

Brief Overview Formal Consultation Responses

Transport -

Movement of the train station – what happens if it does not move?

Increase in traffic – congestion / rat running

Solution of the A10 prior to development

Inadequate cycle / pedestrian links within the site

No strategy for increasing cycling / decreasing A10 traffic

Landbeach main road access closed at peak times for P & R – impact access to neighbouring villages eg. Milton, Cottenham

P & R & Station would not be effective unless congestion on Station Roads decreased

Schools located on main road – discourages sustainable transport

Design -

Proposed height of buildings

Density of housing

Equestrian Bridleways

Community Facilities –

Adequate health care services

Provision of housing / facilities for elderly – ½ bed houses (& request updates for Compassion _ Trust)

Swimming pool

When will the schools be built? Will the schools open to existing Waterbeach public

Social Cohesion

Environment –

Increase noise pollution

Increase in air pollution

Biodiversity

Drainage

Flooding

Biodiversity

Key Themes	Responses
Public Consultation Responses (received by 3rd April 2017)	
Transport	<p>A10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not cope now • A10 north/south corridor is over stretched already • A10 traffic is a problem needs to be resolved • A10 should be improved prior to building commences • Queues exist already • No development should be considered until major improvements to infrastructure • A10 cannot currently cope • Widening A10 at the same time & A14 roundabout improvements • No strategy to reduce traffic on A10 • Only concern A10 – which will never cope until improved • A10 must be addressed before planning permission is given, does not work as it is • A10 & village roads are at capacity • Improvements to A10 need to be before development else it would lead to increased traffic • Lack of belief people would use public transport over cars • Approved prior to obtaining budget for A10 Infrastructure • concerns about the capacity of the A10 to cope with the additional traffic is development will cause • the A10 is at overload during the rush hour • concerned about the traffic volume • A10 max capacity already - congestion • This development must not be approved until extensive upgrade and widening of the road is implemented. • The main arterial road, the A10, cannot cope now • The A10 transport assessment should factor in this additional predictable traffic burden albeit it related to developments that may deliver later than the proposed initial phases of the Waterbeach development.

- Accessing the A10 would be hard with an increase of housing
- Exit from the village via Clayhithe is also unsuitable for a large increase in traffic volume.
- - I am concerned about traffic coming through the village and next to the Cam Locks estate which is very tranquil and a lovely place to live. It would help if traffic could only go through the A10 access points to the town.
- I believe the A10 should not be used as the "main entry/exit road" towards Cambridge/ Ely from the Waterbeach development. If the Waterbeach development consists of up to 6,500 houses then the developers should pay for an alternative road linking to Cambridge/ Ely/ A14.
- It's my believe that Milton residents have a fundamental right to an acceptable quality of life and therefore there should be no further development of roads -near or around the village and especially the widening of the existing A10.
- The level of traffic on the A10 is now high causing jams towards Cambridge in the mornings and towards Stretham and Ely in the evenings. Other developments are proposed, particularly in Ely and if the proposed site is also built on the situation will be intolerable. Major work is required now to improve the situation and must happen to cope with the increase of vehicles from the proposed site. The provision of guided buses and cycle ways without the ability to drive private cars on the A10 is not right in my view.

Train Station

- Specific details would be needed if moved – access for existing villagers
- Station moving – should remain accessible
- Improvement required – high traffic, dangerous at rush hour – restriction on parking?
- Needs good connection to current village
- Existing station convenient for Landbeach residents – potentially retain it?
- Train station at capacity already
- Safety aspect of opening the existing station to accommodate new proposal
- Overcrowded trains – slow & expensive
- Don't move the station, upgrade it – toilet, more parking, cycle facilities
- At capacity already, regardless of additional 6,500
- Movement of station would equate to villagers who walk to drive
- Increase of traffic due to the station moving
- Movement of the station should not leave Waterbeach village as a ghost town
- Easy access to the proposed new station – walking / cycle path parallel to the track between the existing station site and new station.
- Please consider a train station move ASAP the current is dangerous, no parking and not fit for purpose
- Keep the station in existing location – but with adequate car parking. If you move the station please provide access immediately adjacent to the existing railway line – for people currently in the south of the village the new proposed route is

