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Planning Statement
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1. INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared by Boyer on behalf of RLW Estates (the Applicant) in support of a Full Planning Application (FPA) for development of a relocated railway station at Waterbeach within South Cambridgeshire District. The new station provides an enhanced facility for the existing village, overcoming existing shortcomings and safety considerations, which will meet growth in background demand, and will ultimately form a key part of the proposed Waterbeach new town.

1.2 Planning permission is sought for a relocated railway station comprising platforms, pedestrian bridges, access road and enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes, car and cycle parking, with other associated facilities and infrastructure. See full description (below) for more detailed breakdown of the scheme.

1.3 Upon relocation of the station it is expected that the existing station would be closed.

1.4 The application site is located to the north-east of Waterbeach on land broadly between Cody Road and the ‘Fen Line’ railway that links Cambridge and King's Lynn, as shown on the Site Location Plan at Appendix 1.

1.5 The site measures approximately 4.87ha. It comprises agricultural land controlled by the applicant, in addition to existing rail land, owned by Network Rail, along with small sections of public highway land, with all parties therefore supportive of the proposed development and its delivery.

1.6 RLW Estates is a joint venture company specifically established to promote and deliver a new town at Waterbeach. It brings together a local landowning Trust, St John’s College, Cambridge, The Royal London Mutual Assurance Company and Cambridge based developer Turnstone Estates.

1.7 The applicant is currently preparing a parallel outline planning application for development forming almost half of the strategic new town allocation proposed within Policy S/6 of the Draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, referred to as Waterbeach New Town East.

1.8 The remainder of the Waterbeach new town allocation site is the subject of a current outline planning application (ref: S/0559/17/OL) submitted jointly by the Secretary of State for Defence and Urban&Civic Plc. (U&C) in February 2017.
1.9 The requirement for a relocated railway station to serve the new town is specified within Policy SS/5, which sets out the details for the allocation, in addition to being embedded within other relevant strategy documents, including the recently issued Ely to Cambridge Corridor Transport Study (January 2018). This statement provides an overview and assessment of the policy basis for the proposed new station in the context of the new town. However, it also presents the robust case that exists for provision of an improved relocated railway station to serve Waterbeach in any event, given clear physical constraints and shortcomings at the existing station location.

1.10 The proposals that are the subject of this current full planning application will secure an initial station format that represents an improvement over the current station in a number of respects, offering an enhanced facility to the existing village. Furthermore, in the context of the emerging new settlement, this will enable early delivery of this key transport infrastructure that will support the establishment of sustainable travel patterns from the outset.

1.11 The RLW Estates outline planning application covering the eastern part of the new town scheme will also include the area of the new station, facilitating further development and refinement of this facility through subsequent reserved matters applications.

**Application Documents**

1.12 The application comprises and is supported by the documents listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report/Plan</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 App Planning Application Forms</td>
<td>Noise impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Plans (including landscaping and car parking details)</td>
<td>Parking provision (see TA and Plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and access statement</td>
<td>Draft S106 Heads of Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality assessment</td>
<td>Planning statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological assessment</td>
<td>Outline site waste management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk assessment</td>
<td>Transport assessment (with Travel Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foul sewerage and utilities assessment</td>
<td>Tree survey/implications assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land contamination assessment</td>
<td>Sustainability statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial external lighting assessment</td>
<td>Health impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and visual appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


EIA Screening

1.13 A request for an EIA Screening Opinion in connection with the proposed development was originally submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), dated 9th September 2017 (see Appendix 2). This was withdrawn on 23rd November 2017 and replaced by a revised screening request, dated 21st November 2017, principally reflecting amendment to the site boundary. This related to inclusion of land associated with the provision of vehicular access from Cody Road, and use of Bannold Drove solely for pedestrians and cyclists in respect of access to the new station. These revisions resulted from pre-application discussions with officers at SCDC as the Highway Authority, and accord with the current application.

1.14 The EIA Screening Opinion issued by SCDC on 11th December 2017 confirmed that EIA is not required in relation to the project, having considered the request against the relevant provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (see Appendix 3).

Planning Statement Format

1.15 The remainder of this planning statement follows the format set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Site and Surroundings</td>
<td>Describes the application site, having regard also to its relationship to the surrounding area, including the existing village of Waterbeach, and other key land uses, including the proposed Waterbeach new town strategic allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proposed Development</td>
<td>Explains the nature of the proposed development, including the various land use and structural elements proposed, having regard to the formal application material and supporting information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Sets out a summary of consultation activities undertaken with a range of rail industry, local authority and public stakeholders, helping to inform the development proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planning Policy Context</td>
<td>Provides an overview of relevant national and local planning policies and guidance, including the NPPF, Development Plan and supplementary planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Planning Considerations</td>
<td>Sets out an assessment of the proposed development against the policy requirements identified, underlining the sustainable nature of the proposals and their overall compliance with the relevant policy framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Draws a number of conclusions from the preceding assessment, including consideration of the appropriate planning balance and ultimately presenting the reasons that full planning permission should be granted to assist the decision maker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Site location and description

2.1 The application site is located to the north east of the village of Waterbeach, and includes land in the vicinity of the former barracks.

2.2 The site is irregular in shape and extends to approximately 10ha.

2.3 It comprises land broadly between Bannold Drove and the ‘Fen Line’ railway that links Cambridge and King’s Lynn, as shown on the Site Location Plan at Appendix 1. The site includes land along Cody Road, Bannold Drove and a corridor of land between these two roads, immediately to the north of Capper Road, in addition to land within the existing railway corridor itself.

2.4 A narrow strip of land is also included on the eastern side of the railway line, running from Bannold Road in the south to the northern limits of the site.

2.5 The site is controlled primarily by the applicant, comprising agricultural land, in addition to existing railway land, owned by Network Rail, and public highway land. All parties have been engaged in pre-application discussions and are supportive of the proposals’ delivery.

Surrounding context

2.6 The site lies at the northern fringes of the existing Waterbeach village at the interface between the village and the former Waterbeach barracks.

2.7 To the east of the site is agricultural land between the railway and Long Drove, which runs parallel to the rail corridor.

2.8 Dwellings within the Annington Estate, comprising principally Kirby Road and Capper Road lie to the south of the proposed new access road, as well as being flanked by the elements of the site along Cody Road and Bannold Drove.

2.9 To the west of the site are buildings within the former barracks complex, and a short distance to the north is the Waste Water Recycling Centre operated by Anglian Water, set within agricultural fields.

2.10 Buildings associated with Midload Farm are located on the eastern side of Bannold Drove, whilst residential development approved in recent years, within a series of sites, lying to the east and west of Cody Road and north of Bannold Road, are also in proximity to the access routes for the scheme.
3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Proposed Development

3.1 Full planning permission is sought on behalf of RLW Estates for development comprising the following elements:

- A two platform station with partial shelter on either side of the existing railway line;
- Two pedestrian bridges spanning between the new platforms (one with accessible lift, one step only);
- Surface level car park;
- Cycle parking provision;
- Bus stops;
- Taxi rank;
- Passenger drop-off area;
- Emergency pedestrian escape route from the platforms via overbridges;
- Staff welfare facilities within portakabin;
- Access road from the eastern side of Cody Road to the station car park, providing access for buses, taxis and private vehicular traffic associated with the railway station;
- Hard and soft landscaping including Sustainable Drainage System, bund and boundary fencing; and
- Platform lighting, station information and surveillance systems.

3.2 Beyond the application site it is envisaged that further minor works would be undertaken to the highway network (within Public Highway Land), including:

- Resurfacing of the southern section of Bannold Drove and introduction of stud lighting to improve attractiveness for pedestrian and cycle movements (and for existing vehicular traffic associated with Midload Farm);
- Traffic calming and footway enhancements along Cody Road;
- Traffic calming and cycle/pedestrian priority measures on Way Lane.

3.3 It is proposed that such works would be implemented either via a payment to the Local Highway Authority for undertaking the works or under a Highway Agreement (Section 278) for the works to be undertaken by the developer at its own cost. The s106 Heads of Terms submitted in support of this planning application provide further details, alongside other potential obligations associated with the proposed development, aimed at ensuring their acceptability in planning terms, including:

- Provision of a subsidised (free at the point of use) shuttle service linking the southern part of Waterbeach village with the relocated station to facilitate accessibility;
- A station car parking management scheme (relating to free car parking) to ensure that on-street parking in the local area is prevented.
3.4 The station will be constructed with platforms to cater for 8-car trains, at 170m length, and permission is therefore sought within this application on this basis. Passive provision for future expansion to accommodate 12-car trains (250m) is however also safeguarded through the availability of land at either end of the proposed platforms, to cater for increased stopping frequencies and to meet the substantial increase in passenger demand anticipated over time.

3.5 Further details of the proposed relocated station development, including the design rationale, access and modal interchange arrangements and longer-term integration with the masterplan for the wider new town development (to be the subject of a separate outline planning application and subsequent reserved matters submissions), are set out within the Design and Access Statement that accompanies this planning application.
4. **STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

**Introduction**

4.1 The proposed development has been the subject of considerable engagement with a wide range of stakeholders over a significant period of time, as an integral part of the promotion of the new settlement proposals through Structure Plan, Regional Plan and Local Plan preparation processes.

4.2 This has included technical discussions with various sectors of the rail industry, with SCDC and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) in the context of formal pre-application engagement and with the local community through a series of public consultation events. Full details of these activities are set out in the Transport Statement (in respect of the technical rail sector engagement) and Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), whilst a broad overview is presented below.

**Rail Industry Engagement**

4.3 Engagement with the rail industry has included technical discussions with Network Rail, and other elements of the sector, such as the Department for Transport (DfT) and the Train Operating Company (TOC), as well as rail lobby groups such as the East Anglia branch of RailFuture, independent advocates of an enhanced rail network within the region.

4.4 Work has been progressed through the rail industry’s Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) process. Network Rail have worked closely with RLW Estates and their consultants on a GRIP2 and emerging GRIP3 study that is being prepared in parallel with the planning application.

4.5 The geometry of the station and the integration with the station facilities will be accessible for the intended user groups which includes wheelchair users and those of impaired mobility. Network Rail acknowledge the significant and unacceptable impacts that the proposed new town would ultimately create at the existing station and support the delivery of the proposed station as the best and most appropriate mitigation for this impact.

4.6 Network Rail has set out strict requirements for the delivery of the new station to ensure that accessibility to the relocated station is maximised for existing passengers where reasonably practical. This requirement is being discharged by locating the station as far south as possible and providing improved pedestrian and cycle infrastructure from the village to the new station.
SCDC Pre-application Engagement

4.7 RLW Estates has entered into a Planning Performance Agreement with SCDC and CCC covering both the Outline Planning Application for Waterbeach New Town East and this Full Planning Application for the relocated railway station. This has facilitated a programme of pre-application meetings covering a range of topic areas. The rail station proposals have featured across the sessions, and particularly those focussed on transport matters, as well as being the subject of two specific dedicated meetings as part of this process, on 19th October 2017 and 15th December 2017.

4.8 Within these pre-application meetings the proposed approach to the applications in respect of the station relocation and associated land uses within both the initial full application and the longer-term vision to be pursued through the outline and subsequent reserved matters application was discussed. Other matters debated included the strategy for accessing the relocated station, in respect of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connectivity (initially with the existing village and passengers from the surrounding area, but also for residents of the new town in due course); design considerations, with particular regard to the proposed bridges between the new platforms; and potential mitigation measures to be secured within a Section 106 Agreement; as well as reaching agreement over the validation requirements to support the application.

Public Consultation

4.9 The RLW Estates team has attended a number of parish council meetings to discuss both applications (with further details set out in the SCI).

4.10 In respect of more formal pre-application public consultation the station relocation proposals have featured in a series of public exhibitions during 2017 and early 2018. These were held at the Salvation Army Hall, close to the existing Waterbeach railway station, on 22nd April 2017, and 24th and 25th November 2017 covering all aspects of Waterbeach New Town East, including the new station. A further session relating specifically to the station relocation scheme and application was held at the same venue on 20th January 2018. Further information on these events, including the material presented and overview and analysis of the consultation responses collected, are included within the SCI.
5. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Introduction

5.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) establishes that any application for development should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In England, such material considerations include the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012), which sets out the strategic planning policy to which all Development Plans and planning decisions should accord, and National Planning Practice Guidance.

5.2 The requirement for a new railway station at Waterbeach, in the context of a proposed new settlement to the north of the existing village, is contained explicitly within the emerging South Cambridgeshire Local Plan covering the period to 2031.

5.3 The planning policy context for the new station is set out below, with reference to national and local policies and guidance, in respect of both explicit requirement for delivery of a relocated station in association with the new town and more generally in terms of policies that would support development of a new station in the context of the pursuit of sustainable development in any event.

National Planning Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework

5.4 The NPPF sets the Government’s strategic planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied in the plan-making and decision-taking processes. The primary purpose of planning is stated to be the pursuit of sustainable development.

5.5 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF defines sustainable development in terms of its economic, social and environmental roles. This includes contributing to building a strong, responsible and competitive economy, supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities and contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. Paragraph 8 states that these roles are mutually dependent, and therefore cannot be undertaken in isolation.

5.6 The importance of pursuing sustainable development through planning is emphasised in Paragraph 14, as follows:

“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.

For decision-taking this means:

- Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

5.7 Paragraphs 186 and 187 further note that local planning authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

5.8 Paragraph 17 sets out a series of 12 core land use planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Of greatest relevance to this application are that planning should:

- not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;
- always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
- support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy);
- actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable;
- take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

5.9 Chapter 4 is concerned with “promoting sustainable transport” and states that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development, but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives.

5.10 It is noted at Paragraph 29 that “the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel”, whilst Paragraph 30 requires encouragement to be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion, and states that “local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.”

5.11 It is expressed, at Paragraph 31 that local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities.
5.12 In respect of specific application requirements it is set out (at Paragraph 32) that all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment, and that plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. [Our emphasis].

5.13 Paragraph 34 reiterates that plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. The subsequent paragraph states that plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people, with the requirement for a Travel Plan recorded as a key tool in achieving this (Paragraph 36). Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to (inter alia):

- give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities;
- create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones;
- incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles; and
- consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

5.14 It is noted that local planning authorities should identify and protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice (Paragraph 41).

5.15 Chapter 7 focusses on “requiring good design”, setting out the need for development to respond to local character and be visually attractive, as well as emphasising the integration of development into the surrounding natural and built environment. Paragraph 56 notes that “Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.”

5.16 Chapter 10 addresses the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change. Paragraph 99 requires new development to be “planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change.”

5.17 Chapter 11 requires that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, with Paragraph 109 including reference to minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible. Paragraph 118 provides further detail on the approach to be taken in the context of determining planning applications.
5.18 The issues of pollution risk and land instability are addressed at Paragraph 120, with a requirement to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The effects of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account.

5.19 Noise considerations are covered within Paragraph 123, in respect of avoidance of significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life, including scope to secure appropriate mitigation measures. The issue of artificial lighting is addressed at Paragraph 125, with encouragement given to good design to limit light pollution, amenity and nature conservation impacts.

5.20 The NPPF also sets out policies on ensuring viability and deliverability of developments, stating that such matters are relevant to pursuit of sustainable development (Paragraph 173), as well as specifying the approach to seeking planning obligations (Paragraph 204) and applying conditions (Paragraph 206).

*National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)*

5.21 The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) website was launched on 6th March 2014 and has since been reviewed and updated several times. As well as amplifying and clarifying policy contained within the NPPF in respect of a range of technical topics, the NPPG also provides guidance on procedural and practical matters associated with aspects of the planning system, including submission and determination of applications and appeals.

5.22 Technical topics addressed that are of particular relevance to this planning application include:

- Air quality;
- Climate change;
- Design;
- Flood risk and coastal change;
- Health and wellbeing;
- Land affected by contamination;
- Light pollution;
- Natural environment;
- Noise;
- Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements;
- Waste.

