

c. This Park & Ride site could be served by a shuttle bus for the population of Hardwick and it has the benefit of the existing pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A428 to the village.

d. Locating this facility further to the west (1.5 miles), traffic would be caught earlier – traffic is already queuing on the slip road off the A428 and this will be further exacerbated as a result of the additional homes being built at Bourn and Cambourne.

e. The outcome will be reduced traffic flow on the A1303, an improved quality of life for residents living alongside Madingley Road, and reduced rat running through the narrow, winding roads of Madingley Village.

2. The development of the cloverleaf at Girton to provide a six-way junction allowing traffic from the west to use the A428 and particularly to be able to turn south onto the M11.

3. The best option is for the Area 1 Central Red Route to be implemented (rejecting Option Area 1 North Blue). A bus lane(s) developed along the existing A428 and A1303 from Cambourne to Cambridge is clearly more advantageous as it uses an existing road network which will be cheaper to construct and maintain. It will be quicker in use and respect the local environment – both key aims of your proposal – by not building on the 800 Wood or imposing on the tranquility of the American Military Cemetery:

The Area 1 North (blue) route would ruin the 800 Wood which was planted to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the University, is intended for the public to enjoy and makes a significant environmental and ecological contribution to one of the least wooded counties in the country. It will also impact on the adjacent SSSI 'Madingley Wood' which, together with the 800 Wood, is the focus of unique, long-term research within several departments of the University of Cambridge. The Area 1 North Blue route continues southwards through fields in full view of the American Military Cemetery which is the only permanent American World War II Cemetery in the UK with the site selected for its beauty and tranquility on a hill overlooking fields. A letter from Anthony Eden to the American Ambassador (dated 21st June 1954) sets out the terms of agreement, including a reference to the surrounding fields: 'the area coloured yellow will be restricted to agricultural use'. This agreement cannot and should not be ignored.

052 I have been a [REDACTED] resident for over 50 years and wish to register a very strong objection to the proposed new bus road over the west fields which is vandalism. This is the green coloured option 1 south. It would devastate an area I have known for some 60 years to little traffic advantage.

The option down Madingley road would be vastly preferable as well as being very much cheaper and not spoil the one remaining pleasant access to Cambridge.

The consultative documents seem very biased towards destroying the area to allow future over-development to occur. Would you attempt to stop this destructive proposal.

053 We are [REDACTED] residents and we am writing to object in the strongest terms to the proposed new busway that is likely to pass very close to the North of Coton (option Area 1 South)

We believe that this scheme would cause irreparable environmental damage to the village of Coton. From what we can see form the map of Coton, that is unacceptably inaccurate, you appear to be proposing the construction of a bus road that would pass either very close to the north of the village, or even through it. It is impossible to envisage how this would not have a very serious impact not our village.

The scheme would also cause irreparable damage to the land to the north of Coton, the Coton

Countryside Reserve and the West Fields. The land to the north of the village is important green belt countryside and is protected by Nation Trust Covenants. The West Fields form part of the special character of Cambridge, as was confirmed by the High Court in 2008 when development there was last proposed . We would like to see both these areas continue to enjoy protection from development..

The Area 1 South scheme also seems a huge waste of public money. It will not deliver significant savings in journey times, as claimed. The information provided is fanciful, misleading, and based on unjustifiable comparisons. We believe that promoting the South option as a superior option on the basis of faster access to the city is open to serious challenge.

We are also led to believe that these buses would be unlikely to stop in Coton, and a new crossing on Cambridge road would actually slow down our journey times into Cambridge. In fact, it is unclear how residents of any of the villages closer to Cambridge than Cambourne will use these buses. Will it necessitate driving to a new Park and Ride, thus adding to traffic congestion?

We believe that traffic congestion could be better solved using an on road solution on Madingley Road. This could be a tidal scheme. This would cause minimal environmental and property damage, no loss of green belt , and could be done at a fraction of the cost. Local people on local buses could use this route, and so it would benefit far more residents to the West of Cambridge. Furthermore, some of the saved £50 million could be used to improve cycling facilities along the Coton footpath , putting a tidal route down Barton Road as well, and the introduction of electric buses to reduce pollution.

We would therefore, urge you to reject the Option Area1 South and choose the much less damaging Area1Central proposal. We feel that it would make the best use of public money and also preserve the unique character of West Cambridge for future generations.