longer than necessary

- Existing station could not support proposed development
- Deprive existing village of the train station
- Train Station needs to be able to deal with proposed no. residents
- Parking arrangements at the railway station is also a major concern as it is local to me. We already have a big problem with commenters parking there cars in our stree causing problems for deliveries and bin collections.
- Moving the station would result in rat running through existing village
- Increase in traffic, noise and pollution, through Waterbeach village - this could make High Street more busy and would likely have a much worse effect on Way Lane, which is quite narrow but would also probably provide the shortest route to the Waterbeach New Town station and become another “rat run”, this time for northbound traffic in the mornings.
- Congestion and possible gridlock on Station Road:-
- In the morning, there is currently more traffic heading southwards out of Waterbeach than northwards into Waterbeach (evening is the opposite)
- Often severe congestion because parked cars, mainly owned by Station Road residents, effectively turn Station Road into a “single track road with passing places”.
- With a re-sited railway station, there would be appreciable additional traffic heading northwards in the mornings against the overall southwards flow.
- two stations, given that the size of the New Town with Waterbeach village would eventually be around 75% of the current size of Ely:
 1. Waterbeach village station - served by hourly Great Northern service (as it is now) from Kings Lynn to London Kings Cross
 2. Waterbeach New Town station - perhaps served by hourly Greater Anglia trains from Norwich to Cambridge
- This would also help reduce the congestion that would result were there to be just one station in Waterbeach, at the site of the New Town.
- is currently less than a 10 minute walk from the centre of the village which, if it was relocated, would make it no longer practical for people in the village to use.
- The proposal to move the station clearly only benefits the new development not the current village and appears to have been suggested with no regard for the existing community of Waterbeach residents.
- Finally I object to moving the train station however I gather this has been consulted on and is a done deal - to take it away from the village is very harsh and other public transport will need to be put in place.
- Development will lead to an increase of people using the rail station in the village. There is insufficient parking and cars are left all around the village. It is suggested that the station could be moved to the north. If it were to happen it would be some years away and in the meantime the situation would get worse. In any event Waterbeach as it is now would lose one of its principal attractions if the station moves some distance from the centre of the village

Rat Running

- Traffic calming in Landbeach on the High St pushing traffic onto Waterbeach Road instead.
- Waterbeach village already a rat run
- Rat run to marshalls/ E.Cambs, commuters,
- Traffic control measures – gated in Landbeach are concerning
- Concerned about access from Landbeach being closed – detour to reach Milton or the A10
- Traffic management along station road – restricting or diverting traffic
- Rat running existing in Waterbeach and makes it dangerous for cyclists
- Increased use of B1047 – via Horningsea
- Speeding problem in Horningsea already - up to 12% of vehicles were recorded at 36mph+ by the Speedwatch team
- Using Waterbeach village as a “rat run”,
- The B1047 which passes through Horningsea is a route into Cambridge that is hardly mentioned in the document. Without significant restrictions on the use of this road it will quickly turn into a rat run when the A10 is busy or people are travelling to the south of Cambridge.
- This development will also have a negative effect on the other villages along the A10 as cars will try alternative routes though them to avoid the A10.
- Waterbeach village is already a rat run and at capacity for through traffic
- The proposed development will lead to an increase of traffic through Waterbeach on the road to Horningsea and Fen Ditton. This already causes problems and the situation will worsen.