*Local Planning Policy Context*

*Adopted Development Plan*

5.23 The existing statutory Development Plan for South Cambridgeshire comprises:
• South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, which includes: the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) (January 2007) and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (DCP) (July 2007);
• Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2011); and,
• Local Plan 2004 ‘Saved’ Policy CNF6. This saved policy is not relevant to the Proposed Development as it relates to an area of Chesterton Fen Road, Cambridge and deals with applications for Gypsy and Traveller site.

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) (January 2007)

5.24 The CS forms part of a suite of Development Plan Documents within the Local Development Framework for South Cambridgeshire, which sets out policies and proposals for the development and use of land in the district, covering the period to 2016. The CS sets out the strategic vision and objectives for South Cambridgeshire, together with strategic policies for development.

5.25 In the preparation of the CS, the land at Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield was considered as a potential location for the delivery of housing to meet the need beyond the Plan period. Within the Inspector’s Report of The Examination (9th November 2006), it was noted that the site presents an option for longer term development beyond 2016, for which the level of need could not be determined at that time, and should therefore wait for the first review of the Core Strategy.

5.26 The emerging Local Plan policy framework, which will replace the Core Strategy, is addressed below.

Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (DCP) (July 2007)

5.27 Alongside the CS, the DCP is included in the suite of statutorily adopted Development Plan Documents within the Local Development Framework for South Cambridgeshire. It sets out the principles, policies and proposals that govern the development and use of land in the district, over the period to 2016.

5.28 The DCP policies and related objectives referred to below are directly relevant to the Proposed Development. Whilst it is acknowledged that DPD is now dated, the policies below are deemed to be consistent with the more up-to-date provisions of the NPPF.

Development Principles

5.29 The DCP states that “there are a number of principles that need to be taken into account fully in new development, … so that the special qualities of the area remain” (Para 2.2). These include the following relevant objectives:

• DP/a To ensure essential infrastructure is provided appropriately.
• DP/b To ensure provision of appropriate community facilities to meet the needs of new developments, working in partnership with other service providers and voluntary organisations.
- DP/c To ensure that new development, activities and uses of land uphold and promote the principles of sustainable development.
- DP/d To ensure high quality new development that protects and enhances the character of the district and local distinctiveness through careful integration with the existing built form.
- DP/e To ensure that major new developments create distinctive, sustainable and healthy environments that meet the needs of residents and users, and contribute towards the creation of vibrant socially inclusive communities.
- DP/f To ensure that all new development makes appropriate provision of services and infrastructure to meet its needs.

5.30 In line with the NPPF, Policy DP/1 (Sustainable Development) seeks to ensure that only development consistent with the principles of sustainable development will be permitted. Through 18 criteria the policy “draws together sustainability issues to ensure that the fundamental principles of sustainable development underpin all development proposals” (Para 2.4).

5.31 Policy DP/2 (Design of New Development) requires all new development to be of high quality design and sets out specific provisions against which the design of new development will be assessed.

5.32 Policy DP/3 (Development Criteria) catalogues the requirements of all development proposals, as appropriate to the nature, scale and economic viability, including (inter alia) the provision of safe and appropriate access from the highway network, enhanced public and community transport; minimum car parking standards; safe and secure cycle parking; safe and convenient access for all to public buildings and spaces; screened refuse storage, and a design and layout that minimises opportunities for crime.

5.33 Policy DP/4 (Infrastructure and New Developments) seeks to ensure that new development makes suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. In addition, the policy indicates that contributions may also be required towards the future maintenance and upkeep of facilities.

5.34 Policy DP/6 (Construction Methods) guards against adverse impacts upon the local environment and amenity during construction.

_I Natural Environment_

5.35 South Cambridgeshire District Council seeks to apply the principles of international commitments to sustainable development and sustainability. The following relevant objectives are therefore prescribed, together with policies that ensure that the wide ranging issues are taken into account:

- NE/a To address climate change mitigation and adaptation issues including the need to ensure that new developments are “climate proofed”.
- NE/b To protect and enhance the character and appearance of landscapes and natural heritage.
• NE/c To protect and enhance biodiversity.
• NE/d To protect and improve the quality of the water environment.
• NE/e To protect and improve the ambient noise environment.
• NE/f To minimise light pollution.
• NE/g To safeguard resources by maximising the re-use and recycling of materials.
• NE/h To ensure that any risks to human health or the environment are addressed in the re-use of land.
• NE/i To protect and improve air quality.
• NE/j To protect high quality agricultural land.

5.36 Policy NE/1 (Energy Efficiency) requires development to achieve a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of new buildings. In addition, Policy NE/3 (Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development) states that all major development proposals should include technology for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of predicted energy requirements.

5.37 Policy NE/4 (Landscape Character Areas) states that “development will only be permitted where it respects and retains or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the individual Landscape Character Area in which it is located”.

5.38 Under Policy NE/6 (Biodiversity), new development will be required to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity.

5.39 Policy NE/9 (Water and Drainage Infrastructure) indicates that planning permission will not be granted where there is inadequate water supply, sewerage or land drainage systems available to meet the demands of the development.

5.40 Policy NE/11 (Flood Risk) indicates that in relation to flood risk, all applications for planning permission will be judged against national policy.

5.41 Policy NE/14 (Lighting Proposals) seeks to ensure that external lighting is kept to a minimum to protect against light pollution, spillage, adverse impacts on residents and the surrounding countryside, or distractions to highways users.

5.42 Policy NE/15 (Noise Pollution) indicates that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an unacceptable impact on existing or planned development, or the surrounding countryside.

5.43 Policy NE/16 (Emissions) seeks to ensure that air quality is appropriately considered and any emissions arising from a development is minimised, including indirect emissions such as those attributable to associated traffic generation, in order to control any risks arising.

Cultural Heritage

5.44 The DCP sets out the following objectives (inter alia) for the protection of the historic environment within South Cambridgeshire:

• CH/a To protect historic landscapes and public rights of way.
- CH/b To protect, preserve and enhance the archaeological heritage.
- CH/c To maintain the character of villages including important open areas.
- CH/e To protect Listed Buildings and their settings.

**Travel**

5.45 Through the following Travel objectives, and in line with Government policy, South Cambridgeshire District Council seeks to promote more sustainable transport choices, to improve access to major trip generators by non-motorised modes, and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car:

- TR/a To provide a transport system that meets the needs of the economy.
- TR/b To reduce the need to travel, and where travel is unavoidable, to increase the use of sustainable modes.
- TR/c To promote the use of more sustainable modes of travel such as public transport, community transport, walking and cycling by making such modes more integrated, highly accessible, safer and more attractive to use.
- TR/d To promote sustainable travel by ensuring new development takes place in locations with, or with potential for, good accessibility by non-motorised modes to facilities and services and ensuring provision for all transport modes.
- TR/e To minimise the amount of car parking provided in new developments, within the context of maximum car parking standards, compatible with its location and availability of alternative transport modes, to avoid over-reliance on the car.
- TR/f To promote a healthy lifestyle through travel choice.
- TR/g To improve the safety of travel for all people and all modes, including measures to reduce the number and severity of road accidents.
- TR/h To improve personal safety and accessibility for all modes and all people, including those with disabilities.
- TR/i To reduce the environmental impact of travel, to conserve energy and reduce air pollution by limiting the growth in road traffic.
- TR/j To provide transport proposals that protect or enhance the built and natural environment.
- TR/k To safeguard land for highways and other transport proposals.
- TR/l To encourage the provision of transport improvements through the development process.

5.46 Under Policy TR/1 (Planning for More Sustainable Travel) planning permission will not be granted for development which is likely to give rise to a material increase in travel demands unless the site has (or will attain) a sufficient standard of accessibility to offer an appropriate choice of travel by public transport or other non-car travel mode(s).

5.47 Policy TR/2 (Car and Cycle Parking Standards) requires car parking to be provided in accordance with the maximum standards set out, and will seek opportunities minimise provision in order to reduce the over-reliance on the car and to promote more sustainable forms of transport.
5.48 Policy TR/3 (Mitigating Travel Impact) of the DCP requires new developments to mitigate their travel impact, including their environmental impacts (such as noise, pollution, and impacts on amenity and health). The policy requires adequate provision to be made for integrated and improved transport infrastructure or appropriate mitigation measures, through direct improvements and Section 106 contributions.

Emerging Local policy and guidance

5.49 The emerging South Cambridgeshire Local Plan will provide planning policies and land allocations to guide development in the district to 2031. On adoption of the Local Plan, the Core Strategy, Development Control Policies DPD, Site Specific Policies DPD and 'saved' Policy CNF6 from the Local Plan 2004 will be revoked in their entirety.

5.50 South Cambridgeshire District Council began gathering evidence and preparing their Local Plan in 2011. Following various rounds of consultation on Issues and Options, and the Proposed Submission version in 2013, the Council submitted their Local Plan for independent examination to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in March 2014, alongside the Cambridge Local Plan. The examinations commenced in November 2014.

5.51 During the course of 2015 and 2016, the Councils undertook further analysis and consulted on modifications proposed to address concerns raised by the Inspectors in May 2015, particularly in relation to housing need. The consultation responses, evidence base documents and associated proposed modifications were submitted for consideration by the Inspectors in March 2016.

5.52 Since then, the Council has progressed further proposed modifications, which were submitted to the Inspectors in November 2016, and which are the subject of public consultation between 5th January and 16th February 2018. This includes modifications relating to Policies SS/5 and SS/6 for the proposed New Settlements of Waterbeach New Town and Bourn Airfield New Village, to state that Supplementary Planning Documents will be prepared instead of Area Action Plans, and also to make other consequential changes to the policies.

The Submission Local Plan (July 2013) as Proposed to be Modified (March 2016 and November 2016 Modifications)

5.53 Policy S/1 provides the Vision for the Emerging Local Plan:

“South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live, work and study in the country. Our district will demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth. Our residents will have a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment”.

5.54 To secure this Vision, six objectives are set out through Policy S/2 (Objectives of the Local Plan):
“a. To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire’s position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.

b. To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.

c. To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.

d. To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.

e. To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.

f. To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.”

5.55 Policy S/3 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) asserts that the Council will take a positive approach to development, reflecting the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development.

5.56 The strategy for development within the district over the plan period is set out under Policy S/6 (The Development Strategy to 2031), including identification of a new strategic scale allocation for housing-led development with associated employment and supporting services and facilities in the form of a new town north of Waterbeach.

5.57 Policy SS/5 (Waterbeach New Town) relates to the strategic site allocation for the proposed new settlement at Waterbeach and states that “a new town of approximately 8,000 to 9,000 dwellings and associated uses is proposed on the former Waterbeach Barracks and land to the east and north as shown on the Policies Map. A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will be prepared for the new town as addressed at subsection 17 of this policy.”

5.58 The policy specifies that “appropriate integration should be secured by the provision of suitable links to enable the residents of Waterbeach village to have convenient access to the services and facilities in the new town but with limited and controlled opportunities for direct road access from the wider new town to Waterbeach, with emphasis on connections by public transport, cycle and on foot.”
5.59 The policy goes on to state at criteria 4, that “It will deliver an example of excellence in sustainable development and healthier living, which will make a significant contribution to the long term development needs of the Cambridge area. It will deliver high quality public transport links to Cambridge, including a relocated railway station, to enable a high modal share of travel by means other than the car.”

5.60 Policy SS/5 sets out a range of requirements to be addressed within proposals, against which proposals will be assessed. Those most relevant to this application include that the new town will:

“Incorporate necessary mitigation to sensitive receptor boundaries, with regard to noise and odour, including from the… proposed railway station….to ensure no significant adverse impact on quality of life / amenity and health using separation distances or acoustic earth bunding rather than physical barriers if appropriate and where practicable.”

5.61 Criteria 11 of Policy SS/5 specifies the requirement for creation of a comprehensive movement network, with an emphasis on encouraging the use of sustainable travel modes, with “Provision of a relocated Waterbeach station with appropriate access arrangements by all modes to serve the village and the new town” featuring as a prominent requirement (i).

5.62 Policy CC/1 (Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change) indicates that planning permission will only be granted where it has been demonstrated through a Sustainability Statement that the proposal embeds the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation into the development.

5.63 Policies CC/7 (Water Quality), CC/8 (Sustainable Drainage Systems) and Policy CC/9 (Managing Flood Risk) relate to the protection and enhancement of water quality, the incorporation of sustainable surface water drainage systems (SuDS), appropriate to the nature of the site, and minimising flood risk.

5.64 Protection of the natural and historic environment is provided through Chapter 6 of the Emerging Local Plan. Policies NH/2, NH/3, NH/4 and NH/14, as set out below, are all relevant to aspects of the proposed development.

5.65 Policy NH/2 (Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character) provides that development will only be permitted where it respects and retains, or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which is it located.

5.66 Policy NH/3 (Protecting Agricultural Land) protects good quality agricultural land unless land has been allocated for development.

5.67 Policy NH/4 (Biodiversity) requires that new development must aim to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity, and opportunities should be taken to achieve positive gain through the form and design of development.
5.68 In relation to the historic environment, Policy NH/14 (Heritage Assets) indicates that development proposals will be supported when they sustain and enhance the special character and distinctiveness of the district’s historic environment including its villages and countryside and its building traditions and details; they create new high quality environments with a strong sense of place by responding to local heritage character including in innovative ways; and when they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings.

5.69 Policy SC/2 (Health Impact Assessment) seeks to ensure that new developments have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of new and existing residents.

5.70 Policy SC/4 (Meeting Community Needs) addresses provision of the services and facilities needed to support a new community including the range of the provision, accessibility, delivery, a management and maintenance and support through the early phases.

5.71 Policies SC/10 (Lighting Proposals), SC/11 (Noise Pollution), SC/12 (Contaminated Land), SC/13 (Air Quality), SC/15 (Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air) address environmental impact considerations which are all relevant considerations in relation to the Proposed Development.

5.72 Policy TI/2 (Planning for Sustainable Travel) provides an overarching policy to ensure development is designed and located to reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable travel. Development that is likely to give rise to increased travel demand is required to achieve sufficient integration and accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport; make provision to mitigate impacts; demonstrate that opportunities for sustainable travel have been maximised (through a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan related to the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan).

5.73 Policy TI/3 (Parking Provision) states that parking should be addressed through a design-led approach in accordance with the relevant standards set out within the Plan.

5.74 Policy TI/8 (Infrastructure and New Developments) seeks to ensure that suitable arrangements having been made for the improvement or provision of infrastructure to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011)

5.75 Part of the Application Site is within a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) as shown on Proposals Map C: Mineral Safeguarding Areas. As indicated within the Core Strategy (paragraph 9.3-9.5), the purpose of MSAs is to ensure that mineral resources are adequately considered in all land use planning decisions. MSAs do not necessarily preclude other forms of development taking place, or identify areas for future extraction, but indicate the potential presence of mineral reserves so that they are not unknowingly or needlessly sterilised by development.
5.76 There is a proven mineral resource in the general locality of the application site, which is considered to be a significant resource. Whilst this will not prevent development from coming forward, in line with the principles of the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (Policy CS42) the County Council as Mineral Planning Authority will seek to ensure that any mineral extracted during development is put to a sustainable use.

Draft Waterbeach New Town SPD

5.77 In accordance with Policy SS/5 of the emerging Local Plan (see above) preparation of a supplementary planning document for Waterbeach New Town is underway, with consultants Arup having been appointed to prepare this on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

5.78 It is anticipated that the SPD will highlight the importance of delivering a relocated rail station as part of the public transport strategy, emphasising the need to ensure easy access on foot or by bike to allow efficient multi-modal travel in support of sustainable travel choices. It is understood that this will underline the policy requirement for achievement of the station within the context of the new settlement, along with a range of associated uses.

Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan

5.79 Waterbeach Parish Council are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, relating to the whole of the Parish area, including the proposed Strategic New Town Site. As yet, the Neighbourhood Plan has not been published for first consultation.

Ely to Cambridge Corridor Transport Study

5.80 The Preliminary Strategic Outline Business Case, prepared by consultants Mott MacDonald on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council was published January 2018, setting out the findings of a transport study into the transport network linking Ely and Fenland to Cambridge and the strategic transport network in the county of Cambridgeshire.

