I object to the application on the following grounds.

**Loss of a valued service**

The proposal includes closing the current station, which in the most recent year for which figures are available was used for 440,142 journeys.

(1) A substantial proportion of those journeys will be by people living in the southern end of the village (the applicants state that 50% arrive on foot); they can currently leave home 5 to 10 minutes before the train is expected, and get home within about 5 minutes of the return train arriving. They can leave home later if the on-line information shows the train is delayed.

The shuttle service proposed in the “S106 heads of terms” document is described as “transitional”, which implies it will be withdrawn after a few months, and gives no indication that it will meet all trains, including early morning and late night services, nor what measures (if any) there will be to ensure it is reliable – an unreliable service would be worse than no service. The Design and Access statement says it will meet the majority of (i.e. not all) departures throughout the day, with no indication whether “day” refers to anything more than 9 to 5. It also makes no reference to arrivals; for instance a vehicle that is adequate for passengers leaving on the 1730 to Ely would not accommodate all those arriving on it.

(2) The current station has step-free access to both platforms. Access to the up (southbound) platform in the proposed new one is by two footbridges, only one of which has lifts.

(a) The bridge with lifts is at the far end of an 8-coach platform, i.e. about 150 metres from the entrance, so people of restricted mobility who are not in wheelchairs have a choice of climbing three flights of stairs or walking 150 metres to the lift. This makes a mockery of putting the “accessible” parking places near the entrance, and having a “fully accessible” shuttle bus. Similarly the “parent and child” spaces, in the case of those with pushchairs.

(b) Recently the lift on the bridge to platforms 7 and 8 at Cambridge was out of order for several days. It is to be expected that the same could happen here. There does not seem to be any provision for people who need to use the lifts in such an eventuality. Some emergency escape routes are shown on the drawings, but they all appear to have steps and in any case don’t seem to lead to an exit.

(3) The shelters on the platforms appear to be even smaller than the ones on the current station. Although there is a canopy over about half the width of the up platform, that won’t afford any protection from the wind, nor from driving rain.

(4) The Design and Access statement lists a number of supposed problems with the current station. Many of those problems can be easily fixed if there is a will to do so, for example: now the goods shed has been removed there is plenty of room to widen the access to the up platform; there is now space to the north of Clayhithe Road (between the railway and the footpath) for more cycle storage;
more car parking could be provided on the derelict county council land opposite the entrance to the current car park. Nothing in the proposal helps Network Rail to close level crossings.

**Safe access**
All vehicular access to the site, including from the A10, is proposed to be through the village and along Cody Road, which (as other commenters have pointed out) is unsuitable.

The draft Waterbeach New Town SPD shows an access road directly from the A10 to the location of the proposed station. Development of the new station should not begin until that route is available.

**Effects on the area**
The success of the Cambridge region has meant that there is increasing demand for housing for people working in the area, and Waterbeach New Town, adjacent to the proposed new station, is supposed to help to meet that demand. However, housing built next to a station with a fast train service to London will be likely to be occupied by people who work in London; thus with the station relocated the New Town will deliver many fewer housing units for people working locally, who will then need yet more housing to be built somewhere else in South Cambridgeshire, putting yet more pressure on local infrastructure.