

Planning Policy Team

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Cambourne Business Park

Cambourne

Cambridge

CB236EA

Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan – Comments and Questions about the Plan April 2021

The plan contains a lot of public relations phrases that are unquantifiable and mean nothing. Such as in 6.13.1 also recommendations that are quickly proved unenforceable or outside the scope of the N.D.P. remit, so nothing will be done. Example WPD16.

Who are the Stakeholders? Are they developers, layers of Government, investors, funding agencies, or lobbyists?

No “green” requirements seem to be included, such as insisting on the use of solar panel and grey water use in the new developments.

Also no mention of sewage and run off water from the new town. How is Waterbeach going to cope with it, or will we just be swamped by it?

Key Issues

Issue 3

House prices in Waterbeach have been inflated compared to other local villages due to houses being marketed as “good access to Cambridge/ London, mainline station.

Local Bus services have been reduced.

Issue 4

Nowhere for short term parking for shops. During “Lockdown”, when most cars would have been at home, fewer cars were parked around the Green and Gault area than when everyone is going to work. We have needed residence only and short term parking measures for a long time.

## Issue 5

New Towns have problems – as evidenced by Haverhill, Stevenage, Livingston and others. No local connection for most of the new residence. More properties are bought for profit rather than as family homes. It is misleading to title it as development of the former Army Barracks. The new town will cover a much larger area. Only a small part of it a brown field site. Most of it is in fact prime agricultural land. This country needs to keep as much of its good farmland as possible to reduce our dependence on imports especially from countries that do not meet our high quality farming and production standards.

## Issue 6

Potential relocation of Waterbeach Railway Station to the new town. The N.D.P. treat this move as a forgone conclusion. So why pretend that the consultation has any bearing on the move.

## 5 Neighbourhood Plan Vision

What a load of hot air. So far the most recent developments between the Barracks and Bannold Road have proved to be overbearing and the extra traffic has overwhelmed Way Land and the High Street. The extra buildings have increased flooding of local land. The existing village roads have not been repaired from the damage due to the construction of the new housing estates. Why should existing residents have to put up with all the inconvenience and reduction of services. The extra population has spoiled the local open spaces and walks by their sheer numbers, especially during “lockdown”. The amount of litter, dog [REDACTED] that has not been cleared up, also bags of dog [REDACTED] disposed of in bags in hedges and gateways has increased.

So can we expect that all the rest of the new developments and new town will be in anyway sympathetic to the village.

The vision and objectives are either unquantifiable or cannot be implemented. The existing pavements need improving and the roads need repairing and have for a long time. Is it now a priority due to the new development? . Did it not matter before? If it did matter, then why was nothing done?

## 6 Planning Policies

6.1.1 So what is being done to make the A10 better. Not everyone can or wants to walk or cycle. Lack of buses make cars the only option for some people.

Traffic will still be held up at all the level crossings even if trains no longer stop at what is now the Station.

### 6.1.6

Why encourage priority route for cyclists along Station Road to the River Cam cycle path when the N.D.P. moan that this cycle path is narrow and poorly maintained or a direct route. The Tow Path

along the river was not created as a commuter route. If this existing cycle path has not been maintained I doubt that any new ones will be either. The cycle path from Hornigsea to Fen Ditton is not used by a lot of the “lycra” cyclists who still use the road.

Way Lane is no longer a quiet road due to all the extra traffic from Cody Road, the old Married Quarters and the other new housing estates off Bannold Road. Why no planning to link all these estates to each other so the traffic could use Denny End as their main entry and exit road to the A10 and A14?

You can walk to Wicken Fen already, the National Trust and Cycling lobby seem to have a very strong influence on the plan.

#### 6.1.8

Waterbeach to Research Park. Of course the route should be through the new town.

#### 6.2

Route from Waterbeach village railway Station to relocated New Town Station

Why is one needed. The people who moved to Waterbeach especially to be walking distance of the station, Lode Avenue, Whitmore Way and Station Road will not want to walk or cycle further to the new station. Others in the village will have no need to access station road to get to the new station as they would be going out of their way.

Will the New Town Station provide parking for ?. Or will they have to park on the residential roads near the new station?

How does removing the station from the village “encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel”?

Will the Park and Ride be in the New Town near the A10 – so Waterbeach residence can also easily use it?

Is the A10 getting a segregated Bus link to Cambridge, but no other improvements?

So more urbanisation of the Green Belt to facilitate more commuters. 5m route is not very green is it.

Who is financing the purchase of the land for the route?

Will it be screened from the gardens and fields it goes through? It will need to be so that all the rubbish, dog ██████ bags etc. Remain on the route and not next to it.