5.81 The purpose of the study was to explore the perceived capacity constraints that were seen to be threatening growth within the corridor (with identified sites, including the new town north of Waterbeach, due to deliver 17,000 new homes and 14,000 new jobs), and to develop and deliver a package of transport measures both to address the problems experienced today and to manage the impacts of growth.

5.82 The report includes information on the growth in patronage at the existing Waterbeach Station, which in the context of the corridor as a whole has seen the proportionately greatest growth, handling over five times as many passengers as it did in 1997/98.

5.83 Within the report delivery of a relocated railway station at Waterbeach, closer to the new town, features prominently within the recommended strategy (and indeed included within each of the options tested), being included within a package of “quick wins” comprising public transport, pedestrian and cycle enhancements and active parking restraint to promote mode shift away from the private car.
5.84 Whilst further outputs of the study are still awaited it is evident that early delivery of a relocated station to serve both the existing village and the proposed new settlement is regarded as a key element of the recommended strategy to support achievement of sustainable growth within the corridor.

*Other Transport Strategy Documents*

5.85 In addition to the emerging findings of the Ely to Cambridge Corridor Study it is evident that further transport strategy documents provide additional acknowledgement of the proposed strategic growth at Waterbeach and support the need for associated improvements to rail facilities.

5.86 The Cambridgeshire Long Term Transport Strategy (LTTS, July 2015) which forms part of the Local Transport Plan refers to the new town at Waterbeach Barracks, highlighting the great potential to achieve further increases in rail travel through a range of measures, including (among other things) building the case for opening new railway stations.

5.87 The Transport Strategy for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC, March 2014) refers to the new station at Waterbeach as a planned improvement in a number of places. These include Policy TSCSC 7, in respect of supporting sustainable growth, TSCSC 10, specifically in terms of bringing forward service enhancements and new infrastructure to increase rail use.

5.88 *In this context it is noted that “A critical part of the transport package for the planned new town on the Waterbeach Barracks site will be a replacement station to cater for both the village and the new town. This station will need to be capable of taking longer trains that will run on the line north of Cambridge after the commencement of the new Thameslink timetable in 2018.”* Figures 4.2 and 4.7 explicitly show a new transport hub at the Waterbeach Barracks site and the new Waterbeach Station as a planned improvement respectively.
6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

6.1 Within this chapter assessment of the relevant planning considerations, in the context of the planning policy framework set out in preceding sections, is presented, having regard to legislative requirements and the relative weight to be afforded to planning policies and to other material factors.

6.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires that any application for development should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. In England, such material considerations include the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), with Paragraph 2 of the former confirming this.

6.3 The NPPF requires (at Paragraph 215) that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. Such considerations would apply to the adopted Local Plan documents, which although adopted prior to publication of the Framework, are held to be in broad accordance.

6.4 The Framework also addresses the issue of weight that can be afforded to relevant policies in emerging plans, with Paragraph 216 advocating this according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)."

6.5 It is evident that significant weight should generally be applied to the emerging Local Plan, given the advanced stage that this has reached, having been the subject of a lengthy Examination (which itself is now in its latter phases), and given that relevant policies are considered consistent with the NPPF. Whilst the final set of proposed modifications are currently being consulted upon, it is considered that the issue of requiring relocation of the railway station in the context of the proposed new town has long been established, and is supported by other evidence base and strategy documents.
The Principle of Development

Need for relocated station location at Waterbeach

6.6 There is a robust case in support of the proposed new station location in order to address current shortcomings and safety concerns at the existing station.

6.7 There are a number of operational and safety concerns with the existing station and its access and parking arrangements, including:

- The ALCRM assessment of the Automatic Half Barrier Level (AHB) Crossing will continue to show a high level of risk, which may increase further as users of the crossing increase;
- There will be increased congestion at the platform accesses with Station Road / Clayhithe Road, with further potential for spilling out onto the carriageway and therefore bringing pedestrians into conflict with vehicular traffic;
- There will be increased demand for cycle parking, and because the existing supply on the northbound platform is at capacity, there would be inappropriate cycle parking at, for example the fencing along Station Road. This could further impede what is already a relatively poor quality pedestrian route along Station Road between the station and the rest of the village;
- There will be increased demand for car parking, most of which will occur on-street. For existing 2017 conditions there is demand for 145 spaces but only 73 spaces. The demand would increase to 189 spaces with background growth to 2021. Some of this additional displaced parking may be inappropriate and affect road users' inter-visibility, for example pedestrians crossing roads between parked vehicles, and parking around junction radii. Some of the parking may also straddle footways, as it currently does on Station Road between the Church and Chapel Close, and impede pedestrian movement.

6.8 These are each considered significant road safety concerns with the existing station, which will only be exacerbated through background growth in passenger numbers in the years to come. The Transport Assessment supporting this application sets out that over the last ten years growth of 30.3% has been experienced, equating to an average increase of 6.8% per annum.

6.9 The relocation of the station will therefore have the following direct benefits:

- Allow the creation of a modern accessible station, with facilities appropriate for the level of patronage;
- Provide capacity for 8-car trains whilst facilitating future expansion to 12-car trains and increased stopping frequencies to meet the substantial increase in passenger demand;
- Provide plentiful cycle parking to cater for peak use;
- Provide free car parking to avoid commuter parking on residential streets;
- Provide bus stops and dedicated drop off facilities away from the public highway;
- Reduce pedestrian, cycle and car use of the Station Road level crossing, reducing the risk of serious accidents occurring;
- Remove the blight of commuter parking from the village streets between Greenside and Lode Avenue.

6.10 Overall, the relocated station will provide a significantly enhanced transport interchange compared to the existing station, in terms of safety and convenience of station users and more suitable for accommodating future patronage growth.

**Adopted Local Plan support for sustainable travel**

6.11 The proposed relocation and improvement of the railway station can be seen to accord with the “Travel” objectives of the adopted Core Strategy, including in particular TR/a, TR/b, TR/c and TR/d in respect of provision of a transport system that meets the needs of the economy, increases and promotes the use of sustainable modes, such as public transport, and makes such modes more integrated, accessible, safer and more attractive to use. These latter aspects are particular pertinent in light of the advantages notes above in respect of ensuring improvements over the existing situation.

**Strategic growth location context**

6.12 The requirement for a relocated railway station in this location is a clear and important part of the strategy for creation of a sustainable new town on land comprising the former barracks and neighbouring agricultural land to the north of Waterbeach village.

6.13 In respect of the principle of strategic growth in this location, as noted in the previous chapter, the potential of the site to meet future development needs, beyond 2016, was previously highlighted in the Inspector’s Report into the examination of the adopted Core Strategy. This in turn follows earlier acknowledgement of such potential within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan EIP: Report of the Panel (2003). The EIP Panel had considered alternative locations and concluded that there was little to choose between Waterbeach and Northstowe, ultimately supporting the latter. They concluded that in the longer term a second new settlement was likely to be required and Waterbeach would be favoured.

6.14 In para. 9.82 of the report the Panel added: “However, should a second new settlement be required to meet the development requirements of the Cambridge Sub-Region, either towards the end of the Plan period or, more likely, beyond 2016, we would regard Waterbeach as the most sustainable of the locations we have examined at the EIP.”

6.15 The emerging Local Plan confirms the allocation of strategic scale development as a key plank of the development strategy for the district within Policy S/6 in the form of a new town north of Waterbeach. Within the Submission Draft Local Plan this was anticipated to commence delivery within the latter part of the plan period, beyond 2026, with a cap set at 1,400 dwellings within the plan period. Subsequent modifications have however proposed removal of such phasing restrictions, therefore supporting delivery throughout the plan period and beyond.
Emerging Local Plan policy requirement for relocated station

6.16 It is also evident that the provision of a relocated railway station within the boundary of the new town allocation is an important, indeed a required, element of the New Town in support of sustainable travel choices, as too is the need to ensure that this is accessible to new and existing residents.

6.17 It is anticipated that the Waterbeach New Town SPD which is also required within Policy SS/5 (as set out in the preceding Policy Context section) will also emphasise the importance of delivering a relocated railway station at an early stage, whilst the recently published outputs of the Ely-Cambridge Corridor Transport Study have also given particular prominence to achievement of this requirement. In this context the relocated station is regarded as an essential, early stage requirement and features within each of the options tested. It is therefore clear that early delivery of a relocated station to serve both the existing village and the proposed new settlement is regarded as a key element of the recommended strategy to support achievement of sustainable growth within the corridor.

6.18 In the context of the new settlement the new station will avoid the potential for more than 8,000 additional trips on the A10, whilst providing an important component of integrated transport networks that prioritise non-car modes, including increased use of public transport. These advantages are assessed in greater detail within the Transport Assessment that also supports this application.

NPPF support for sustainable travel

6.19 In the context of its support for sustainable development the Framework requires the promotion of sustainable transport, setting out key principles and policies which require management of growth in manners which make “the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.” (Paragraph 17).

6.20 The proposed development in this instance will assist in delivering a high quality public transport system as the sound basis for strategic growth in this location, where the use of sustainable modes can be maximised (Paragraph 34). Delivery of the new station also accords with the requirement that local planning authorities should identify and protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice (Paragraph 41).

Design and layout

6.21 Details of the various aspects of the design rationale for the relocated station, including its layout, accessibility and the visual appearance of the most substantive elements, including the footbridges and associated canopies are set out in the accompanying Design and Access Statement (DAS).
6.22 This demonstrates that careful regard has been had to ensuring an appropriate response to both the existing surrounding rural context and the manner in which this context will change in connection with the new town over time, in terms of scale, massing, height and simplicity of detailing. The DAS includes an assessment of relevant design policies.

6.23 It is considered that the proposed design is responsive to a range of social, economic, environmental, statutory, operational, construction, safety and place making requirements, and can be considered to accord with design policies and objectives of the adopted Local Plan (DCP, DP/d, DP/2 and DP/3) and emerging Local Plan (S/2d).

**Construction and Delivery**

6.24 Delivery of the relocated station will require the securing of track “possessions” from Network Rail, and is estimated will take approximately 18 months to 2 years, depending on the availability of such possessions.

6.25 It is anticipated that a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) would be required by a prior to commencement condition attached to the full planning permission.

6.26 The CEMP will set out details of the proposed site access arrangements during the construction phase, site management procedures and proposed routing of construction vehicles, lighting and hours of operation. It is envisaged that the majority of construction traffic will be routed via Bannold Drove which it is noted is currently in use as a construction access for existing residential development. Cody Road will be used less frequently for construction vehicle movements related to utilities enabling works, pedestrian and cycle improvements and tie in works for the new link road. Similarly, construction traffic will also be routed via A10 and Denny End Road, rather than through the village High Street avoiding the existing village primary school and the Waterbeach level crossing at the existing station.

6.27 It is considered that these arrangements are sufficient to address the requirements of Adopted DCP Policy DP6 in respect of guarding against adverse impacts upon the local environment and amenity during construction.

6.28 A Utilities Statement (combined with Foul Water Drainage Strategy) has been prepared in support of the proposed development. This considers the utility requirements for the scheme.

6.29 SCDC has a range of policies, within the adopted DCP (DP/4 and TR/3) and emerging Local Plan (SC/4 and TI/8) requiring suitable arrangements for the provision of infrastructure necessary to make schemes acceptable in planning terms. Whilst the relocated station itself can be seen as an item of key infrastructure, both in respect of meeting increasing background demand and overcoming the constraints of the existing station location, and in the context of the Waterbeach New Town allocation, it is also apparent that appropriate provisions are also proposed within the S106 Heads of Terms to ensure acceptability in planning terms.
Other technical assessments

Air Quality

6.30 The Air Quality Assessment considered nuisance, loss of amenity and health impacts caused by construction dust on sensitive receptors and changes in traffic related pollutant concentrations on the local road network as a result of the proposed development.

6.31 Based on a qualitative assessment of construction dust effects for the proposed development it is concluded that following the appropriate implementation of standard mitigation measures recommended impacts are predicted to not be significant.

6.32 A quantitative assessment of the air quality impacts associated with development traffic during the operation phase found that this is not predicted to cause any exceedances of the annual mean NO2, PM10 or PM2.5 objectives. The assessment also demonstrated that the short-term objectives for NO2 and PM10 are not expected to be exceeded at nearby sensitive receptors. The overall change in concentrations of these pollutants as a result of the proposed development is not predicted to be significant.

6.33 It is therefore considered that Adopted DCP Objectives and Policies NE/1 and NE/16 and emerging Local Plan Policies SC/13 and SC/15 are satisfied.

Noise and Vibration

6.34 The Noise and Vibration assessment concludes that construction vibration is unlikely to lead to significant adverse effects.

6.35 Residents on the north side of Capper Road will be exposed to a new noise source i.e. road traffic on the access road from Cody Road to the new station. When mitigated with a noise barrier, the noise level is only fractionally above a negligible noise increase and is well below Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL). Nonetheless, it is anticipated that there will be no significant adverse effects due to noise from the new access road.

6.36 Noise level increases elsewhere are either negligible or only fractionally above the negligible noise increase criterion so there will not be significant adverse effects due to road traffic noise. The noise profile of trains will change slightly at the proposed development but the overall noise levels from the railway will change only negligibly.

6.37 Noise control measures for fixed plant and the PA systems of the new station have been specified and will comply with SCDC’s requirements.

6.38 Operational vibration from the trains is not expected to change as a result of relocation of the station so it produces no significant adverse impacts, whilst a negligible noise reduction is expected for the villages of Clayhithe and Horningsea.
6.39 With application of the mitigation set out in the assessment the proposed development will lead to no significant adverse effects due to noise or vibration. It is therefore considered that Adopted DCP Objectives and Policies NE/e and NE/15 and emerging Local Plan Policy SC/11 are satisfactorily addressed.

*Lighting*

6.40 Baseline surveys identified that views towards the Site and surrounding study area were mainly dark although street lighting and perimeter fence security lighting is present to the west. The Site has been categorised as having a low district brightness in line with the ILP environmental zone E2 classification. The Proposed Development will require artificial lighting for safety, security and wellbeing which will increase the baseline lighting levels.

6.41 Best practice lighting design and the mitigation measures outlined in the Lighting Assessment will ensure that impacts of obtrusive light are minimised as far as is reasonably practicable. The Site and study area are predominantly dark with very minor artificial light viewable, it is therefore anticipated that the presence of any artificial light, obtrusive or not, will have a minor adverse effect on the character of the study area. It is also predicted that proposed lighting will have a moderate adverse effect on light sensitive species.

6.42 Obtrusive lighting calculations carried out with suitable methodology to prove compliance with the limits of obtrusive light described in section 3 of the Lighting Assessment will need to be presented to SCDC along with the requirements of SCDC Local Development Framework, District Design Guide, Appendix 7, but it is considered that this can be achieved at detailed design stage and governed by condition attached to the planning permission.

6.43 It is determined that DCP Objectives and Policies NE/f and NE/14 and emerging Local Plan Policy SC/10 are satisfied

*Ecology*

6.44 A desk study, Phase 1 habitat survey and protected species surveys were conducted on Site between May and October 2017. These surveys included bat activity surveys, a badger survey, water vole and otter surveys and a reptile survey.

6.45 The Site is dominated by arable fields, with species-poor hedgerows and some ditches. Habitats of ecological interest include mature trees, wet ditches and areas of semi-improved grassland.

6.46 The Site offers suitable habitat for a number of protected species: breeding birds (including species listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981), bats, reptiles, badger, water vole and otter.

6.47 At least eight species of bat were recorded on Site including long-eared bats, soprano pipistrelle bat and noctule bat, listed as priority species of conservation in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Biodiversity Action Plan and identified as Species of Principal Importance (SPI). No bat roosts have been recorded on Site.
6.48 Water vole is present in the wet ditch adjacent to Bannold Drove in the western section of the Site. No signs of otter have been recorded. A good population of common lizard is present within the arable field grassland margins and grass snake is present in low numbers. Kingfisher is present on Site and possibly breeding.

6.49 In respect of potential impacts it is identified that construction and operational works may disturb commuting and foraging bats through light spill, particularly light sensitive species such as Myotis and long-eared bats. Potential impacts on badgers, water vole, reptiles, nesting birds including Schedule I (kingfisher) and Species of Principle Importance (SPI) during the construction and operational phases are variously highlighted.

