March 26, 2018

Dear Mr Huntington,

Camcycle is a volunteer-led charity with over 1,200 members that works for more, better and safer cycling and walking in the Cambridge region.

We have no objection in principle to application S/0791/18/FL (Relocated Waterbeach railway station) but we would like to make some comments about aspects that stand to be improved.

We have concerns about the way the cycle parking is provided. Although the proposal is far superior to the poor conditions at the present station, we believe that many more Sheffield stands should be provided instead of double-stacker racks. Sheffield stands are much easier for people to use, especially for people who are unable to lift their cycle into a double-stacker space, and there appears to be plenty of room to lay out a set of Sheffield stands such as those found at Cambridge North. We also believe that 100 cycle parking spaces will quickly fill up and require the additional set to be deployed almost immediately. Beyond that, it is likely that 200 cycle parking spaces will be insufficient within a year or two, and plans should be made for a larger expansion of cycle parking (especially as development continues at nearby sites) as mentioned in paragraph 6.4.10 of the Transport Assessment.

Section 2.3.5 of the Transport Assessment claims that the applicants have provided space for more than double the observed number of cycles at the existing station. We note that moving the station to this new, further, location will naturally increase the demand for cycling to the station, and the provision of high quality cycle parking will also attract people who were worried about theft at the old station. To help make the cycle parking more attractive we ask that provision be made for CCTV monitoring, good lighting and other theft-prevention measures at the cycle parking areas.

The applicant has indicated that some cycle parking spaces are reserved for people with specially adapted cycles, which is a good idea, and we would like them to submit a plan for how they intend to ensure that those special cycle parking spaces are kept available for people who need them.
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We support the provision of a verge-protected foot- and cycle-way along the new access road from Cody Road. However, we believe that it should be segregated provision with, for example, a 2m footway separate from and adjacent to a 3m cycleway. We note that the Transport Assessment has an error in paragraph 2.2.2 where it says there would only be a ‘2m wide footway provided along the north side’ with no mention of a cycleway, and we seek to have that corrected.

We are concerned about the design of the junction of Cody Road and the new access road where it shows the footway/cycleway ‘bending into’ the flare of the new access road. This is not a normal or appropriate junction design. Instead, our recommendation is that the footway/cycleway continues in a straight line and meets Cody Road at a perpendicular angle, where there should be provided a parallel walking and cycling Zebra crossing.

We support the gating of Bannold Drove to ensure that it is a safe and pleasant route for non-motorised users, indeed this is a vital improvement needed to mitigate the travel impacts of the relocated station. Therefore we ask for a condition and/or S106 commitment to be added to this application that the necessary traffic regulation order be taken forward prior to the station opening in order to establish the route as a non-motorised user route from the start. We also support the style of junction provided where Bannold Drove meets the new access road and gives priority to people walking and cycling. We hope that when the A10 access road is built, its junction will give similar priority to people walking and cycling.

We are concerned about the layout of the station platforms and the arrangement of lifts and access. During the first phase of station operation, prior to the construction of the follow-on station building, the proposed layout will require users of the lifts to traverse the entire northbound platform before they can reach the lifts, which is unfair to people who must use wheelchairs and similar mobility devices. Furthermore, lifts break down frequently, so there should always be redundant provision in new builds like this. Both station footbridges must be ‘access for all’ designs providing lifts for safety and redundancy purposes and to give much better service to people with disabilities.

Yours sincerely,
On behalf of Camcycle

Matthew Danish,
Trustee