

Residents' feedback on TregaZinkwit

Wishes and requirements arising from the residents' meeting in Limmel (13 April 2026) and the consultation with the Limmel Neighbourhood Council (12 May 2026).

Document intended for: Construction team partner for infrastructure and public spaces

Date of version: 15 May 2026 | Subject: TregaZinkwit area development, Maastricht

Introduction and context

To ensure that the views of Limmel's current residents are given concrete consideration in the planning process, the council organised a dedicated information and participation evening for Limmel residents on 13 April 2026. Representatives from several council departments were present. Residents were given the opportunity to voice their feedback, concerns and wishes through an open discussion and by placing post-it notes on the planning area.

In addition, an initial draft of this document was further refined in consultation with the Limmel Neighbourhood Council. Finally, all responses were verified and supplemented during the Limmel Neighbourhood Council's neighbourhood meeting (15 June 2026).

This document compiles the feedback received relating to public spaces, the design of outdoor areas, mobility and infrastructure. The feedback has been organised by theme and accompanied by a description (wish or requirement), an explanation of the underlying rationale and, where relevant, a note on legal or planning considerations. This document is intended for the infrastructure partner.

NB: A parallel document containing feedback on housing and the built environment has been drawn up for the housing partner.

Legend

WISH

A point that the local authority wishes to express as a preference or ambition, but for which there is no enforceable framework.

REQUIREMENT

A point that is specified as a strict precondition on the basis of policy, social or planning considerations.

NOT FEASIBLE

The point has been raised but falls outside the scope of this partner or is otherwise not feasible.

Theme 1 — Public space, green spaces, nature and the living environment

Green spaces are one of the most frequently mentioned and most important themes for residents. This concerns both the quantity and the quality of green spaces in public areas.

Feedback	Wish/Requirement	Rationale	Explanation / points for consideration
Plenty of green spaces in public areas is very important	REQUIREMENT	Residents perceive the existing residential environment as being too urbanised.	
Facilities for the 12–18 age group	WISH	Following the removal of the football cage in Limmel, nothing has been put in its place for this age group	<i>Specific consultation rounds on the design of public spaces will need to demonstrate that there is greater support for this type of facility.</i>

Theme 2 — Mobility, traffic and infrastructure

Mobility is the most extensively discussed theme. Residents have expressed concerns about road safety, access routes to the planning area and the disruption that additional traffic flows may cause in and around Limmel.

Issue	Wish/Requirement	Rationale	Explanation / points for consideration
The main route to and from the development area (north-south link/town centre/Beatrixhaven) is the A2, not the Willem Alexanderweg or Borgharenweg	REQUIREMENT	Residents do not want the increase in traffic resulting from the new neighbourhood to be channelled through the local streets of Limmel. The A2 is the designated main route.	<i>This relates to the traffic access to the planning area and must be safeguarded in the mobility plan.</i>
Minimise the risk posed by traffic on Borgharenweg	REQUIREMENT	Residents perceive the Borgharenweg as dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. With the additional traffic resulting from the area's development, this danger will increase.	<i>Specific attention must be paid to speed-reducing measures, crossings and cycling infrastructure.</i>

Issue	Request/Requirement	Rationale	Explanation / points for consideration
The increased appeal of Borgharenlaan must not lead to an increase in traffic (including in relation to Balijeweg)	REQUEST	If Borgharenlaan becomes more attractive (e.g. as a through route or residential thoroughfare), there is a risk that more traffic from outside the neighbourhood will use this route as an alternative to the A2.	<i>This calls for a comprehensive traffic assessment: how should Borgharenlaan be designed as part of the new neighbourhood, without creating a shortcut via Balijeweg?</i>
Close a road (Willem Alexanderweg?) to motor traffic (at the planning area)	WISH	Residents are calling for one or more routes within or adjacent to the planning area to be made car-free, in order to make room for pedestrians and cyclists and to enhance the quality of life.	Post-its indicate the intended location. Further clarification is required during the planning process.
Water taxi as a link across the Maas	NOT FEASIBLE	Residents have expressed a desire for alternative, sustainable connections across the Meuse as part of a broader mobility mix.	This idea has previously been investigated and rejected by the Provincial Council on the grounds of operational unfeasibility.

Theme 3 — Connection to the existing Limmel neighbourhood

Residents want TregaZinkwit not to be developed as an isolated new district, but to form an organic connection with the existing Limmel neighbourhood.

Feedback	Wish/Requirement	Rationale	Explanation / points for consideration
Businesses along the edge of the planning area and noise pollution affecting the neighbouring Limmel	REQUEST	Residents are concerned that commercial activity along the boundary of the planning area causes noise and traffic nuisance for the existing homes in neighbouring Limmel.	The design of the buffer zone between the plan area and the existing town of Limmel must take this into account.

This document has been drawn up on the basis of input gathered during the TregaZinkwit neighbourhood meeting on 13 April, the consultation with the Limmel Neighbourhood Council on 12 May and the neighbourhood meeting in Limmel on 15 June.