6.50 Recommendations of the assessment include:

- An appropriate lighting strategy that is sensitive to bats. Retention of mature trees with suitable bat roosting features.
- Pre-construction badger survey. Avoid killing/injury to badgers through appropriate mitigation.
- Pre-construction water vole and otter survey.
- Translocation/displacement of reptiles into an on-Site receptor area within the southern section of the Site adjacent attenuation features.
- Pre-development vegetation clearance checks for nesting birds, if clearance is required during the breeding bird season (1 March to 31 August, inclusive), including checks for kingfisher nests.
- Prepare and implement management plans for construction, operational and management phases.

6.51 A ‘Biodiversity Impact Calculation’ has been used to demonstrate net gain in biodiversity post development in line with the NPPF.

6.52 Biodiversity enhancements will include new planting of native trees and new species-rich hedgerows and the creation of rough grassland habitat with vegetation differing in structural height within a dedicated receptor area within the Site. Connectivity for bats and birds will be improved by appropriately managing retained hedgerows and the Bannold Drove ditch bank.

6.53 Opportunities for additional biodiversity enhancement include installation of bat and bird boxes, a bee/butterfly bank and three hibernacula for reptiles within the receptor area.

6.54 It is therefore considered that Adopted DCP Objectives and Policies NE/c and NE/6 and emerging Local Plan Objectives and Policies S/2b and NH/4 are complied with in respect of biodiversity matters.

*Landscape and Visual Impact*

6.55 A Landscape and Visual Appraisal has been submitted in support of the application, which has assessed the impacts in respect of potential landscape character and visual effects.
6.56 It is assessed that medium scale landscape character effects are confined to the Site itself and its immediate context, which will result in the change from an agricultural field to an area of built development. Beyond the immediate context of the Site, effects on the character of the landscape would rapidly decrease as the prevailing landscape character would prevail. Overall, the permanent effects to landscape character would be at most moderate, and adverse within the Site in its immediate context. Beyond the immediate context of the Site, the effects on the Western Claylands Landscape Character Area would be negligible magnitude, minimal and neutral both in the medium-term and permanently.

6.57 It is concluded that visual effects are relatively localised, with the most affected receptors being those in close proximity to the Site, notably users of Bannold Drove, residents in areas in the northern area of Waterbeach and motorists along stretches of Long Drove and Bannold Road south and south east of the Site, where effects would be moderate and adverse. Views will also be possible from a stretch of the Fen Rivers Way and are judged to be moderate and neutral.

6.58 Beyond the immediate context of the Site, the taller elements of the proposals would be visible, with elements such as the car park, platforms and access road being largely screened from view by intervening built form and vegetation from locations along Bannold Road and Long Drove north and north east of the Site where effects would be slight and neutral. Beyond these areas visual effects are judged to be negligible.

6.59 New planting will not significantly reduce the visual effects of the taller elements of the Proposed Development. However, it will contribute to the layering of vegetation that provides visual screening of lower level elements including the car park and access road.

6.60 The application Site forms part of land allocated for strategic scale development at Waterbeach New Town including explicit reference to the need for a relocated railway station, and therefore Draft Local Plan Policy NH/3 is satisfied. In due course the station will be viewed in the context of the proposed new town, proposals for which will be the subject of further separate landscape and visual impact assessment.

6.61 It is also considered that regard has been had to preserving local character and distinctiveness and that Adopted DCP objectives and policies NE/b and NE/4 and emerging policy NH/2 are complied with.

Flood risk and drainage

6.62 An FRA and Surface Water Drainage Strategy report has been prepared, having regard to the implications of climate change, and therefore Adopted DCP Objective NE/a is satisfied in respect of flood risk matters.

6.63 Flood Zone mapping shows that while some of the proposed development lies in Flood Zone 1, the majority lies in Zone 2. A small section in the South-East corner lies in Zone 3.
6.64 On the basis of the (NPPG) Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification “less vulnerable”
development is appropriate on land designated as Flood Zone 1 but requires the sequential
test on land in Zone 2. The area of Flood Zone 3 benefits from flood defences along the
River Cam. Localised land raising in Flood Zone 2 is proposed to mitigate flood risk. Only
“Water Compatible” developments are proposed for Flood Zone 3, with development located
in Flood Zone 1 where possible.

6.65 The site has also been considered for groundwater, pluvial, surface water overland flow,
sewer capacity, Pump Station failure, Flood Defence Breach, tidal and estuary flooding.

6.66 There are pockets of the development at “more risk” of flooding from pluvial sources. It is
proposed that these are mitigated through localised ground raising; removal of surface
barriers and engineering flow paths.

6.67 It is considered that the risk of sewer capacity flooding is low.

6.68 The site is at negligible risk of flooding from reservoir failure.

6.69 The impact of any failure of pumps at Bottisham Lock and Cam pumping stations has been
investigated and it is considered that any such failure is unlikely to impact the proposed
development.

6.70 Breach modelling has been undertaken to determine the potential effects on the
development during a worst-case scenario breach. Modelling shows a depth of flooding of
approximately 0.45m in the area of the proposed development (approx. 2.87mAOD).
Mitigation measures for vulnerable and essential infrastructure include localised land raising
and raised floor levels.

6.71 The existing railway line and proposed station platforms are above the modelled flood level
and therefore considered to be at negligible risk of flooding in a breach event.

6.72 The potential of tidal and estuary flooding event causing a tidal lock at the confluence of the
Ouse and Cam rivers, combined with a fluvial event in the River Cam have been considered.
Modelling undertaken has shown this to likely increase water level by 100mm and have an
annual probability of 0.01% to 0.005%. The risk to the site is therefore considered low.

6.73 On the basis of the geology encountered and the infiltration test results, it is considered that
disposal of surface water to ground via infiltration is not feasible. It is proposed to construct
separate drainage networks for foul and surface water drainage to serve the proposed
development, and to drain surface water from the proposed development to the Bannold
Drain, which ultimately discharge to the River Cam via the Bottisham Lock Pumping Station.

6.74 Foul Water drainage is covered under the Utilities and Foul Water Drainage report (Ref:
328331-UT001-A).
6.75 As part of the strategic surface water runoff management strategy for the wider development it is proposed to incorporate SuDS features to best mimic current greenfield conditions, as well as provide source control, water quality, biodiversity and amenity benefits. These features could include swales, filter strips, ponds and permeable paving.

6.76 Discharge from the proposed development will be limited to 1.11/s/ha in accordance with IDB requirements to mimic existing flow rates.

6.77 It is evident that Adopted DCP polices NE/9 and NE/11 are complied with, in respect of surface water drainage and flood risk respectively, the latter requiring judgement against national policy. Draft Local Plan Policy CC/9 is also satisfied.

Ground conditions

6.78 Ground conditions, determined from British Geological Survey (BGS) geological maps and one historical borehole within 250m of the site comprise: Superficial deposits (Peat deposits in the south east of the site; underlain by River Terrace Deposits over the rest of the site); and Superficial deposits are underlain by the Gault Clay Formation.

6.79 Made ground is not anticipated within the proposed development, except for the area directly along the existing railway. Alluvium deposits have been identified to the east of the site, surrounding the River Cam.

6.80 The Peat and Alluvium deposits are designated as Unproductive Strata. River Terrace Deposits at the site are designated as Secondary A aquifer. The Gault Clay Formation at the site is designated as Unproductive Strata. All designations are reported by the Environment Agency (2017).

6.81 Historical mapping has indicated that the site has been an agricultural field. A military airfield (now disused), located 1,150 m west of the site, was recorded from 1975 and a sewage treatment works, 300 m west of the site, was recorded from 1952.

6.82 Zetica mapping for the unexploded bomb risk suggests that the site is in a low risk area for unexploded ordnance.

6.83 All contaminated land mitigated risks were assessed as low assuming the associated control measures and mitigation were implemented, as detailed below. It is recommended that targeted ground investigation is undertaken to better inform the risk assessment. Ground investigation should include ground gas monitoring determined by the proposed location of enclosed spaces, recommended to assess the risk from ground gas; soil and soil leachate sampling within limited parts of the site to identify any existing contamination risk; and groundwater level monitoring and sampling to identify any contamination risk and groundwater flow direction.
6.84 On the basis of the work undertaken to date it is considered that Adopted DCP objective NE/d and emerging Local Plan policies CC/7 and SC/12 in respect of Water Quality and Contamination have been satisfied, with any further work considered capable of being conditioned.

Cultural Heritage

6.85 As part of the EIA Screening process a consultation response was provided by the Senior Archaeologist in the Historic Environment Team at Cambridgeshire County Council. This confirmed in the context of advising of no requirement for EIA from an archaeological perspective, that any archaeological investigation required could be secured by condition.

6.86 In respect of above ground heritage assets it is noted that that there are no currently known heritage assets within the proposed development area itself. The closest listed building beyond the site boundary is that recorded as “Long Drove BARN TO NORTH OF LOCK FARM” (List entry Number: 1179436), to the south-east of the site along Long Drove, close to its junction with Bannold Road.

6.87 The Grade II Listed barn at Lock Farm derives significance from its architectural and historic interest as an example of 17th century farm building. Its setting is the small group of farm buildings surrounded by agricultural land associated with this farm, within a broader rural setting to the east and north with the current Waterbeach village c.300m to the west beyond the current railway line. These agricultural surroundings and the relationship with the other farm buildings contributes to the significance of the barn. The new station (although potentially visible from the farm) would be located c.800m north-northwest of the barn and would not alter the positive contribution that these immediate agricultural surroundings make to its significance. The new station will not be visible from the other listed buildings within Waterbeach due to the intervening built development.

6.88 It is therefore considered that relevant Objectives and Policies of the Adopted DCP (CH/e) and Draft Local Plan (S/2b and NH/14, in respect of protection of the historic environment are not conflicted by the proposed development.

Sustainability Strategy

6.89 The Sustainability Strategy provides a strategic review of the overall sustainability performance of the proposed Waterbeach New Railway Station development. By understanding the broad options available at this early stage, the masterplan remains adaptable, and promotes sustainable development as the design progresses.

6.90 This covers the issues of energy, transport, green and blue infrastructure, sustainable design and construction, waste, health and wellbeing and climate change resilience and adaptation.
6.91 Through the implementation of these strategies, all aspects of sustainable practices can be embedded throughout the design and construction phases. This will be utilised to demonstrate that the sustainable objectives of the national, regional and local planning policies and guidance can be implemented and adhered to as part of the delivery of the development.

6.92 It is considered that the Sustainability Strategy adequately addresses objectives and policies of the Adopted DCP (DP/c, DP/1 and NE/g) and emerging Local Plan (S/3 and CC/1).

Waste Management

6.93 An Outline Site Waste Management Plan has been prepared and is submitted in support of the application. This covers proposals for the minimisation, reuse and recycling of waste in connection with the proposed development in accordance with the waste hierarchy. Strategies for the management of waste are also covered, including segregation, treatment and disposal of waste, during both the construction and operational phases of the development.

6.94 It is intended that implementation of the strategy would be progressed by the principal contractor, and will remain a live document to be monitored and updated over time.

6.95 It is considered that the strategy follows best practice and policy requirements in respect of waste management, demonstrating that this has been considered as an integral part of the proposed development.

Transport and access

6.96 A Transport Assessment with associated Travel Plan Framework has been prepared in support of the application, as required by the NPPF and Policy TI/2 of the emerging Local Plan.

6.97 The impacts of the station relocation compared to retaining the existing station have been assessed for 2021 as follows:

- The number of users exposed to risk at the Station Road AHB level crossing will be significantly reduced, and the new station will have two bridges connecting the two platforms so eliminating crossing risk for station users;
- There will be improved non-car accessibility of the new station compared to the existing station, with better pedestrian links and appropriate cycle parking provision compared to the under-supply at the existing station;
- Most of Waterbeach will continue to be within a reasonable 25 minute walk and no more than a 10 minute cycle of the new station;
- Bus services will be provided for the new station that integrate with train timetables, and which will assist with the non-car accessibility of the site with the rest of Waterbeach and particularly for those nearest the existing station;
• Car parking will be provided at an appropriate quantity, free of charge and subject to careful management alongside parking surveys, avoiding the potential for overspill and displaced car parking. The overspill and displaced car parking that currently takes place near the existing station will be removed;
• Station-related vehicular traffic flows overall will not change but will be redistributed. There will be increases on Denny End Road, Bannold Road and Cody Road, but reductions in flows on Car Dyke Road, High Street including passing the Primary School, and Station Road.

6.98 Overall, the relocated station will provide a significantly improved transport interchange compared to the existing station, in terms of safety and convenience of station users.

6.99 Based on the findings of the TA it is considered that the impacts of the proposed station relocation can be cost effectively limited through the proposed improvements in the transport network, and that the residual cumulative impacts of the relocation are not severe (therefore satisfying the relevant NPPF test (Paragraph 32)).

6.100 Indeed there are significant transport benefits to be secured by the removal of station-related travel demand in the vicinity of the existing station and reduced risk at the level crossing. It is therefore considered that the relevant transport and travel-related policies and objectives of the Adopted DCP (TR/a-I; TR/1; TR/2; and TR/3) and emerging Local Plan (SS/5; TI/2; TI/3 and TI/8) have also been satisfactorily addressed.

Health Impact Assessment

6.101 A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) has been undertaken, the findings of which are submitted in support of the application. This assesses the potential health and wellbeing impacts of the proposed new Waterbeach Railway Station, and identifies opportunities for enhancing the positive health impacts, and reducing any negative impacts.

6.102 The single greatest potential health outcome of the proposed development has been assessed as the indirect health benefits from improved access to transport and its associated indirect health benefits from the employment and training opportunities. These benefits have been assessed as being of permanent moderate benefit of major intensity for all groups. In addition the proposed development has been assessed as providing indirect health benefits as a consequence of reducing Crime and public safety through safe urban design.

6.103 Potential adverse impacts associated with relocation of the station were identified in respect of reduced neighbourhood amenity for residents closest to the current facility. This will be mitigated and off-set through the provision of the proposed shuttle service and improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity. Minor adverse health outcomes were predicted due to both construction and operational noise, although similarly mitigation has been built into to the scheme to address this.

6.104 A set of recommendations were identified for a number of health determinants, which would enable additional health benefits to be harnessed from the proposed development.
6.105 Through adopting ‘Designing out Crime’ sustainable development principles the proposed development will be able to further reduce the opportunities for anti-social behaviour and risk of crime. Creating separate segregated cycling routes and footpaths allows free movement of cyclist and pedestrian reducing collision risk.

6.106 The provision of cycle stands within the public realm design of proposed scheme development, as well as prominent segregated cycle paths and enhanced pedestrian access would all result in a direct beneficial health outcome upon health inequality for the whole Waterbeach population.

6.107 Increased use of public transport or promotion of active travel methods could indirectly promote increased levels of physical activity amongst public transport users. Health benefits gained from the reduction of traffic congestion via modal shift from motor vehicles to active travel or public transport would be compounded with the health benefits arising from the increase in physical activity associated with regular use of public transport.
7. CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

7.1 This planning statement is submitted in support of a full planning application for development of a relocated railway station at Waterbeach. The new station provides an enhanced facility for the existing village, overcoming existing shortcomings and safety considerations, which will meet growth in background demand, and will ultimately form a key part of the proposed Waterbeach new town.

7.2 Planning permission is sought for a relocated railway station comprising platforms, pedestrian bridges, access road and enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes, car and cycle parking, with other associated facilities and infrastructure. Upon relocation of the station it is expected that the existing station would be closed.

7.3 The proposed development has been assessed against the relevant planning policy framework including the adopted South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (2007), adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011), and Draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (incorporating proposed Main Modifications 2018). Regard has also been had to the policies of the NPPF and to guidance within the NPPG, as important material considerations, in addition to other material factors such as the emerging Waterbeach New Town SPD and initial outputs of the Ely-Cambridge Corridor Transport Study.