We would also add that we sincerely hope that the views of residents in the villages that may be affected will be taken into account , and that the consultation process is a fair and open process.

054 Re: Objection to bus route consultation process

I am a resident of [REDACTED] and write to object in the strongest terms to the manner in which the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' is being conducted. The consultation documents are unclear, inaccurate and misleading written in a biased way designed to encourage people to support the Area 1 South option.

First, it is unclear what we are being consulted on. Is this a busway, a bus road or a dedicated busway? What is the proposed route? How close does it come to our village? Does it dissect our village? Where will these buses stop and will people from Coton be able to use them? I believe failure to provide clarity on these fundamental aspects of the scheme calls into question the validity of this consultation process and the public's ability to respond.

Second, the consultation documents are highly misleading. The argument in support of the Area 1 South route, and thus spending an extra £50 million of public money, is guaranteed quicker and more reliable journey times. Yet the information given on this is bound to mislead respondents. The consultation leaflet states that the journey time for the Area 1 South option is 7 minutes shorter than for the other options, but the comparisons are clearly unfair. The North and Central routes end at Northampton Street, while the South route ends at Grange Road, further from the city centre. For buses to negotiate West Road and Queens Road at rush hour could take most, if not all, of the 7 minute difference. In a consultation document which deliberately provides only the most approximate, 'fuzzy' information on route options, it is frankly absurd to provide journey times to

the nearest minute. A fair document would have journey times in the range of 10-15 minutes for all three options. Promoting the South option as superior to the others on the basis of faster access to the city centre can only be taken as intentional bias.

Equally misleading is the map of Coton. Those parts of the village to the north and the east that are most affected by this scheme are completely missing. The clear impression to a reader who does not know the village is that the route would by-pass it and consequently have no local impact. It is not good enough simply to say 'the map is indicative'. Unless the City Deal team can definitively rule out the route passing through any part of Coton, the map needs to show that the route may dissect the village, so that respondents can appreciate the potential impact.

Third, key information vital to an informed response is missing. No mention is made of the following important issues:

The enormous ecological or environmental damage the Area 1 South would cause - the route is simply drawn through a void

The potential visual, noise, and pollution impacts on the village of Coton

How people living in villages along the route, including Coton, Comberton, Madingley, Toft and Hardwick, might use these buses. Do they have to drive to the Park and Ride?

Finally I believe this document has been written in a biased manner in order to justify the enormous extra cost of the Area 1 South route. Therefore, for all the reasons above I believe this process to be flawed, biased and so any conclusions drawn as a result of this process will be open to serious challenge.

055 I would like to register my concerns about the proposed bus route through the west fields of Cambridge. Whilst I understand the need for improved transport links between Cambourne and Cambridge and support measures to reduce traffic and improve cycle lanes, I feel very strongly that ploughing double decker buses through green belt land and out onto Grange Road would be a significant and very expensive mistake for the city of Cambridge. Once the west fields are gone, they are gone forever and for everyone. Cities do not knock down buildings to create green space. Green space is precious and needs to be safeguarded.

One of the most disingenuous aspects of the proposal as it is laid out is the idea that option 1c will be significantly quicker. The comparison is not like for like as the journey time from Grange Road into town at rush hour has not been factored in at all. Why in an open consultation must these ideas be presented in a biased way?

Further there is a deliberate evasion of any discussion of how these buses will travel into town. Grange Road has had significant traffic calming measures in place for some time because it has two primary schools and many student residences on it. Cars are not permitted to travel at more than 20mph and there are traffic islands in place at regular intervals. Students on their way to lectures often cycle three abreast along Grange road. At rush hours the road is populated by young children on their way to school, cycling, walking, in pushchairs, with dogs. If the objective is to get people into town quickly, using Grange Road and/or West Road or Sedgwick Avenue cannot serve to meet this end. Indeed it is positively dangerous to consider this option.

I urge you to support the central option using existing roads and to focus on encouraging alternative ways to reduce traffic to improve journey times into the city. Please do not allow the destruction of green space lightly. Option 1c is expensive, ill-thought out and dangerous. Is this what Cambridge really needs?

