed data available to ensure the model was accurately reflecting current base year (2015) flows." This conclusion clearly cannot apply to the F-series model given the large discrepancy seen in the validation report. If such a large deviation was not corrected by adjustments to the model (as I believe is required), all outputs based on this transport modelling are likely to be significantly incorrect. If these adjustments were made they should be described and presented.

I apologise that my misunderstanding on procedure as detailed above means I am raising a point at a late stage of the inquiry. However as the point is very limited in scope I hope it is not too unreasonable to ask for it to be addressed by the Applicant.

When I became aware of this issue I requested clarification from the GCP through an FOI request as detailed here:
https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/f_series_model_validation_for_c2#outgoing-1953303

As yet I have received no substantive reply, but this is due within a week at the latest (according the timelines set out in the Freedom of Information Act), and therefore should be available for the Applicant to present to the inquiry if you or the Inspectors deem it

appropriate to raise this point with them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best wishes,
Jan Marchant