7.4 It is required, within Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), that any application for development should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

7.5 In line with Paragraph 215 of the NPPF weight should continue to be given to relevant policies of the adopted Local Plan documents, which although adopted prior to publication of the Framework, are held to be in broad accordance with it. Similarly, in line with Paragraph 216 it is considered that weight should also be applied to the emerging Local Plan, given the advanced stage that this has reached and given that relevant policies are considered consistent with the NPPF.

Principle of Development

7.6 Set against this policy and legislative context it is considered that the principle of the proposed development is firmly supported.

7.7 The proposals will address current and significant deficiencies and safety concerns at the existing station relating to its access and parking arrangements, including:

- The level crossing at the station is in the highest risk category for its type, which will be exacerbated through continued background growth in users of the station and traffic on Station Road;
- Increasing passenger congestion at the platform accesses with Station Road / Clayhithe Road, with further potential for spilling out onto the carriageway and therefore bringing pedestrians into conflict with vehicular traffic;
- Increasing demand for cycle parking at the existing station, and because the existing supply on the northbound platform is at capacity, there would be more inappropriate cycle parking at, for example, the fencing along Station Road. This could further impede what is already a relatively poor quality pedestrian route along Station Road between the station and the rest of the village;
- Demand for car parking generated by the station continues to increase, much of which will occur on-street, with some of the parking straddling footways and impeding pedestrian movement.

7.8 These are each considered significant safety concerns with the existing station, which will only be exacerbated through anticipated continued background growth in passenger numbers in the years to come.

7.9 The relocation will therefore have the following benefits:

- Allow the creation of a modern accessible station, with facilities appropriate for the level of patronage;
- Provide capacity to accommodate 8-car trains, whilst facilitating future expansion to 12-car trains and increased stopping frequencies to meet the substantial increase in passenger demand;
- Provide plentiful cycle parking to cater for peak use;
- Provide free car parking to avoid commuter parking on residential streets;
- Provide bus stops and dedicated drop off facilities away from the public highway;
- Reduce pedestrian, cycle and car use of the Station Road level crossing, reducing the risk of serious accidents occurring;
- Remove the blight of commuter parking from the village streets between Greenside and Lode Avenue.

7.10 Accessibility to the new station for residents of the existing village will be ensured through a series of enhancements to pedestrian and cycle routes, combined with provision of a free shuttle service.

7.11 In addition to these clear benefits, which justify the proposed development in any event, the requirement for a relocated railway station in this location is a clear and important part of the strategy for creation of a sustainable new town on land comprising the former barracks and neighbouring agricultural land to the north of Waterbeach village.

7.12 It is also evident that the provision of a relocated railway station within the boundary of the new town allocation is an important, indeed a required, element of the New Town in support of sustainable travel choices, as too is the need to ensure that this is accessible to new and existing residents.
7.13 It is anticipated that the Waterbeach New Town SPD will also emphasise the importance of delivering a relocated railway station at an early stage, whilst the recently published outputs of the Ely-Cambridge Corridor Transport Study have given particular prominence to achievement of this requirement, regarding this as a “quick win” (or essential requirement for early stage delivery) that features within each of the options tested.

7.14 It is therefore clear that early delivery of a relocated station to serve both the existing village and the proposed new settlement is regarded as a key element of the recommended strategy to support achievement of sustainable growth within the corridor.

7.15 In the context of the proposed Waterbeach New Town, which is already the subject of an outline planning application for up to 6,500 dwellings (by U&C and DIO), with a further parallel application on behalf of RLW Estates for a further 4,500 dwellings anticipated shortly, the relocated station will avoid the potential for more than 8,000 additional trips on the A10, underpinning a significant sustainability advantage of the new settlement.

7.16 The principle of development is therefore in accordance with both Local and National Policy support for creation of a transport system that meets the needs of the economy, increases and promotes the use of sustainable modes, including public transport, and makes such modes more integrated, accessible, safer and more attractive to use. These latter aspects are particular pertinent in light of the advantages notes above in respect of ensuring improvements over the existing situation, whilst supporting sustainable travel choices.

**Development Management Policy Considerations**

7.17 The preceding assessment demonstrates that regard has been had to a wide range of development management policy considerations, covering both Local and National Policy requirements, and presented within the suite of validation reports that accompany the application.

**Design and Access**

7.18 It is shown, primarily within the DAS, that considerable care has been taken in formulating the design of the new facility, having regard both to its design response to the current surrounding rural and village edge context, including visual impact of the tallest elements formed by the platform bridges, and to its adaptability over time to appropriately serve the existing village and future residents of the new town. This extends to siting of the facility, as close as possible to the northern edge of the existing village, and formulation and improvement of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connections that will be convenient and attractive to users.

7.19 It is acknowledged that whilst relocation of the station will make access easier for residents within the northern part of the village, this will be further away for residents to the south than is currently the case. The application therefore proposes a package of measures in the form of footpath and cycleway enhancements within the wider village, as well as provision of a free shuttle bus service timed to coincide with train timetables, to address these issues.
Amenity Impacts

7.20 Consideration has been given to a number of issues that could be seen to have potential impacts on the amenity of existing residents in the area, in respect of noise, vibration, air quality and lighting. These are additionally drawn together within the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the application.

7.21 It is noted that the proposed development will require artificial lighting for safety, security and wellbeing which will increase the baseline lighting levels. Best practice lighting design and mitigation measures outlined will ensure that impacts of obtrusive light are minimised as far as is reasonably practicable. It is however considered that this can be achieved at detailed technical design stage and governed by condition attached to the planning permission.

7.22 Similarly air quality objectives can be met, with specific construction phase impacts capable of being addressed through application of standard mitigation practices.

7.23 In respect of vibration it is concluded that operational impacts are unlikely to change, and that construction phase impacts are unlikely to be significant. Noise limits can be specified for construction activities to avoid significant adverse impacts to residential receptors and during the operational phase are broadly negligible. It has been identified that impacts could arise for residents on the north side of Capper Road, from a new noise source in the form of the proposed access road, but would be appropriately mitigated through inclusion of the proposed bund to the south of this new feature.

7.24 The HIA identifies permanent moderate indirect health benefits of major intensity for all age groups from improved access to transport and its associated indirect health benefits from employment and training opportunities. In addition the proposed development has been assessed as providing indirect health benefits as a consequence of reducing crime and public safety through safe urban design. It is considered that potential adverse health outcomes for some residents through relocation of the station can be offset by provision of the proposed shuttle service and improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity.

7.25 It is considered that relevant Local Plan and NPPF policies, in respect of avoiding or appropriately mitigating potential amenity impacts are therefore satisfied.

Other Environmental Assessments

7.26 Assessment has also been undertaken on a number of other environmental topics, covering ecology, heritage, ground conditions, sustainability, waste management, flood risk and drainage.

7.27 These have shown that due regard has been given to a wide range of environmental topics and that the impacts arising from the proposed development will either be modest or otherwise capable of being addressed satisfactorily through mitigation measures, such that relevant policy requirements and tests are satisfied.
7.28 Potential ecological impacts, including those on protected species and habitats can be mitigated through a range of measures, including sensitive lighting strategy, appropriate construction methods and translocation to on site receptor area. Biodiversity enhancements and further opportunities in this regard are also highlighted.

7.29 In landscape and visual terms it is concluded that the development would be relatively well contained by existing built form and vegetation, with relatively limited scope for longer distance views, and scope for planting to provide further visual screening of the lower level features.

7.30 In respect of cultural heritage it has been established that any archaeological investigation can be the subject of condition attached to the grant of planning permission, whilst regard has been had to impacts on the setting other heritage assets. It is concluded that the Grade II listed barn at Lock Farm draws its setting from the small group of farm buildings surrounded by agricultural land associated with this farm, within a broader rural setting to the east and north. The proposals would not alter the positive contribution that these immediate agricultural surroundings make to its significance. The new station will not be visible from the other listed buildings within Waterbeach due to the intervening built development.

7.31 In respect of flood risk and drainage it is shown that appropriate consideration has been given to vulnerability classification, with only water compatible uses proposed for the small area within Flood Zone 3 (which benefits from flood defences), and development located in Flood Zone 1 where possible. The existing railway line and proposed station platforms are above the modelled flood level and therefore considered to be at negligible risk of flooding in a breach event. It is proposed to incorporate SuDS features to best mimic current greenfield conditions, as well as provide source control, water quality, biodiversity and amenity benefits.

7.32 All contaminated land mitigated risks were assessed as low assuming the associated control measures and mitigation are implemented, including the recommendation that a ground investigation is undertaken to better inform the risk assessment.

7.33 The Sustainability Strategy demonstrates the manner in which all aspects of sustainable practices can be embedded throughout the design and construction phases, whilst the Outline Waste Management Plan addresses proposals for the minimisation, reuse and recycling of waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy alongside strategies for the management of waste during both the construction and operational phases of the development.

7.34 It is therefore considered that in addition to the proposed development being accepted as a matter of principle, the proposals have been devised in a manner which demonstrates that the wide range of practical issues and development management policy requirements, have been positively addressed, such that the application should be fully supported.
Summary of Sustainability

7.35 By way of a concluding summary it is considered helpful to briefly assess the proposed development against the three strands of sustainable development which are set out in the NPPF and the pursuit of which is stated to be the key purpose of the planning system.

- **Economic Role:** The development will contribute towards the building of a strong, responsive and competitive economy in the Cambridgeshire Sub-region by providing infrastructure in the right location at the right time to support existing and future housing and employment growth. This is reinforced within the emerging Local Plan and within the Ely-Cambridge Corridor Transport Study, which sees delivery of the relocated station as a key mechanism for unlocking growth in the corridor.

- **Social Role:** The development will support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by creating a high quality built environment with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being. The new station will provide significant improvement over the existing facility, addressing safety concerns and constraints at the existing site. It will provide a key meeting place and point for interaction between residents of the existing village and new town. Whilst it is recognised that accessibility to the station for those in the south of the village will be reduced this is to be addressed through a package of enhancements aimed at improving connectivity, in addition to provision of a free shuttle bus service.

- **Environmental Role:** The development will contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment. Efforts have been made to protect and improve biodiversity, to use natural resources prudently, whilst minimising waste and pollution and ensuring that climate change matters have been fully considered. Most significantly the relocated station will facilitate sustainable travel choices which favour non-car modes, and can therefore be seen to assist in the move towards a low carbon economy.

7.36 The proposed development is therefore considered to represent sustainable development which accords with provisions of both the adopted and emerging Local Plan and should therefore be approved accordingly.
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EIA Screening Request: Relocated Railway Station for Waterbeach, South Cambridgeshire

Dear Andrew,

I am writing to seek South Cambridgeshire Council’s formal opinion as to whether the
development described in this letter constitutes EIA development.

As set out in The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations
2017, the following information is submitted as part of this EIA Screening Opinion Request:

a) A plan sufficient to identify the land;

b) A description of the physical characteristics, including in particular –
   a. A description of the physical characteristics of the development and, where
      relevant, of demolition works;
   b. A description of the location of the development, with particular regard to the
      environment sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected;

c) A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the
   development;

d) To the extent the information is available, a description of any likely significant effects of
   the proposed development on the environment resulting from –
   a. The expected residues and emissions and the production of waste, where relevant; and
   b. The use of natural resources, in particular soil, land, water and biodiversity; and
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e) Such other information or representations as the person making the request may wish to provide or make, including any features of the proposed development or any measures envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant adverse effects on the environment.

1. Application Site and Surroundings

The application site is located to the north east of Waterbeach on land between Bannold Drove and the 'Fen Line' railway that links Cambridge and King's Lynn. An indicative site boundary is shown on Drawing 5475_SK_0003 and is subject to minor alterations in response to the final design and layout of the relocated railway station. The site area extends to approximately 8.5ha.

The site is predominantly comprised of agricultural arable land, which is drained via ditches along the field boundaries. There are no buildings or structures located within the site boundary, apart from a short section of the railway line and associated embankments together with overhead electricity and signalling equipment.

The site boundary also incorporates the proposed access routes to the site via Bannold Drove and Cody Road. Bannold Drove (a public highway) has a ditch along the eastern side and is vegetated along both sides, Cody Road is flanked by vegetation and existing residential development along both sides. An agricultural field lies between Cody Road to the west and Bannold Drove to the east. This field is currently laid to crops and is bound by high hedgerows on its southern boundary, with a community building and residential dwellings to the south, and a Water Treatment Works to the north east.

The site is not covered by any formal designations or 'sensitive areas' as defined by the EIA Regulations. The nearest Scheduled Monument is 1.4km to the south-west within Waterbeach village. A Grade II listed farmhouse is however located within the vicinity approximately 400m to the south. Wicken Fen RAMSAR site is located over 5km to the northeast.

The EA flood maps show that the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 (medium probability of fluvial flooding), with a localised small area at the south-eastern corner in Flood Zone 3 (high probability). However, the EA Flood Zones map shows the undefended fluvial extents.

The site is protected by the River Cam bank defence, protection above the 1% annual exceedance probability flood level. In the unlikely event of a breach in the River Cam during the 100 year return period rainfall event (and climate change event), part of the eastern site area is susceptible to shallow flooding (generally, less than 0.2m). The EA have confirmed that they would consider the new station as "Less Vulnerable" on the basis that the train station can be closed in times of flooding, and be easily designed to withstand the impacts of the flood and become functional again rapidly.

The area within which the site is located contains Grade 3a agricultural land according to the ALC Survey undertaken across the site.

2. Proposed Development

The proposed development constitutes a detailed planning application for the relocation of Waterbeach Railway Station. The proposed railway station, subject of this EIA Screening Request, is accordingly a replacement for the existing station, which in turn will be decommissioned and demolished. The primary function of the station in its new location will be to enable longer trains
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to serve Waterbeach village, for which there is a degree of urgency in order to satisfy rail industry objectives. The proposed station will initially constitute a relatively basic form of development to facilitate its early establishment and its design shall comprise the following:

- A two platform station consisting of approximately 250m long platforms with partial shelter on either side of the existing railway line;
- Up to two pedestrian bridges spanning between the new platforms;
- 200 space car park;
- 200 cycle parking spaces;
- Bus stops;
- Taxi rank;
- Emergency pedestrian escape route from the platforms;
- Resurfacing of the existing Bannold Drove access for pedestrian and cycle movements and for existing vehicular traffic associated with Midload Farm;
- Access road from the eastern side of Cody Road to the station car park, providing access for buses, taxis and private vehicular traffic associated with the railway station. The exact alignment of the access road between Cody Road and the Station Car Park is subject to ongoing design development;
- Hard and soft landscaping including Sustainable Urban Drainage System;
- Platform lighting, station information and surveillance systems; and
- A temporary construction access to the east of the railway line.

The existing Waterbeach railway station does not meet modern standards and suffers from a number of problems, including:

- Reliance on a level crossing for passengers to cross from one side of the tracks to the other;
- Narrow and unsatisfactory footways on the approaches to the station;
- No provision for use by disabled passengers;
- Minimal shelter, providing no passenger facilities;
- Minimal cycle parking, with very limited scope to increase provision;
- No proper bus interchange or drop-off/pick-up point for taxis and private cars;
- Inadequate car parking.

The proposed relocation of the railway station will accordingly offer significant betterment compared to the existing railway station. These benefits will include:

- Reduced risk at the existing railway station level crossing, due to decreased use and shorter barrier closure times;
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- Reduced risk for station users, with a segregated footbridge for crossing the railway instead of using the existing level crossing;
- Reduced risk for people accessing the station through clear segregation of the vehicular access route (via Cody Road) and primary pedestrian and cycle route (via Bannold Drove);
- A site with sufficient space available to provide a modern station, including wheelchair accessible lifts and pedestrian bridge;
- Increased provision of sheltered waiting areas in comparison with the existing station, to reflect the current levels of demand;
- Improved and greater number of cycle parking spaces (approximately three times the number of spaces at the existing station);
- Improved location of cycle parking on the west side of the railway line, providing safer and more convenient access for cyclists from Waterbeach village than the existing railway station;
- Improved access facilities for public transport, including bus stops and turning area;
- A dedicated drop off zone and taxi rank;
- A larger car park, including accessible bays, to alleviate the current car park over spill on local roads adjacent to the existing railway station; and
- The ability to accommodate longer trains to meet rising passenger demand.