Transport Assessment Inadequate

- TA p.153 needs to be in place prior to development
- Census data collected in 2011 is not appropriate for assessing Waterbeach – at the time a large proportion of the community were on the Barracks and worked onsite. Now occupiers work outside the village.
- I note that in the Environmental Statement section 9.3.71 there are stated limitations of the spreadsheet tool used to determine road traffic effects. In the last part of this section it states that the tool cannot determine the effects of routing through alternative routes "for example any impacts of re-routing through the villages adjacent to the A10". However, in section 9.6.63 figures from the model are used to state that there would be "negligible effect within the centre of Waterbeach Village." In actual fact, as the model cannot calculate this, it is not known what the effect will be in Waterbeach and other villages. To state that the effect in negligible is misrepresentation of the data provided by the model.
- there is no clear address of traffic-flow/parking issues within the existing Waterbeach village while development takes place. Traffic volume already creates road-crossing problems; Primrose Lane/High Street-entrance is frequently blocked by parked cars. The safety and traffic requirements of the plan need clearer examination and more practical proposal relating to predicted traffic volume. It cannot be safely predicted that workers will prefer bicycles to cars; provision for bus transport is

unclear.

- If the basis for the quality of housing has been derived from the figures put forward for traffic movement from u&c, I feel this must be re-visited. Particularly the percentage for car share is totally fictitious and will not be achieved.
- Given that the traffic model developed by Peter Brett Associates LLP cannot determine the effects of traffic routing through alternative routes "for example any impacts of re-routing through the villages adjacent to the A10" (application section 9.3.71), what plans are in place to prevent traffic from the new development from turning off the A10, through Waterbeach and Horningsea?
- Will there be some form of restricted access through Car Dyke Road and Denny End Road (presumably after the Pembroke Ave turn off, to allow traffic to the trading estate)? If so, what form will this restricted access take?

Cycling Infrastructure

- Routes from village to communities east of Waterbeach would be brilliant – traditionally an issue
- A10 cycle route needs improvement being resident move in – too dangerous currently, needs segregation from traffic
- Butt Lane cycle crossing (drawing ref: 30509/2003/SK06 should be traffic light controlled with cycle priority
- Should be state of the art cycling provision – eg Holland
- Cycle access to the existing train station needs to be improved
- Access to the green via foot & cycle should be a priority.
- Poor cycling links to Cambridge
- Cycling should be linked to key transport options, community facilities, adequate lights and separation from traffic for safety.
- Poor – expected more cycling proposal
- No strategy to increase cycling
- We are supportive of the current city deal greenways plans and would like to see better inter-village connections for cycling through more greenways
- Concern that the planning application will provide insufficient cycling infrastructure and not incentivise residents to cycle enough
- We urgently need a safe cycle link from Waterbeach to Horningsea on the Eastern side of the river. The A10 cycle path south is dangerous and the river path is narrow and shared with fisherman and dog walkers
- I would urge SCDC to insist on segregated cycle ways around the new development – not mixed use with pedestrians – make it easy to walk and cycle around – make it more onerous to drive?
- I would like to see improved cycle routes to Wicken Fen and Anglesey Abbey
- Safe cycle routes to Cambridge are needed – well lit, safe, tarmac
- Any new cycling routes should not be on the road before to combine wide cycle/pedestrian routes
- Cycling infrastructure linking Waterbeach to Cambridge needs to be improved
- the diagrams relating to the proposed cycleway are artistically unclear and seem to be across what is currently agricultural

land. Pressure on the Cam footpath/cycle path via Bates Bite Lock is undesirable, unless there were a proposal to provide a metalled surface and separate pedestrian provision.