What will prevent the route users straying off the route onto private land and the railway line?

Who will finance and carry out the maintenance of it? If at all?

As existing paths such as 247/1 (6.97) has been “poorly maintained” who is responsible for this?

If so many cyclists need the Greenway from the Newtown to Cambridge, no need for them to have our station.

A free minibus link would be more realistic if it ran every 15 minutes. The cycling lobby is being put before people with children, mobility issues, the elderly, the need to carry shopping or any other reason that makes a car or bus the more realistic choice.

If the pavements in the village were improved and maintained it would be a benefit for everyone and a better use of money than destroying green belt and making more pathways to be maintained. Improve what you have instead of being content with uneven, too narrow pavements. Passing train passengers might even use the village shops on their way past.

The mitigation to station users will be at a cost to home and landowners whose property will be used for the route.

Previously when the Greenway was proposed the route was going to be on the land owned by the railway, which was not very convincing then, even less so now. The expense of the civil engineering on an embankment and drainage ditch makes it seem unlikely and the closeness to the track will make it dangerous.

There are already foot paths 247/13, 247/20, 247/21 that link to the tow path along the river to Cambridge.

How is the Greenway financed. What makes it such a popular idea with the N.D.P.?

Why is the other intended Greenway from Denny End to Car Dyke not mentioned in this plan? Is it because it has already been given the go ahead? So there is no need for the pretence of a consultation?

**Policy WAT2 shows that the decision has already been made.**

6.3.1 , 6.3.2

Traffic volume and inadequate pavements have been made worse by the recent developments off Cody Road and Bannold Road. Who was responsible for the go ahead of these developments? The same people who have published this N.D.P.? Waterbeach as a village should not have segregated routes.

6.3.3

When the station moves to the new town, they can use the other substandard footpaths like everyone else.

6.3.6

So why were these design principles not used to connect all the new estate by paths?

#### 6.4.2.

Could traffic from the A10 be encouraged to use just the Car Dyke junction and Station Road to connect to Horninsea etc?

#### 6.4.3

All the roads would be safer if the adults dropping children off at school did not double park all around the school area of the village. Have a one way system to drive into the school grounds, drop off there and then leave. The delivery of the children is causing the problem, get the school to help solve it.

#### 6.4.4

Narrowing the road is not necessary due to all the double parking by parents. The residence of Way Lane should not have more difficulty using their road. The school run should not overshadow the rest of the villagers needs.

#### 6.5.2

How unrealistic. This will encourage parking on surrounding roads and cause congestion and inconvenience all at no extra cost to Urban & Civic.

#### 6.6.3

If St Andrew's Hill is made narrower, will cars still be allowed to park there? Making it even more dangerous. The junction was much easier to use, with fewer parked cars during "lockdown". Suggesting usually parkers avoiding paying for the station car park use these roads.

#### 6.6.6

Denny End / High Street/ Bannold Road. Just stop road parking on the junction and the bends after it on Bannold Road/High Street. Speed indicator signs might also help.

Station Road, less footfall when we loose the station.

Way Lane the problems existed before the new developments. Why was it not addressed before? Why was it not considered before the development was given the go ahead?

It seems the bigger the development the easier it is for the developer to do what they want and no one in planning does anything to foresee the problems it will cause in the surrounding area.

Way Lane, the problems we now have should easily have been anticipated before the developments in the north of the village. So why did the planners give the development the go ahead and not make any provision for the consequences of increased population and traffic? Linking the estates and exiting them via Cody Road, with no left turn into Bannold Road to Way Lane, or out through the main Barracks gate onto Denny end?

#### 6.7.3

No wonder we have so much commuter mentality with the new population.

Shuttle bus services between the current and relocated station would be a sensible idea. It would also be useful from other parts of the village to the new town facilities. Would the train shuttle bus be guaranteed, or just to start with as public relations exercise? Who would pay for it and where would the bus stop be located so it was safe and not a traffic hazard? Presumably with no income from commuter parking the existing car park by the station will be closed.

#### 6.8.6

So why did nothing similar apply to the recent large developments – no mitigating measures were put in place. Are the same planning authorities responsible for that and this document?

#### 6.9

Please make sure the new town has a Country Park for all the people who expect the countryside to be dry, clean, level and sanitised. The ones who moan about mud, ruts and stray off the paths to avoid getting dirty so eroding the surrounding area as well as the footpaths. Talk so loudly on phones or to others in their group that any wildlife is drowned out or scared off.