The Site of the relocated railway station will be connected to the existing village of Waterbeach via a section of new road to the existing public highway at Cody Road. Bannold Drove will be resurfaced to accommodate pedestrian and cycle movements, while continuing to provide vehicular access to Midload Farm and the Water Recycling Plant operated by Anglian Water. Bannold Drove will be a safe, ‘low traffic’ environment, vehicle traffic associated with access/egress to the relocated railway station will be prohibited, thereby encouraging and maximising the number of walking and cycling movements from the village to the relocated railway station. Resurfacing and signage works will not require any additional land take beyond the existing carriageway width. All existing trees, hedgerows and ditches adjacent to Bannold Drove will therefore be retained.

The sole vehicular access to the relocated railway station will be via a new section of road to be constructed off the eastern side of Cody Road. This new section of road will connect directly to the station car park, bus stops and taxi ranks. All motorised traffic gaining access/egress to the relocated railway station would use this route. A pedestrian and cycle route would be provided along the full length of the new access road, providing a secondary pedestrian and cycle access.

It is anticipated that the proposed relocation of the railway station will take approximately 18 months to construct and that a temporary construction access will be required off Bannold Road to the east of the railway, located between the railway line and Burgess Drove, to allow construction of the eastern platform and the pedestrian bridge. All other construction vehicles shall access the site via Bannold Drove to the west of the railway line.

The proposed relocation of the railway station will not lead to a reduction in services or replace the existing railway station until it has been fully completed, so to ensure that a railway station at Waterbeach remains operational at all times.
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Once the existing station is no longer required it will be closed and decommissioned, as set out in the GRIP2 Feasibility Study (Para 8.1.1). The existing part-concrete, part-wooden deck platforms would be removed by Network Rail and disposed of, reused or recycled as appropriate. It is not expected that the removal of the other (limited) existing station infrastructure would have any significant environmental effects.

It is evident that any works to decommission the existing station would be temporary/time-limited, and that longer-term impacts are likely to be positive in environmental terms due to the removal of buildings/structures and activity levels from this area and the surrounding road network.

3. EIA Regulations 2017

The process of Environmental Impact Assessment is governed by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Regulations only apply to certain types of development and/or projects – commonly referred to as EIA Developments. The EIA Regulations define ‘EIA Development’ in Regulation 2(1) as either:

a) Schedule 1 development; or

b) Schedule 2 development likely to have a significant effect on the environment by virtue of its size, nature or location.

Screening is a procedure used to determine whether a proposed project is likely to have significant effects on the environment and whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is required. If a project is listed in Schedule 1, an environmental impact assessment is required in every case. If the project is listed in Schedule 2, the local planning authority should consider whether it is likely to have significant effects on the environment. “Schedule 2 development” means development, other than exempt development, of a description mentioned in Column 1 of the table in Schedule 2 where –

a) Any part of that development is to be carried out in a sensitive area; or

b) Any applicable threshold or criterion in the corresponding part of Column 2 of that table is respectively exceeded or met in relation to that development.

The proposed development does not fall within ‘Schedule 1’ of the EIA Regulations where an EIA is mandatory. However, the proposed development falls within the project description set out in Schedule 2 Paragraph 10 (d) “construction of railways”.

The thresholds set out in Schedule 2 paragraph 10(b) for ‘construction of railways’, which are of relevance to the construction of the relocated Railway Station in this location, are as follows –

“The area of works exceeds 1 hectare”.

As the proposed development does not technically constitute the construction of a new ‘railway’, it could also be considered as development falling within Schedule 2 Paragraph 10 (b) “Urban Developments” which includes “the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas”. The thresholds set out in Schedule 2 paragraph 10(b) are as follows –
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“The development includes more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development”.

Finally, the proposed relocation of the railway station will involve minor resurfacing works to Bannold Drove, a public highway, and construction of a new access road from Cody Road. As such it is prudent to screen the proposed development against Schedule 2, Paragraph 10 (f) “Construction of roads”. The thresholds set out in Schedule 2 Paragraph 10 (f) are as follows:

“The area of works exceeds 1ha”.

The online national planning practice guidance provides further guidance on establishing whether an EIA is required for a particular project. At paragraph (4-017-20140306, accessed June 2017) it advises that –

“If a proposed project is listed in the first column in Schedule 2 and exceeds the relevant thresholds or criteria set out in the second column (sometimes referred to as ‘exclusion thresholds and criteria’) the proposal needs to be screened by the local planning authority to determine whether significant effects are likely and hence whether an assessment is required. Projects listed in Schedule 2 which are located in, or partly in, a sensitive area also need to be screened, even if they are below the thresholds or do not meet the criteria.

Projects which are described in the first column of Schedule 2 but which do not exceed the relevant thresholds, or meet the criteria in the second column of the Schedule, or are not at least partly in a sensitive area may not be Schedule 2 development. Such projects do not usually require further screening or Environmental Impact Assessment.”

The proposed relocation of the railway station comprises development on a site in excess of 1ha. It is therefore above the applicable threshold of 1ha for railway development set out at 10 (d) of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations. It is also above the applicable threshold of 1ha for urban development, set out at 10 (b) (i) of the EIA Regulations. Consequently, the proposed relocation of the railway station constitutes Schedule 2 development in relation to these development types and is subject to further EIA screening. With regard to Paragraph 10(f), the total area of works proposed for the construction of the new road should not exceed 1ha. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development is still considered as a Schedule 2 Development.

Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations set out the selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 development, focussing on the characteristics and location of the development, and the types and characteristics of the potential impact. In determining whether an EIA is required, particular regard is to be given to, inter alia:

- The size and design of the whole development;
- The use of natural resources, in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity;
- Production of waste, pollution and nuisances;
- Existing and approved land use;
- The relative abundance, availability, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area and its underground;
- The absorption capacity of the natural environment;
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- The magnitude, extent, nature, intensity, probability, timing, duration, reversibility, cumulation and potential for reducing any potential impacts identified.

The Government’s Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes clear that only a very small proportion of Schedule 2 development will require an EIA. In order to assist the process of determining whether an assessment is required, DCLG has published indicative thresholds and additional criteria for the identification of Schedule 2 development requiring an EIA. PPG is clear that these indicative thresholds are not definitive:

“... it should not be presumed that developments above the indicative thresholds should always be subject to assessment, or those falling below these thresholds could never give rise to significant effects, especially where the development is in an environmentally sensitive location. Each development will need to be considered on its merits.” (PPG, Paragraph 057, Reference ID: 4-057-20140306).

However, the indicative thresholds do provide a useful first step in considering the likelihood of an EIA being required. The indicative thresholds and criteria for urban development projects, as defined in Column 2, Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations, are as follows:

- Area of the scheme is more than 5ha;
- It would provide a total of more than 10,000m² of new commercial floorspace; or
- The development would have significant urbanising effects in a previously non-urbanised area (e.g. a new development of more than 1000 dwellings)

The key issues to consider in determining whether an urban development proposal requires an EIA are stated to be the physical scale of such developments, potential increase in traffic, emissions and noise.

The sole indicative criteria and threshold for railway development is that the new development proposed exceeds 2km in length, while key issues to consider are estimated emissions, traffic, noise and vibration, the degree of visual intrusion and the impact on the surrounding ecology.

While the proposed relocation of the railway station will involve works taking place around the railway line, it is not proposed that any significant alterations will be made to the line itself, and no new railway track will be laid. The proposed relocation of the railway station therefore falls beneath the indicative 2km threshold for railway development. Full details of anticipated likely effects are set out at sections 4.1 – 4.9 below, but no significant effects in relation to the additional issues specified in the PPG are considered likely, namely traffic, noise, vibrations, emissions, visual intrusion and ecology.

The site area is approximately 8.5ha, which is above the first indicative threshold of 5ha for urban development. In this circumstance, it is important to note the guidance set out in PPG, that it should not be presumed that development above an indicative threshold should always be subject to assessment. Instead, development must be considered in the context of all of the specified thresholds and the specific nature, context and likely effects of the development.

With regards the further thresholds for urban development, no commercial, or indeed any type of internal floorspace, is proposed. The proposed relocation of the railway station will not involve the construction of dwellings or buildings that could be occupied, instead comprising ground-level parking areas, low rise platforms and shelters, and enhanced access and landscaping works that fall
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well below the example of ‘significant urbanising effect’ identified in the indicative threshold for urban development.

The proposed relocation of the railway station is also located in close proximity to the existing railway to the east, Bannold Drove public highway to the west, and established areas of housing around Kirby Lane and Capper Lane. Notwithstanding the low-impact nature of the development, these existing surrounding land-uses constitute urbanising features that further reduce the degree to which the proposed relocation of the railway station would have an urbanising effect.

The proposed relocation of the railway station is not located within a sensitive area, as defined in Regulation 2(1) of the EIA Regulations, which includes Sites of Special Scientific Interest and European Sites, National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and World Heritage Sites. It is also important to note that the proposed relocation of the railway station does not include provision for any new access links to Wicken Fen RAMSAR site. The relocated station will be designed to meet the current demand of the existing station and is not expected to attract significant increases in recreational visitors to Waterbeach. The existing railway station is located approximately 1.4km away from Bottisham Lock, via the Fen Rivers Way, which offers the closest point of pedestrian and cycling access to Wicken Fen from Waterbeach Village. The relocated station will also be approximately 1.4km away from Bottisham Lock, therefore the proposal to relocation the railway station will not result in improved access or a closer point of access to Wicken Fen.

On the basis of the indicative thresholds and criteria, and the specific nature, context and likely environmental effects, we are of the opinion that the proposed relocation of the railway station would not require an Environmental Impact Assessment. However, in the spirit of the online PPG and the new screening regulations, further high level assessment has been undertaken to ensure that the site context and specific nature of the proposed relocation of the railway station are given full consideration in reaching a final conclusion. The following section of this letter sets out the likelihood of significant environmental effects arising, proposed mitigation measures, and whether there are any factors out with the indicative thresholds that indicate an EIA is required.

4. Likelihood of Environmental Effects

4.1 Ecology and Nature Conservation

Construction Effects

At construction stage, the proposed relocation of the railway station will largely only impact an intensively managed arable field which has limited ecological value. Other types of habitat, which will be impacted, include a small area of semi improved, neutral grassland, tall ruderal vegetation and scrub along the existing railway corridor. Scrub, trees and ditches along Bannold Drove are unlikely to be impacted by construction activity. Bannold Drove will be used as a temporary construction access only, with no widening of the carriageway or removal of vegetation or re-profiling of ditches required. Following completion of the construction phase, resurfacing works will be undertaken on the existing carriageway, however these will not involve carriageway widening or encroach on adjoining ecological features.

During the species surveys undertaken in 2017 bats, great crested newts, reptiles and water vole were recorded within the site. No roosting bats have been recorded and providing no night time working is undertaken during the construction phase, bats are unlikely to be impacted. Great
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crested newts have been recorded in ponds off site and common lizard have been recorded within the ditch margins. The proposals will remove some suitable terrestrial habitat for great crested newts and reptiles. Therefore a receptor site, containing compensatory habitat for both species, will be created within the applicant's land ownership boundary.

Water vole have been recorded along the wet ditch along Bannold Drove however impacts to the ditches are not anticipated and so water voles are unlikely to be impacted. King fisher have also been recorded along Bannold Drove however they have not been confirmed breeding along the ditch.

Badgers have been recorded off site and so measures to prevent impacts to badgers during construction will need to be implemented. These are set out in the mitigation section below.

The habitats support nesting birds and therefore mitigation measures in relation to nesting birds are recommended.

Operational Effects

At operational stage, the proposed relocation of the railway station is likely to lead to an increase in noise and light levels in the area which has the potential to impact a range of species and in particular bats. Therefore, mitigation measures are required to ensure that no significant impacts will arise.

With the exception of existing limited vehicle movements to Midload Farm and occasional maintenance trips to the Water Recycling Plant, Bannold Drove will be used as a pedestrian and cycle access only. Vehicular access and egress to the relocated railway station will not be permitted. Therefore, no widening of the carriageway is required that might have a significant impact on ecological receptors. Disturbance arising from increased pedestrian and cycle movements is also likely to be minimal as the movements will be restricted to the resurfaced existing carriageway along Bannold Drove and therefore no significant impacts are expected to arise. Vehicle volumes along the vehicular access road are likely to be low and no significant impacts are expected to arise as a result of the connection between Cody Road and the station car park.

A number of designated sites are located within 10 km of the site. These include the Cam Washes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Wicken Fen SSSI, Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar Site; Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI and The River Cam County Wildlife Site (CWS). Due to the small scale nature of the proposals and the distances from the designated sites to the development site, it is not anticipated that these sites will be impacted via the construction or during the operation of the relocated railway station.

Mitigation Measures

The scrub and trees on the site may support nesting birds and therefore vegetation clearance will either be timed to avoid the nesting bird season (February – August inclusive) or pre-clearance checks will be undertaken by an ecologist to ensure no active birds nests are being impacted by the clearance.

As described above, habitat for great crested newts and reptiles will be removed to enable the station to be developed. In advance of habitat clearance works a European Protected Species Mitigation licence will be obtained from Natural England to enable great crested newts to be moved from within the development boundary to a newly created receptor site. The receptor site will be
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created within the land ownership boundary and will contain habitats suitable for newts and reptiles such as rank grassland, scrub and hibernacula.

To avoid impacts to bats and other species a sensitive lighting scheme will be devised. This will include using directional lighting to ensure only areas that require lighting are lit and to avoid excessive light spill. The types of light to be used will be carefully selected to help to ensure insects are not attracted to the lights.

Badger have been recorded within the site, though no setts have been identified. Therefore, a pre-construction badger survey will be undertaken no more than 6 months in advance of construction of the station to ensure an assessment of the current status of badger on site is undertaken prior to construction. Additionally, during construction measures to prevent badgers getting stuck in excavations or open pipework will be undertaken such as using wooden ramps and covering pipework at night.

A pre-construction survey for kingfisher along Bannold Drove will be undertaken no more than 6 months in advance of construction of the station to ensure an assessment of the current status of kingfisher along the ditches can be undertaken and if necessary appropriate mitigation measures implemented.

The construction activities will be controlled via a Construction and Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) which will provides details as to how construction activities will be controlled to reduce and prevent ecological impacts. A Habitat Management Plan (HMP) will be produced which will detail how the habitats within the receptor site will be managed and protected in the long term.

The mitigation measures should ensure that there will be no significant residual ecological impacts as a result of the proposals.

4.2 Landscape and Visual Impact

The site occupies an area of relatively flat land east of a water treatment works and the Waterbeach Barracks. It is currently predominantly used as arable farmland.

Trees and hedgerows within the site mark the edge of Bannold Drove and the drainage ditches that lie either side of it. Initial research indicates that the site contains no Tree Preservation Order trees or tree groups.

Existing vegetation will not be significantly affected by the proposals and will be retained as an integral part of the proposed development where possible. Additional tree and hedgerow planting will form part of the development proposals. Species selection and design will reflect local landscape character.

Given the location and scale of development proposed, it is judged that there will not be significant effects on the character of the local landscape at either construction or operational phase.

Furthermore, initial site analysis indicates that the proposed relocation of the railway station will have relatively limited visual effects due to the nature of the proposals and the location of the site adjacent to existing rail infrastructure. Views from within the central area of Waterbeach are judged unlikely. However, views may be possible from the northern and eastern fringes of the settlement and from properties (for example off Long Drove) and footpaths in the local area including along the Fen Rivers Way, which follows the River Cam. Views from locations to the east...
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of the River Cam may also be possible. Initial analysis indicates that views from Wicken Fen will not be possible due to the screening effects of intervening vegetation.

There are opportunities to mitigate the effects of the proposed relocation of the railway station at the operational stage through the selection of materials, design of lighting and incorporation of trees and other vegetation into the proposals.

From an initial desk study exercise and site appraisal, no significant landscape or visual constraints have been identified. The site appears, from a landscape and visual perspective, to be suitable for the development of the type and scale proposed, subject to sensitive design. As such, it is considered an EIA in relation to landscape and visual effects is not required.