- The people representing them think that if they put cycle paths in, everyone will get on their bike, as this is the Cambridge way a development of this size will be detrimental to the area in general.
- As **Mere Way** is a bridleway giving lawful rights to walkers, cyclists and horses I can see an inherent danger to both the cyclist and horse rider caused by an unsuspecting horse and rider being alarmed by the sudden and silent overtaking of a cycle.
- Should provision of a segregated horse way be provided alongside that of the bridleway?.
- Both **Cock Fen Lane and Akeman Street** should be regarded as single carriage with no designated passing places. These roads are used by cars, vans, agricultural tractors with implements attached, combined harvesters, heavy goods vehicles (including articulated) and coaches (accessing the Coach Park). Neither side of the road has a defined edge and each side is overgrown with long grass, brambles etc. so should a cycle way not be installed?
- The road surface in **Akeman Street** is higher than that of the adjoining ground with the surface water running off uncontrolled either side. The ditches either side have not been maintained and in particular the part running alongside my property which is non-existent and causes deep surface water to form on the lower grass verge and onto my ground. At present this has caused me no problem. I, fear however, that any upgrade of the road will cause a greater run off and by doing so my septic tanks would be flooded with unpleasant results. I would expect that if any upgrading to the road the ditch be reinstated to join that further up
- highways England have recommendations on cycle infrastructure design and as of yet the plans set out by u&c do not come anywhere close to these standards.
- There are two sports centres local to Waterbeach, impington and botisham, at present there is no safe cycle route to either this should be investigated to help ease traffic.

Public Transport

- Interim shuttle bus would be chaotic
- Road network should be developed so public transport is more efficient and encourage.
- Proposed Bus Service for Landbeach is a great benefit enabling Landbeach residents to access service in Waterbeach New Town And Cambridge
- Park and ride wont work with congestion along station road
- Integrated across the A10 to Cambridge Business Park, Old Landbeach marine – including non motorised user bridge across A10 or links in the public rights of way across to Landbeach to Cottenham – Countryside bridleways
- Better bus routes should be considered – existing is slow & unreliable
- Insufficient detail about exact timescales and facilities for providing effective and safe community facilities for rail users.
- Problems with existing guided busway, this is not likely to be the way to go

	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No transport access to new town • Drawing on p.22 wish list not a proper proposal • A lot of focus on A10 – don't overlook the Clayhithe Road, A14 west and Fen Dittion access route. • insufficient evidence that there will be sufficient money and time spent on upgrading the infrastructure of the area to cope with this. • A10 & train currently maximum capacity • Developments at Campkin Road look good- take note • No problem with the concept of building the proposal and suggest an access road to the station and beyond parallel to the river from the new development would be essential as a starter. • General infrastructure needs putting in place before anything else is attempted. • Speeding on way lane – rat run route • Transport links between village and new should be distinguishes to avoid rat rub – adequate * multiple options to commute by walking, cycling, bus, and taxi if the infrastructure is to create a cohesive development. • Roads near schools – not discouraging car use • Solution to the traffic congestion on the A10 is essential before any development begins • Explore the option of residential parking on Station Road • Too many people park in the village to use the trains – I propose residents only • Infrastructure needs to be improved considerably before any building takes place • non-car based modes of transport should already be in place before the first people move into the development • a dormitory town for Cambridge, new residents are tempted out of their cars and into the community, and this is why I place such emphasis on the importance of providing non-car infrastructure that new residents can use. • Object until such time as a proper infrastructure is able to support such a development.
<p>Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should push for maximum % of social affordable housing as renting is currently unaffordable with 20 miles of Cambridge • Ought to be provision for housing older people 70+ - single level one & two bedroom houses with appropriate facilities
<p>Community Facilities</p>	<p>Local Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New facilities could boom Waterbeach village but not if they have to get in a car onto the A10. • Many years had a swimming pool on the Barracks – would expect we should have our facility back • Doctors surgery is currently over-utilised it takes up to 4 weeks to get an appointment please consider whether adequate

