

Summary of consultation responses 09.09.2022

South Cambridgeshire District Council - 22/03628/TWA

Lead Councillor - Cllr Hawkins – No comments received.

Air Quality, Environmental Health Team – Initial review. The level crossings are being improved in terms of safety of the public which is welcomed. The EIA scoping request did not identify any significant impact and the application was not subject to an EIA assessment. The re-signalling improvements are for existing level-crossings and therefore no new use or exposure source is introduced. Therefore, no need for an air quality assessment at this stage especially for idling vehicles at the barriers. Any concerns regarding idling vehicles could be managed through traffic management measures.

Contaminated Land, Environmental Health Team – No comments received.

Conservation, BNE-GCSP – No material conservation issues with this proposal.

Ecology, BNE-GCSP – None of the land identified for permanent or temporary acquisition, nor that required for access to the identified sites within either South Cambridgeshire or Cambridge City has any statutory or non-statutory protection. Each site will require individual ecological assessment for protected species.

Trees, BNE-GCSP – No comments received.

Site	Comments received
Waterbeach	<p>Cllr Bearpark – Ward Councillor for Milton and Waterbeach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Under 2018 traffic scenario queues in the morning will reach back to the village green. This could lead to extremely chaotic scenes in the village.• Modelling doesn't take account of the development of the Waterbeach New Town therefore traffic growth is probably too low.• Barrier down times and specifically concerns that Waterbeach Station will become unusable for passenger during peak times, resulting in additional car or cycle trips to North Cambridge or choosing not to travel by train.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future shuttle bus from Waterbeach New Town to the station intended to reduce traffic levels would get stuck in queues. • The crossing is used by residents to access the river. Safety concerns as increased barrier down times could lead to passengers crossing the barriers. Alternative provision required for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the railway line. • Query why a half barrier with obstacle detection has not been considered. <p>Waterbeach Parish Council</p> <p>Sending comments directly to the Secretary of State.</p>
<p>Meldreth (Shepreth)</p>	<p>Shepreth Parish Council</p> <p>Sending comments directly to the Secretary of State</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will increase congestion in the village through substantially increased downtimes, increase the difficulty of traffic flow and the risk of speeding in the of the most densely populated parts of the village. There will also be a deterioration in air quality. • The data underlying the conclusion that the effects on the village will be “minimal” is seriously flawed, being either contradictory, based on averages from other areas or inaccurate. As a minimum, the Parish Council requires consistent data specific to the Meldreth Road and Shepreth crossings be collected, analysed and presented in a transparent and accessible manner before any final decision is made. • Flawed analysis of safety record means that safety benefits have been overestimated. Safety implications of speeding vehicles crossing before barriers come down and entering the residential area. • The reality of significantly longer queues than anticipated in the model means there will be increased pollution and deteriorating air quality. There does not appear to be an assessment of the impact of this on the surrounding

	environment. We would like to see the views of the relevant Environment Officers.
Six Mile Bottom	<p>Cllr for Little Wilbraham & Six Mile Bottom Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land outside the old station is being acquired compulsorily (cars are currently parked here for Station House and 1 Station Cottages) • The VISSIM model suggests there will be significant increased queue possibly justified (p39) because the longer barrier down time 'allows multiple trains to pass at once', but this is single track, with one train each way each hour.
Milton Fen	<p>Milton Parish Council</p> <p>Has no recommendation.</p>
Foxton (Little Shelford)	<p>Little Shelford Parish Council</p> <p>No comments received.</p>

Cambridge City Council - 22/03628/TWA

Lead Councillor - Cllr Thornburrow – Request follow-up on why Fen Road crossing in City was not included in the proposals. This is of huge concern to residents and it was agreed at the North East Forum that GCSP would press Network Rail to consider this. No other questions or comments on the proposals.

Environmental Quality and Growth Team - It is our understanding that this application concerns the compulsory acquirement of land. The majority of the land acquisitions are outside of Cambridge City Council's (CCCs) district and are within South Cambridgeshire District Council's remit. A small parcel of land within CCCs district is located off Long Road. No objections to the acquisition of land. In the event the land is to be developed within future planning applications, this team would likely comment upon construction/demolition and other environmental impacts.

Streets and Open Spaces Team (Open Spaces, Ecology & Trees) – No comments received.

Site	Comments received
Long Road	Cllr Davies – Ward Councillor for Queen Edith’s No objection.