However, a landscape appraisal will be submitted with the planning application to describe the nature of the landscape and visual effects resulting from the proposed development. It will also describe how landscape and visual considerations have informed the design of the proposed development. Reference will be made to a small number of representative viewpoints, the location of which will be agreed with SCDC prior to the assessment being undertaken.

4.3 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Construction Effects

The site does not contain any scheduled ancient monuments or other designated heritage assets that would present an absolute constraint on development.

A Desk Based Assessment along with a geo-physical survey will be undertaken prior to the planning application to ensure that the planning authority has sufficient information about the existence of potential archaeological remains within the site. The recommendations of the authority's archaeological advisor in respect of providing any further information will be followed. This will ensure that the normal planning procedure securing archaeological mitigation by way of a planning condition can be applied. With appropriate mitigation, it is not anticipated that there would be any significant residual construction effects arising from the construction of the proposed relocation of the railway station.

Operational Effects

The small scale of the development along with its distance from designated heritage assets, such as the Grade II listed farmhouse, and intervening landscape features means that any operational effects arising from change in their settings are likely to be imperceptible.

4.4 Hydrology, Drainage and Flood risk

The Site lies within the District Boundary of the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The area is a pumped catchment reliant on the IDB for operation of pumping plant and drain maintenance for all surface water drainage discharge.

The existing drainage system at the site consists of a network of open channel gravity surface water drains that discharge into the River Cam via Bottisham Locks Electric Pumping Station and Cam Pumping Station. The pumping stations have been sized to discharge surface water runoff from agricultural land at the rate of 1.1 l/s/ha.
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Construction Effects

The use of environmental management controls and procedures such as bunding fuel tanks and siting of refuelling points away from watercourses/drains will ensure that any risk of contamination of surface water is appropriately controlled. These and measures below will be included in the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be submitted with the planning application in due course.

The potential impacts of earthworks operations upon silt loading within the watercourses will be mitigated by phasing the operations and incorporating measures to route surface water run-off from "worked" areas to a sump/silt trap before discharging to the onsite outfalls. In addition, the surface water discharge regime from any sump/silt trap facility would be structured to enable silt to “settle out”.

Construction works within/in close proximity to ditch/course/outfalls will be controlled by best practice and environmental management controls set out by the EA.

Careful planning will ensure that appropriate surface water runoff storage capacity is provided to mitigate flood risk impacts as construction is progressed.

Operational Effects

Mitigation measures (such as land level raising, flood bunds/embankments or combined measures) will be implemented to mitigate against the unlikely breach scenario during the 100 year return period (and climate change allowance) as previously discussed and agreed with the EA (as part of the Water Cycle Strategy). These may require level for level and volume for volume flood storage volume compensation (to be discussed and agreed with the EA).

A site-specific FRA in accordance with the guidance set out in National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance, EA guidance on climate change as well as Regional and Local policies will be submitted with the planning application. The FRA will assess in detail the information on flood risk, describe the proposed surface water management strategy for the site and identify potential flood mitigation measures (as needed). The proposed surface water drainage strategy will be designed to replicate, as close as possible, the existing drainage regime using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and provide betterment over and above the existing hydrological conditions, where feasible and practicable. In order to maintain the current runoff rate of 1.1 l/s/ha from the pumping stations into the River Cam and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere, the surface water drainage network for the proposed development will need to be designed to limit discharge to 1.1 l/s/ha of the overall developed area.

The preliminary surface water management strategy will ensure that overland flows in excess of the capacity of the positive drainage systems are routed away from buildings towards the less vulnerable highways, open space and surface water attenuation provision.

Typical pollution prevention measures within the SUDS treatment train, as well as more traditional measures such as trapped highway gullies and petrol interceptors, will be incorporated into the surface water drainage system as required to help mitigate against diffuse pollution arising from the site.
Based on the above baseline condition and following the implementation of mitigation measures during the construction and operational phase, it is anticipated that there are not likely to be any significant effects and therefore considered an EIA is not required.

### 4.5 Transport and Highways

**Construction Effects**

A temporary construction access will be required and there will be a localised and short term increase in construction traffic on local roads. The total increase in HGV movements is likely to be small in absolute terms, although large in percentage terms on Bannold Road and Bannold Drove due to the low volume of traffic on these links at present. The likely increase in traffic on the A10 will be insignificant in the context of existing flows on this link. Overall, there are not expected to be any significant residual highway impacts as a result of the proposed relocation of the railway station.

**Operational Effects**

The proposed relocation of the railway station will result in a localised redistribution of vehicular traffic flows within the village of Waterbeach. The changes in daily vehicular movements on each link will be small in both absolute and percentage terms on the majority of roads within the village, with the exception of Bannold Road and Bannold Drove which would see a small absolute change in vehicular flows, but a large percentage change due to the low volume of traffic on these links at present. There are not expected to be any changes in traffic flows on the wider highway network (i.e. A10 or Clayhithe Road). There are not expected to be any significant residual highways impacts as a result of the proposed relocation of the railway station.

The relocated railway station will benefit from improved cycle and pedestrian access with increased cycle parking and facilities for bus and taxi drop-off that are not currently available at the existing station location. There are not expected to be any significant adverse residual pedestrian, cycle or public transport impacts as a result of the proposed relocation of the railway station. It is anticipated that it will lead to a betterment of sustainable transport and highway infrastructure in the area.

### 4.6 Noise

Noise impacts may arise during both construction and operation of the proposed relocation of the railway station.

Planning Practice Guidance advises that “noise needs to be considered when new developments may create noise.” It also advises that “… decision taking should take account of the acoustic environment and in doing so consider whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur...” It defines the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) as “the level of noise exposure above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur”. In the same way, that there is no point at which noise is acceptable or intolerable as this depends on the context, so there is no nationally agreed value for SOAEL.

The objectives of European Noise Directive 200249/EC are:

- to determine the noise exposure of the population through noise mapping:
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- to make information available on environmental noise to the public; and
- to establish action plans based on the mapping results to reduce levels where necessary and to preserve environmental noise quality where it is good.

The END is implemented in England by the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations, 2006 (amended 2010) which require that strategic noise maps are produced by a competent authority showing daytime, evening and night-time noise levels. The maps also show Noise Important Areas (NIAs) reflecting part of the population that are exposed to the highest noise levels from road or rail traffic. There are NIAs on the A10 Ely Road west of Waterbeach and approximately 1.2km from the existing station. It is unlikely that the proposed relocation of the railway station will have an impact (beneficial or adverse) on these NIAs.

Construction Effects

Local authorities have statutory controls on noise and vibration. Local authorities may impose conditions on how construction work should be carried out under Section 60 of the Control of Pollution Act, 1974. Alternatively, a developer may obtain prior consent for the works by setting out the detailed measures that will be applied to control noise under Section 61 of the Act.

The Environmental Protection Act, 1990, places a duty on local authorities to serve abatement notices where noise from premises, vehicles or machinery is judged to constitute a statutory nuisance. Statutory noise nuisance laws do not apply to noise from road or rail traffic but construction noise, public address systems (as on station platforms) and plant noise are not exempt.

British Standard BS5228 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites Part 1: noise, 2014, provides a methodology for predicting noise levels produced by fixed and mobile plant used in a range of typical construction operations. The standard includes criteria for the determination of potential significance of noise impacts and guidelines for noise control measures that can form part of a noise management plan.

The nearest receptors to the site of the proposed relocation of the railway station are at a distance of 50m. Provided that the guidance in BS5228 is followed, and a Section 61 application is made, it is unlikely that construction noise will produce a significant adverse impact.

Operational Effects

Noise impacts may arise from changes in noise produced by the trains, fixed plant at the station, the public address system at the station and changes in traffic movements as a result of the Proposed relocation of the railway station.

The Calculation of Railway Noise, 1995, sets out the method to be used for calculating noise from railways. It takes account of the type of train, its speed and service frequency together with factors such as the distance from the track to receivers, ground absorption and any noise barriers.

Relocation of the station will alter the existing noise environment because train speeds will change and trains will accelerate and brake from a new position. However, trains are relatively infrequent on this line and the nearest receptor is 80m from the tracks so a significant adverse impact due to train noise is unlikely.

British Standard BS4142 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound, 2014, can be used for assessing the sound of the station public address system and any fixed plant at the station. Reasonable control measures will be imposed on the noise emissions from fixed plant and
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on the station public address system to ensure that a significant adverse impact from these sources is prevented.

The Calculation of Road Traffic Noise provides procedures for predicting noise levels at sensitive receptors for a given flow of road traffic. The methodology takes into account the volume of traffic, its speed and mix of heavy vehicles, the road surface type and environmental factors such as the distance from the road to receptors, ground absorption and any noise barriers. One of the impacts associated with the proposed relocation of the station is an increase in traffic on Bannold Drove that will serve the car park for the new station. The proposals are for 200 spaces and there may be other traffic such as taxis, buses and drop-off and pick-up vehicles. Although this increase in traffic may be large in proportion to existing flows, it is relatively small in absolute terms so is not expected to lead to significant adverse impacts.

The analysis set out above shows that significant adverse impacts for noise and vibration are not expected to arise and is therefore considered that an EIA for noise purposes is not required.

4.7 Air Quality

Construction Effects

The proposed relocation of the railway station is located within 350 metres of sensitive receptors such as residential dwellings and places of work, beyond which potential impacts on air quality are unlikely to occur. There are no designated sites for ecology within one kilometre of the site.

Best practice construction mitigation measures will be implemented during the construction phase, via a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), in order to control potential impacts from dust. The proposed relocation of the railway station is therefore not considered to result in any significant impacts associated with dust.

It is not expected that there will be any significant impacts on air quality arising from construction phase traffic or construction plant. For a development such as this, construction traffic is expected to be minimal and guidance suggests that impacts need only be assessed if there is going to be more than 100 vehicle movements per day (Environment Protection UK & Institute of Air Quality Management Guidance, 2017). In addition, any impacts from disruptions on the local traffic network will also be minimal based on the low traffic flows in the area and the low existing pollutant concentrations. There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) present within close proximity of the site – the closest is designated within South Cambridgeshire District Council approximately 5.5 kilometres southwest of the proposed development.

Finally, any emissions associated from onsite construction plant will be temporary in nature and therefore no further assessment of construction traffic or construction plant is considered necessary.

Operational Effects

Monitoring in the area indicates that air quality is good, with no exceedances of national air quality objectives recorded in 2015.

In addition to the Local Authority air quality monitoring, Defra provides estimates of background pollution concentrations for oxides of nitrogen (NOx), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) across the UK for each one kilometre grid square for every year from 2013 to 2030. A
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Review of this data for the grid squares relevant to the site indicates that background concentrations are very low and well below the national air quality objectives.

The proposed relocation of the railway station will alter the distribution of traffic flows within the village during operation, although it is not expected to significantly change the volume of traffic in absolute terms. Considering the existing conditions, the alteration in traffic as a result of the relocation of the railway station through provision of the new car park, bus movements, potential taxi movements and pick-ups and drop-offs is not likely to result in any significant air quality effects. Therefore, it is considered an EIA is not required.

4.8 Agricultural Land

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (HMSO, 2015) sets out the requirements for consultation with Natural England where development of agricultural land is proposed. Natural England should be consulted where “development which is not for agricultural purposes and is not in accordance with the provisions of a development plan or involves the loss of not less than 20 hectares of grades 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land which is for the time being used (or was last used) for agricultural purposes” or where the loss of less than 20 hectares of BMV agricultural land “is likely to lead to a further loss of agricultural land amounting cumulatively to 20 hectares or more” (bullet point ‘y’ of Schedule 4).

The proposed relocation of the railway station will result in the loss of approximately 6ha of agricultural land (subgrade 3a). The site is allocated within the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and is below the 20ha threshold at which Natural England would require to be consulted. It is therefore considered that the combination of these policies measures and the quantum and quality of agricultural land affected, relative to both the national resource and the relative availability of land of that quality in the locality, will not result in significant adverse impacts.

4.9 Cumulative Effects

The detailed application for the proposed relocation of the railway station is being promoted as a stand-alone development to serve the existing need of the village only. The station facilities will be designed in such a way to meet the village’s current need but allow for appropriate integration and expansion to accommodate Waterbeach New Town in the future. The planning application for the Waterbeach New Town will include details of any integration or expansion works required to meet the needs of that development at that time.

The selection criteria (paragraph 3(g) within Schedule 3) for screening schedule 2 developments provides clear clarification on the scope of cumulative assessments. The impact of the development must consider the cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development. This is an important consideration in the context of this screening request. The Waterbeach New Town is not an approved development at the time of writing and therefore the cumulative effects of Waterbeach New Town and the proposed relocation of the railway station do not need to be considered at this stage. The planning application for the Waterbeach New Town will consider the cumulative effects of any works required to the relocated railway station and Waterbeach New Town itself.
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Approved developments within close vicinity of the application site are small-scale developments and it is judged that the cumulation of impacts arising from these developments along with the proposed relocation of the railway station would not result in significant environmental impacts.

Conclusions

Having considered the proposed relocation of the railway station against both indicative thresholds and criteria and on its own merits in the context of the site location, we consider that the Proposed Development does not constitute EIA development and therefore an EIA is therefore not required. We request that South Cambridgeshire Council confirm this view by means of a formal Screening Opinion within 3 weeks of receipt of this letter. Confirmation will allow us to proceed with the preparation of a planning application to deliver the relocated railway station.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss anything in this letter further.

Robert Pile
Associate
Robert.pile@lda-design.co.uk

Cc - Chris Goldsmith
    Matt Clarke
APPENDIX THREE – EIA SCREENING OPINION
11 December 2017

Dear Mr Pile

Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

Request for a screening opinion

Proposal: Relocated Railway Station and associated development
Location: Waterbeach

I refer to the above request for a screening opinion received on the 21 November 2017.

The Local Planning Authority has considered the request in accordance with regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The proposed development does fall within Part 10(b) of Schedule 2 of the 2017 Regulations and the Local Planning Authority has considered the proposed development with reference to the relevant criteria set out in Schedule 3.

Having regard to the available information, the Local Planning Authority’s screening decision is that an environmental impact assessment is not required in relation to the project. A copy of the main reasons for this conclusion and the likely effects of the proposed development on the environment including any mitigation measures are included in Appendix 1 attached to this letter.

Yours sincerely

AW

Andrew Winter
Principal Planning Officer
EIA Screening Report
S/4177/17/E1 - Relocated Railway Station, Waterbeach

Site and Surroundings

The application site is located to the north east of Waterbeach on land between Bannold Drive and the ‘Fen Line’ railway that links Cambridge and King’s Lynn. The site is predominantly comprised of agricultural arable land, which is drained via ditches along field boundaries. There are no buildings or structures located within the site boundary, apart from a short section of the railway line and associated embankments together with overhead electricity and signalling equipment. The site boundary also incorporates the proposed access routes to the site along Bannold Drive and Cody Road (both public highways) and a temporary construction access off Bannold Droad to the eastern side of the railway line.

The site is not covered by any formal designations or ‘sensitive areas’ as defined by the EIA Regulations. The nearest Scheduled Monument is 1.4km to the south-west within Waterbeach village. A Grade II listed farmhouse is located approximately 400m to the south at Lock Farm.

The EA flood maps show that the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 (medium probability of fluvial flooding), with a localised small area at the south-eastern corner in Flood Zone 3 (high probability).

The site comprises Grade 3a agricultural land according to the ALC Survey undertaken across the site.

Proposal

The proposed railway station is a replacement for the existing station, which in turn would be decommissioned and demolished. The primary function of the station in its new location would be to enable longer trains to serve Waterbeach village, for which the applicant argues there is a degree of urgency in order to satisfy rail industry objectives. The proposed station will initially constitute a relatively basic form of development to facilitate its early establishment and its design shall comprise the following:

- A two platform station consisting of approximately 250m long platforms with partial shelter on either side of the existing railway line;
- Up to two pedestrian bridges spanning between the new platforms;
- 200 space car park;
- 200 cycle parking spaces;
- Bus stops;
- Taxi rank;
- Emergency pedestrian escape route from the platforms;
- Resurfacing of Bannold Drive access for pedestrian and cycle movements and for existing vehicular traffic associated with Midload Farm;
- New access road from the eastern side of Cody Road to the station car park providing access for buses, taxis and private vehicular traffic associated with the railway station;
- Hard and soft landscaping including Sustainable Urban Drainage System;
- Platform lighting, station information and surveillance systems; and
• A temporary construction access to the east of the railway line.