	<p>health care provision is being allowed for.</p> <p>Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must factor capacity, phasing • Must ensure Waterbeach village are able to attend • Secondary school must allow for extension for existing village & proposed RLW development. • Design must be in keeping with existing village • Contemporary buildings would not work near existing village • 3 primary schools seems low compared to the six in Cambourne • Location of schools alongside main roads • I would support a secondary school for St Bede's with phased opening such that year 7 intake could start as soon as possible • The development must provide enough land and school provision to provide capacity sufficient for Waterbeach Village. <p>Equestrian Bridleways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No provision / consideration for bridleways for existing equestrian community • Protection and provision of safe access is a must to avoid the equine community losing rights to ride & enjoy countryside <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for better residential parking • GP Surgery must be constructed and in phase 1
<p>Environment</p>	<p>Green Belt Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of agricultural land - existing proposal is brownfield, however expanding into green belt <p>Drainage, Sewage & Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doubt flood risk is low level • Concern where the new sewage works will be & associated smell. • Waterbeach area is mostly low-lying and areas to the west of the business Cambridge Research Park are already subject to flooding. • A massive increase in the number of homes will lead to a raising of the water table and increased risk of flooding. Problems with sewage seepage are already occurring in Bannold Road, with further homes now under construction in Bannold Road. • I believe this development will cause Waterbeach, the surrounding villages and possibly Cambridge to be at a greater risk of flooding. Waterbeach already has a recent history of flooding, Station Road in 2001 and Bannold Road in 2014. • A large deployment of new houses together with its associated removal of arable land can only increase this flood risk. • With rising sea levels and changes in weather patterns building this large scale development in a low lying area is clearly

poorly thought out.

- Waterbeach and the surrounding area is subject to water lying on the surface of the land on regular occasions and flooding does occur. With such a scale of development on this site and on other ones nearby there is a danger that surface water from all the building will cause more consistent flooding to the locality including buildings. This cannot be allowed to occur.
- Foul sewage discharge is currently causing problems in Waterbeach and this could increase. Again this must be avoided.

Sustainable Energy

- Should be much higher sustainable energy proposed eg solar panels and wind generation

Pollution

- A primary school is proposed by a main road – air quality issue
- Noise pollution
- Deteriorating air quality
- Need to make sure appropriate measures to ensure air and noise quality issues do not arise
- Dangerous and loud, full with petrol fumes
- Roads near schools = polluted areas
- Noise pollution
- Movement of train – increase noise & pollution
- Can you commit to an equal or better noise and pollution situation after the development?
- Milton - the level of noise and pollution is already unacceptable to me coming from the A10.
- Milton - I am concerned about increased traffic noise from the A10, especially since the the road will need to be widened to cope with more cars.
- what measures will be taken to limit traffic noise increase.

Biodiversity

- Worried about the impact on wildlife due to being allowed to build so close to the river
- On the site there are bee orchids crested nets little owls and bats – have these been given consideration
- Passionate about the environment and want the development to take initiatives to protect nature as far as possible.
- The application includes a large area of wildlife habitat which will be destroyed by the development. Waterbeach golf course and in the immediate surrounding area are inhabited by Adders. This development will have a significant effect on their habitat.
- please can the trees bordering the Cam Locks development be kept

Other

<p>Social Cohesion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do urban & civic plan to remove all the contaminated land as far down as 20 ft is aviation fuel <p>Separation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can there be a form of boundary between the town and the village? • Please do not trash the rural nature – need green spaces • How is the existing community going to be connected south & north • Strong identity of Waterbeach – needs to be integrated • If the development is treated as independent to existing it will create issues if things move north. • Green buffer now houses Bannold Road, as such no break between old/new village, resulting in loss of existing village. • it would be great to have a green space between the old village, the Cam Locks development and the new town • - it would be good if something recreational for the existing village could be at the Southern border so they can use the green spaces easily. <p>Existing Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This existing cohort of employed people contribute substantially to the existing economy of Waterbeach and South Cambridgeshire. Attention to their needs should be prioritised before Mr Hugill’s proposals to provide for a new Cambridge workforce. •
<p>Design</p>	<p>Proposed Height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about 8 storey building – too high for flat landscape, Ely Cathedral stands out which is less than 8 storeys • Should blend with the treescape • Scale & design inappropriate for site • 8 storey should not be considered • Redevelopment of the built up area of the barracks is appropriate but not the green spaces around the runways which have never been developed before (questionable definition of brownfield site) • The gap between the village and the development and the village which was prioritised at an earlier stage has been lost and has not being reinstated in the new design. • High rise flats – no no no / houses – yes • Density – not in keeping, lower density, four storey buildings on the edge! • Concern that the max height of buildings along the south boundary of the development is 4 stories. These could potentially overlook existing residents of Waterbeach. Can we stipulate a 2 storey buffer zone along the southern boundary? • Will the non residential areas near the station include high rise buildings? • Proposed height of buildings is incongruous with the location