#### 6.11

Village heart should run from the Brewery Taps to St. John's Church, Recreation Ground and the Beach Social Club.

#### 6.11.6

Waterbeach Parish Council and S.C.D.C could not even be bothered to clean up Fly Tipping during the "Lockdown". They have a very destructive idea about cemetery maintenance, and Public Foot Path care is minimal. They will not be able to look after any extra paths or street scene improvements.

#### 6.12.1

Were any development contributions sought and paid by any of the developers between Bannold Road and the Married Quarters? If they were, how were they spent? Not on repairs to the roads and pavements wrecked by the developments.

#### 6.13.1

Good sentiment, but how can you enforce local residence employment restrictions – without making some homes tied to the employer?6.14.9

Cafe spilling out onto pavement is a very urban idea. A tea room with a garden would be more in keeping with a village.

#### 6.14.12

No longer rural due the over development. Any insistence, on green building such as solar panels and use of grey water?

#### 6.14.14

Are any of the structures such as Hangers, Water Tank Towers, Blast Shield Walls being retained as part of the airfield history?

WDP10 – Sad lack of it in new estates

WDP11 – The new town will mean Waterbeach is no longer rural.

#### 6.15.5

1. WDP10 States “All” in all locations

6. Off road parking as well as front and rear gardens.

#### 6.16.2

It was better when the open fields and ditches started at Cody Road, not, Bannold Drove and we had more of the old Oak trees.

#### 6.19.2

This demonstrates poor planning procedure – who got the cickbacks for increasing profit by reducing the green space and increasing the amount of saleable units per acre? The drainage basins don't seem to be efficient as Bannold Road and surrounding drains still get flooded by the run off water.

#### 6.20.1

“Benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss” TO WHO?

Who are the Stakeholders?

#### 6.21

Are any “green” building restrictions or demands such as solar panel or the use of grey water being implemented?

#### 6.21.1

You can build the houses to get to the government required numbers, but how is the jobs figure arrived at? Is there already a large new employer committed to location in the area, are the council going to employ more people in the new town? Are there incentives for more employers to relocate here? If there are incentives for new employment is there anything to encourage existing employers to say or expand?

#### 6.21.2

New Towns create their own problems as shown by Haverhill. The population is mainly Cambridge / London overspill. They inflate the prices and tend to be transient, moving to follow jobs. The new Towns soon become shabby and unattractive as they do not live up to the designers and developers P.R. glossy image. They swamp and kill the local and rural nature of the area they are dumped in.

#### 6.21.2/3

The number of new homes will only keep going up.

#### 6.21.10

Due to the large housing stock of married quarters all becoming available at the same time, when the Army / MOD moved out. Lots of properties were bought as buy to lets by investors. So now most of the inhabitants work outside the village. The army worked on the barracks. No wonder we have a lot more traffic.

#### 6.21.14

I guess it will always be adjusted down on grounds of development viability. So Urban & Civic and the others make more profit and build more units. Is anything in place to keep the housing stock as low cost on resale?

#### 6.21.16

Any restrictions on resale?

#### 6.22.6

But in 6.21.14 it was reduced to 30% and that was for an application of 6500 units. Smaller developments are being penalised but massive ones are being appeased. Why? And by Who?

#### 6.22.8

They would stand more of a chance of being met if the 40% was insisted on in all phases of the new town.

#### 6.22.9

“Support in principle” what about in practice. Another get out phrase.

#### 6.23.1

Allocation of affordable housing, the largest element should be to the parish residence.

#### 6.23.7

Another get out phrase, uncertainty. It is most likely that the 40% will be reduced. The % figure costs nothing on paper. It is striking that uncertainty and viability are used when talking about recommendations for the new town, Urban & Civic and others. However implementation of cycle routes through numerous privately owned plots of land can be safeguarded, as they belong to existing



village residence and are apparently of no consequence. Or is it that the N.D.P. is only following planning decisions that benefit themselves in some way?

6.23.9

After 5 years does it all just go back to market forces? Is there any way of imposing restrictions on the number of buy to let/investors for the housing stock?

WAT23

Good, but will it be enforced?

7.1.3

Will the monitoring lead to any action if needed?

8.1.2

Who will the consultant be? Will they be identified to the population of Waterbeach?

8.1.3

Who is monitoring how the Parish Council is spending the S106 contributions.

8.1.9

Why no mention of the Greenway from Denny End to Car Dyke through allotments, homes and private land?

I know this has all been a waste of time, as the decisions have already been made and the consultation is just window dressing. However I would like someone to grow a backbone and answer my questions in writing. Even if it just to prove that my input has been read.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]