The relocated railway station would be connected to the existing village of Waterbeach via a section of new road (including pedestrian and cycle access) joining Cody Road. Bannold Drove would be resurfaced to accommodate pedestrian and cycle movements, while continuing to provide vehicular access to Midload Farm and the Water Recycling Plant. Vehicular traffic associated with access/egress to the relocated station would be prohibited along Bannold Drove with appropriate signage located within the site area.

It is anticipated that the proposed relocated railway station would take approximately 18 months to construct and that a temporary construction access would be required off Bannold Road to the east of the railway, located between the railway line and Burgess Drove. This would allow the construction of the eastern platform and the pedestrian bridge(s). All other construction vehicles would access the site via Bannold Drove to the west of the railway line.

The applicant states that the proposed relocated railway station would not lead to a reduction in services or replace the existing railway station until it has been fully completed, so to ensure that a railway station at Waterbeach remains operational at all times. Once the existing station is no longer required it will be closed and decommissioned. The existing part-concrete, part-wooden deck platforms would be removed by Network Rail and disposed of, reused or recycled as appropriate.

It is evident that any works to decommission the existing station would be temporary/time-limited, and that longer-term impacts are likely to be positive in environmental terms due to the removal of buildings/structures and activity levels from this area and the surrounding road network.

**Waterbeach New Town**

The development put forward in this screening request comprises a relocated station to meet the current demand of the existing station and to enable longer trains to serve Waterbeach village. Subject to the adoption of the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2014) the proposed relocated station would eventually serve and form part of the new town proposals for Waterbeach (Policy SS/5). A separate EIA scoping opinion has been issued by the local planning authority with regards to the likely significant effects of the strategic site including the relocated railway station (ref. S/3203/17/E2).

**Assessment under Legislation**

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended).

1. Does the development fall under Schedule 1?

   No

2. Does the development fall under schedule 2 and exceed the applicable thresholds and criteria?
The proposal does not involve the construction of a new railway line but will involve some works around the existing fenland railway line. No significant alterations are proposed to the line itself and no new railway track is proposed. The construction of the new road would not exceed 1ha under category 10(f). Therefore, technically, the development would more closely relate to category 10(b) 'urban development projects' of Schedule 2 developments.

The submitted screening request details the total site area as approximately 8.5ha, which exceeds the 5ha development area threshold set out in category 10(b) for urban development projects. A set of indicative thresholds and criteria have been produced under national planning guidance (paragraph 057) to aid local planning authorities to determine whether an 'urban development project' is likely to have significant environmental effects. The proposal exceeds these indicative thresholds due to the size of the site area. However, national planning guidance (paragraphs 018 & 032) advises that:

...it should not be presumed that developments above the indicative thresholds should always be subject to assessment, or those falling below these thresholds could never give rise to significant effects, especially where the development is in an environmentally sensitive location. Each development will need to be considered on its merits...In general, the more environmentally sensitive the location, the lower the threshold will be at which significant effects are likely. Only a very small proportion of Schedule 2 development will require an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Therefore to determine whether or not the proposal amounts to EIA development an assessment of its likely environmentally effects (both positive and negative) is required in accordance with schedule 3 of the EIA regulations.

Consultation

Council’s Ecology Officer – "Although I am open to the fact that an EIA may not be necessary in this case there are still three points the applicant should consider in the statements they have made. The EIA Screening Request states that there will no longer be any impact on Banold’s Drive, other than some resurfacing works to create the primary foot and cycle access to the new station site. Although I agree that impact will now be greatly reduced, the new access road east of Cody Road will still have to cross Banold’s Drive at some point which will have an impact on the habitats and species present. However, I do not believe that this will be a significant impact once mitigation is employed to remove any residual impacts on this sensitive corridor.

Secondly I would like the applicant to clarify if, as is stated in the EIA Scoping Request, “No roosting bats have been detected”. As far as I am aware suitable bat roost features have been identified within trees along Banold’s Drive; however as yet no emergence surveys have been conducted. Therefore the fact that no bat roosts have been detected is due to incomplete surveys rather than an absence of confirmed roosts. I am happy to be corrected on this if in fact emergence surveys of these features have now been completed and bat roosts are confirmed absent. As above I do not believe this would create a need for an EIA to be conducted; however it could have a significant impact on any outline application and subsequent mitigation strategy."
My third point relates to the no cumulative effect argument. The applicant maintains that as no outline application for the Waterbeach Newtown has been approved, the New town development cannot be considered as a cumulative effect. Currently an outline application for the Urban and Civic site (6000 dwellings) has been submitted with the LPA, an EIA Scoping Request for the RLW site has been received and is currently out for consultation, and the Waterbeach Newtown site is due to appear in the new South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan as allocated land once approved by the Inspectorate.

The issue of cumulative effect of development is a decision the case officer must ultimately make. The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 does state that the impact of existing and/or approved development must be taken into account, and the new town is yet to be approved either by the LPA or by the inspectorate; although there is strong indications that both will occur in the near future. An EIA is being conducted for the wider RLW development area which will incorporate the station site within its boundaries. The question that must be answered is whether there is a significant ecological impact that the relocated station will have in advance of the development of the wider site which would be identified by an EIA. I don't believe there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the relocation of the station will have a significant ecological impact that will not be identified by the wider RLW EIA, or that its impact would be in advance of any further development of the Waterbeach Newtown.

Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment - We would not object to the development and would not consider archaeology to be a requirement for Environmental Impact Assessment. We would however advise that a programme of archaeological investigation should be secured by condition of planning permission.

Cambridgeshire County Council Highways - No comments received

Environment Agency – In view of the site location within flood zones 2 and 3, albeit defended, and adjacent to the railway, particular attention should be made to flood risk and potential ground contamination.

Environmental Health Officer - With regard to this Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening opinion request we do not envisage any potential significant effects on the environment and the development is unlikely to pose unusually complex or hazardous environmental effects by virtue of its nature, size, or location.

When considering the various factors contained within Schedule 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, we do not consider the proposals to be EIA development. The reasons for this conclusion are outlined below for information.

The area is not currently in a densely populated area and the impacts from the construction phase will be transitory in nature and can be controlled by planning conditions. This would include restrictions on bonfires and burning of waste on site.

The nearest residential properties have been identified as those on Capper Road and Midload Farm and could potentially be adversely affected by noise, dust and possibly vibration from the proposed station construction and operation. However, these impacts can be controlled by planning conditions. To address other environmental related issues, the submission and approval of an overarching Operational Management Plan (OMP) could be considered.
Potential noise sources requiring assessment are plant and equipment associated with the station building, car park and platforms. This will include:

- The operation of any PA system used for passenger announcements.
- Vehicle noise from access roads, car parking, pick-up and drop-offs and taxi ranks.
- Deliveries during both during construction and operational phases.

Conditions may be applied that require noise and vibration impacts to be assessed in relation to existing receptors and a scheme to protect those properties is submitted and agreed before the use commences. A lighting impact assessment /scheme can be required and any approved lighting scheme is installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details to control impacts.

Any application should include a detailed flood risk assessment and a surface water drainage strategy. I have confirmed with the SCDC Scientific Officer (Air Quality) that an assessment of air quality would be appropriate at a later date and could be conditioned at the application stage, but there would not be a need for a full EIA at this time as impacts are not likely to be significant.

If the appropriate environmental controls are introduced and maintained correctly, then there is a low probability of impacts that will be of a sufficient magnitude, complexity or extent to have a significant adverse effect on the environment as perceived by the Health and Environmental Services, Environment Commissioning Team at South Cambridgeshire District Council. Developers and their agents should have consideration of South Cambridgeshire District Council Supplementary Planning Document - "District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in South Cambridgeshire".

**Lead Local Flood Authority** – An EIA would not be required and the relevant matters can be dealt with within a flood risk assessment and surface water drainage proposal. As outlined in the EIA screening report, the surface water discharge rate from the site should be restricted to 1.11/s/ha in line with the IDB requirements.

**Waterbeach Parish Council** – Waterbeach Parish Council unanimously agree to the request that an Environmental Impact Assessment is carried out due to the major environmental impact the relocation of Waterbeach Railway Station will have on the proposed rural location. Areas highlighted are as follows:

- Light pollution (impact of lighting a space which is currently dark) (owls currently feed on that site as it’s dark)

- Air quality (emissions, impact of idling engines while vehicles wait for passengers)

- Traffic (could having a bigger station and carpark provide an incentive for more use by people who currently don’t choose to use Waterbeach on top of the new residents?)

- Ecology and wildlife

- Loss of agricultural land
• Noise

• Visual impact (people parking in the vicinity too? Behaviour of current passenger indicates having a carpark isn’t necessarily an incentive to not use free space on roads) • Drainage and flood risk

The EIA should also consider the impact to the current location of the railway station in regards to the environment and traffic impact in conjunction with the proposed relocation. Taking into account that the proposed relocation site for the railway station is a rural fen scape then the Council feels that any environmental impact should out way the benefits of the relocation.

General Representations

6 representations received:

• Concerns regarding use of Cody Road – impact of traffic, highway safety, narrow road width, noise and disruption

Assessment under Schedule 3 criteria:

1. The characteristics of the development

Considerations:

(a) the size and design of the whole development;
(b) cumulation with other existing development and/or approved development;
(c) the use of natural resources, in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity;
(d) the production of waste;
(e) pollution and nuisances;
(f) the risk of major accidents and/or disasters relevant to the development concerned, including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge;
(g) the risks to human health (for example, due to water contamination or air pollution).

The scheme would result in a larger train station compared to the existing station when taking into account the size of platforms, pedestrian bridge, parking area and ancillary works and structure. However, its siting, scale and design would be related to the existing fenland railway line and would not result in the need for major railway infrastructure changes in the locality. The size and design would also reflect the need for improved parking, access and safety requirements at the existing station.

No significant effects are anticipated in relation to the use of natural resources, production of waste, or pollution and such impacts can be mitigated by planning condition. There is no evidence to suggest the development would pose a significant risk of major accidents and/or disasters or risk to human health when taking into account the potential for pollution of air, land or water.

In terms of cumulation with other existing development and/or approved development, the strategic site SS/5 is not existing or approved and so technically falls outside of the scope of these considerations. The screening request requires the LPA to decide whether there would be any significant effects of the new relocated
station coming forward as an early phase and serving the existing village. There are several existing and approved residential developments along Bannold Road and Cody Road and these are considered further in terms of cumulative transport effects.

2. Location of development

Considerations:

(a) the existing and approved land use;

(b) the relative abundance, availability, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources (including soil, land, water and biodiversity) in the area and its underground;

(c) the absorption capacity of the natural environment, paying particular attention to the following areas - (i) wetlands, riparian areas, river mouths; (ii) coastal zones and the marine environment; (iii) mountain and forest areas; (iv) nature reserves and parks; (v) European sites and other areas classified or protected under national legislation; (vi) areas in which there has already been a failure to meet the environmental quality standards, laid down in Union legislation and relevant to the project, or in which it is considered that there is such a failure; (vii) densely populated areas; (viii) landscapes and sites of historical, cultural or archaeological significance.

The site does not fall within any of the ‘sensitive areas’ defined in the EIA legislation. It is not within a SSSI, national park, the Broads, World Heritage Site, scheduled monument, AONB or European Site. The site is not located within a Conservation Area and the development does not fall within the curtilage or setting of a listed building.

The site is not located within a recognised ecologically designated site and comprises mainly arable land. The River Cam County Wildlife Site is located over 0.5km to the east and Wicken Fen SSSI and the Cam Washes SSSI are within 5km of the site to the northeast. The potential ecological effects outlined in the screening request are acknowledged and agreed along with the mitigation measures in relation to noise, lighting, nesting birds, compensatory habitats for great crested newts and reptiles, pre-commencement badger and kingfisher surveys. However, given the nature of the habitats and limited scale of the site, no significant effects are anticipated.

The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 (medium probability of flooding) with a small portion of land to the south-east corner (including the eastern access track) falling within Flood Zone 3 (high probability). The applicant has confirmed that flood mitigation measures such as land level raising, flood bunds/embankments or combined measures would be implemented to mitigate against the unlikely breach scenario during the 100 year return period. These may require level for level and volume for volume flood storage volume compensation to be discussed and agreed with the EA and submitted in a Flood Risk Assessment in the application. Surface water drainage discharge would be limited to 1.1 l/s/ha to maintain the current runoff rate from the pumping stations at the River Cam and to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Potential pollution of the water environment can be mitigated by planning condition during the construction and operation of the development.
The County Council's records indicate that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential and that the effects of the development could be mitigated by condition to secure a scheme of archaeological investigation.

3. Characteristics of the potential impact

Considerations:

(a) the magnitude and spatial extent of the impact (for example geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected);
(b) the nature of the impact;
(c) the transboundary nature of the impact;
(d) the intensity and complexity of the impact;
(e) the probability of the impact;
(f) the expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact;
(g) the cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development;
(h) the possibility of effectively reducing the impact.

In terms of transport, the proposed development would result in a redistribution of movement by car, motorbike, cycle and pedestrians through the village and along Bannold Road and Bannold Drove. This would result in an increase in traffic on these roads in addition to the following existing and approved Bannold Road developments:

S/2458/16/RM & S/1359/13/OL – 90 homes
S/2461/16/FL – 45 homes
S/0296/15/FL - 60 homes
S/1907/14/OL – 36 homes
S/0558/14/OL – 57 homes

Some vehicular traffic from the above developments might be directed towards the relocated station but a significant proportion would be towards the A10 or Waterbeach High Street. Therefore, whilst there would be increased traffic along local road network from cumulative development this would not necessarily amount to significant congestion heading towards the relocated station along Bannold Road or Cody Road. The proposed relocated station would serve existing need, which currently reaches 52 vehicle movements in the peak hour with the potential for movements to transfer to Cambridge North station. Further mitigation of vehicle movements would be facilitated by the proposed pedestrian, cycling and public transport interventions outlined in the screening request.

Increased on-street parking along Bannold Road or Cody Road during the construction or operational phases might result in potential obstructions and/or slowing of traffic in the locality. However, this impact could be mitigated by a parking strategy and the agreement of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP). Consequently, the development is not anticipated to result in adverse transport, congestion or air quality impacts.

The size and character of development is not anticipated to be a significant producer of noise, dust or lighting effects during construction and all of these effects can be mitigated by a CEMP. External lighting can be controlled by planning condition to mitigate against light pollution effects.
Noise impacts may arise during the operation of the new relocated station from trains, fixed plant and equipment at the station, traffic movements and the public address system. However, the nearest receptor is 80m from the tracks so a significant adverse noise impact is unlikely. Reasonable control measures can be imposed through planning condition upon noise emissions from fixed plant or equipment and the public address system.

The development would be located on land with a flat topography with main views from the eastern and north fringes of the village and potential views from the River Cam. Landscape and visual impacts from the development would likely be limited to the locality due to the scale and character of development. There would be some urbanising effect on the existing landscape, although this would be limited due to the size of built development and its location alongside the existing railway line and overhead electrical cables. The proposal would also be set against the existing backdrop of residential development to the south west and the water recycling centre to the west. Additional tree and hedge planting would assist in mitigating the visual impacts of the development on the local area as well as sensitive design and choice of materials.

It is not expected that the removal and decommissioning of the existing station infrastructure would have any significant environmental effects given its limited size and the fact that it is not located in any of the sensitive areas defined in the EIA legislation.

Consequently, the proposed development when assessed against the criteria set out in Schedule 3 of the EIA legislation would not result in any significant adverse effects on the environment.

Recommendation

Taking into account the above considerations and the thresholds and criteria set out in the EIA regulations and national planning guidance, an environmental impact assessment is not required in relation to the project.

Signature of Delegation Officer

Paul Mumford

Date

11/12/2017