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UC OLP includes building heights of 30m in the central area of the site, tapering away to 2 storey heights on the N & E edges which bound the RLW Estates site. Until the RLW OLP has been revealed, we cannot know if the UC proposed building heights will blend with their submission. Similarly, much is made of the green views and corridors but these will only work if the RLW OLP takes account of them and continues with the theme. • Unnecessary density of dwellings or the location • Local Plan suggests the strategic sites has capacity for up to 8-9,000 dwellings – commercial greed? • the proposed height of the buildings which will inhibit light and are totally out of keeping with the nature of the area - these will be seen for miles around and will ruin the landscape for the area. • The scale and density of the proposed development. The number of dwellings is excessive. The way they are planned in a relatively small area compared to the overall site will overpower the surrounds, particularly as I understand that some buildings are planned to have six or more storeys. If it is appropriate to develop such a large site I suggest a garden village with larger plots and more sympathetic design would be more appropriate. I note this is being proposed elsewhere in the country on former airfields (I believe in Oxfordshire and Cheshire).
<p>Heritage</p>	<p>Loss of Buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at the existing building marked for proposed demolition, It will be an opportunity missed or denied to establish some economic activity by offering this spaces and building for business venture to get employment to waterbeach and the surrounding residents who will be most affected by the development. • The iconic Hangars (Bld 43 & 135 in the proposal) are an example where their demolition will take away the character that is waterbeach. They should be listed to save them from disappearing and put to use by providing them for commercial use. If they are turned into commercial use sooner than later, they will add more value to the community and the developer from jobs created and revenue generated.
<p>Other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport ,traffic & highway safety, noise etc. • Community facilities, design, appearance, materials, layout, density • An inappropriate scale of development with a unacceptable impact on current villages and A10 commuters. • I am broadly in agreement with the plans outlines. The plans outlined are interesting and I believe will provide opportunities for affordable housing and additional education facilities. There is a place for old and new in the communities. • I have a particular interest in provision for housing and facilities for the elderly. I know this has been considered and am interested in being kept informed of developments – I am on the core team of compassion care trust • Generally excited and optimistic about the proposed new development • The advantage of a new town is to provide a gold standard starting with a blank canvas – please enforce this

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SCDC needs to be considerate of ongoing investigations into Urban&Civic links to Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (GCGP LEP).• SCDC needs to be mindful of the objectives and development intentions of Fendland DC and work symbiotically to ensure that Fenland and the future of the Fen Edge/Cambridge Edge has a joined up approach to development• The area of development should be confined to the existing buildings and to the west near to the A10. The rest of the site to the north and east should be excluded from not just buildings, but also from Open Space etc• The site was originally farm land and the majority of the site should be returned to that use. For a considerable number of years hay crops have been taken and in my view agriculture should continue to make use of the high quality of the land. The need to produce food from home grown crops can only increase• Development outside the village would have a detrimental effect on• Waterbeach. Some of its amenities would surely be taken away (see the station above).• I therefore request that development in the manner proposed should be refused. I ask that common sense should return to the way we think and act as surely the majority of people regard the proposal as totally unsuitable even if the aim to produce more dwellings is understandable. |
|--|--|

Public Exhibition Discussion with Officers

- PC should be setting out what it wants from the new town, not trying to resist the development (and I had a couple of comments about the representativeness of the PC)
- The neighbour letter was helpful and exhibitions are very useful
- Phasing got raised a number of times: starting on the barracks site. If starting near the lake the proposal must include high quality cycle and pedestrian links to the village
- Our letter was helpful
- Thanks for coming out and meeting them face to face
- Venue was convenient esp. as it had parking.
- Phasing - should it start nearer the existing village and grow from there so the new residents can support the existing village facilities & services and vice versa
- Why has the application come in ahead of the local plan and just ahead of the hearings?
- Recognition that it's a complex process with lots of steps: the local plan, SPD and planning application.

Transport

Masterplan

- **Cohesiveness with RLW land and station** – Residents questioned how the application site would be integrated with the RLW (and station) land to the east. Clear need for the masterplan to be integrated and for the SPD to be reflected in any planning approval.
- Interest in the location of phase 1 and the town centre area. Agreed with the town centre location;
- **Physical Links to RLW land and station** – Residents discussed the need for strong connectivity through the whole site
- **Connections to village** – Need for strong connections between the existing village and the proposed development

Rail

- **Station location** – A number of residents were dissatisfied with the concept of moving the railway station. It was felt that the existing village benefits from a walkable station and that the proposed new station would be less accessible, necessitating driving, or excluding the less mobile. Questions were raised about why the existing station could not be improved and not relocated. Some suggested that they were not consulted in the proposals to move the station.
- **Station parking** – On street parking around Waterbeach station causes delay currently and needs addressing. This would be worsened by development at Waterbeach, as it is expected that new residents would drive to the station.
- **Station timescales** – Residents were keen to understand when the station would be re-located. Confusion about delivery timing of the railway station it varies in the documentation;
- **New Station Requirements** – Calls for car and cycle parking and potential rail park and ride.

What happens if RLW don't get planning permission for the relocated station, would the whole development stop?

-

Buses

- **Bus Gate** – With regards to the proposed bus gate through Landbeach – Landbeach is seen to be an existing rat-run, so the introduction of a bus gate may put more cars onto the A10
- **Park and Ride** – Buses are too expensive and unlikely to be attractive. Residents were sceptical about the ability to achieve significant modal shift through buses.
- **Busway** – Will Waterbeach have a bus way? When? Where will it go? (all relate to the A10 study, with the applicant indicating in principle support to funding/facilitating)

Road

- **A10 corridor** – Highlighted the existing significant congestion challenges
- **A10** – Residents expressed the urgent need for works on A10 – Residents wanted more detail about what the applicant is proposing on the A10 as part of the early stages.
- A10 needs to be duelled before any development is allowed
- Residents of Chittering concerned that what is currently an untenable situation will get worse for them.

- Horningsea residents concerned that they will get more traffic from the development. They want less as they currently get 500 at peak times.
- A10- no development until there is a plan and it is implemented first.

Cycling

- Need to improve links to Research Park and Science Park
- Cycling improvements need to consider the need to access employment in the Southern Fringe
- Cycling links appeared to bypass Horningsea – residents emphasised for complete connections ensuring connectivity with the heart of the villages.
- Strong support for improved cycling connections to Denny Abbey and Cambridge
- Early cycle links to Cambridge are very important

Community facilities

- Schools need to be open on time
- Health facilities are poor now (long wait for GP) so new facilities need to be on time
- Sports facilities should be managed to allow public access
- Ensuring the existing memorial garden is protected.

Environment

- There doesn't seem to be enough informal open space/parkland
- Odour from the Amey site is a problem
- Drainage - making sure we get it right!

Social Cohesion

- Separation/integration with existing village is a really important issue and needs to be done well

Design

- Concern about heights and how many storeys should be a) in the town centre and b) on the edges
- The character of the new town should be in keeping with existing (but modern too).