056	<p>I am a Cambridge resident living in [REDACTED]</p> <p>Of the routes proposed, I support the 'Central' two red routes which go along Madingley Road particularly enabling residents of Cambourne to access to a direct route into the City I oppose vehemently the routes that veer from Madingley Road, the WORST of all being the one that goes along Grange Road.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that while there is 'free' parking along residential streets, the traffic problems will continue regardless of bus routes and increased Park and Ride facilities. Please can we have Residents Parking permits and a Congestion charge. The parking permits probably only need to be policed once per day and if parking tickets are issued people will soon stop parking where they risk being fined. Similarly, the Congestion Charge needs to be applied at peak times to all drivers regardless of where they live either within the City or outside.</p>
057	<p>I have already submitted my survey form (online) to the 'Better Busways' consultation.</p> <p>Just having seen the response of the Better City Deal campaign, I wish to record my absolute support of its entire content.</p> <p>The complaint made within it is in accord with the observations I and many others have made, and its proposed solutions to our congestion problems a much better use of public money.</p> <p>I urge you to take this opportunity to heed the feedback that has been given, reject the ill-conceived bus roads/bus lanes idea, and implement more imaginative solutions that will actually work for the benefit of all.</p>
058	<p>The undersigned groups are agreed on the following points:</p> <p>We consider that the narrow focus of the City Deal on economic growth and development does not take account of other values which are also important to present and future residents.</p> <p>The City Deal Board has made decisions behind closed doors which affect the lives of all of us and has failed to engage with the community in a satisfactory way.</p> <p>In order for the Cambridge region to grow in a measured way, and remain an attractive and sustainable place for people to live and work, a comprehensive strategy should be created to address the city's transport issues.</p> <p>Such a strategy should seek to use the city's existing road infrastructure in a smarter way by reducing the number of private vehicles and focusing on clean, reliable and inexpensive public transport.</p> <p>The current 'Better Bus Journeys' survey is biased, and has so many errors and omissions that the results cannot be taken as a true or meaningful representation of informed public opinion. It should therefore be disregarded.</p> <p>Public opinion is strongly against the City Deal proposals for bus lanes between Madingley and Cambridge because they are environmentally damaging and won't resolve the scourge of congestion.</p> <p>We welcome the City Deal's 'Call for Evidence', which has provided a platform for alternative proposals. Specific, simple and much better-value-for-money projects have already been identified, delivery of which would help ensure a successful bid for the second tranche of funding.</p>

We call upon the City Deal to abandon the present, deeply flawed consultation and move forward on some of these alternative projects for the benefit of residents of the city and the surrounding area.

- 059 As City residents living [REDACTED] we have received a paper copy of your survey, most of which is irrelevant to us. However, it is crystal clear that we shall be affected by these proposals and, indeed, at least as much affected if no proposal succeeds. As such I would like to make our views known to you. Many of our views will be familiar to you – we attended the public meeting at Cambridge Rugby Club on Thursday 12th November and heard three different perspectives on the proposals. We heard much to sympathize with.
- About us:** We are both over 60 and both own a car which we try to avoid using. We are both cyclists. I ride about 2,500 miles per year, 20-25% of my annual mileage.
- Our views:**
- ② Demand for personal transport by car must be reduced and largely eliminated in the City. All means must be deployed including measures to make buses and park and ride schemes more attractive and less expensive than the *marginal cost* of using a private car (that is the cost of driving it one more mile given that it will be driven some miles anyway).
 - ② Charging for entering a congested zone is certainly part of the solution. Leaving a congested area should be free. There should be no exemptions for City residents.
 - ② Subsidised bus fares and free parking at park and ride sites are both essential. Fund these from road/congestion charges.
 - ② Remove free on-street parking City-wide. Parking should be for residents and legitimate tradespeople only. (We all need deliveries, postmen, electricians, builders, BT, etc, etc. We do not need commuting office workers). I don't mind paying £50 a year towards enforcement costs.
 - ② It is essential to make cycling more attractive as a way to commute and shop. This requires allocating much more of the available road space to segregated cycling facilities that have priority over other road users. Today, many cycle ways are shared with pedestrians and do not have the same priority at junctions as the roads they follow. For cycling to be pleasant and efficient for commuting I need to average towards 25KPH (about 15MPH). I rarely achieve that. On shared cycle-ways dozy and sometimes deliberately obstructive pedestrians ignore warning bells and show no awareness of the danger. If I were to collide with a pedestrian at 25KPH or more they would be significantly injured. So, I take the road and fight with the vehicles. On-road cycle-ways are no better being too narrow, giving no space for overtaking. Being forced to walking pace every few hundred metres is exhausting. Being forced to a halt then accelerating quickly to cruising speed costs as much energy as riding an extra kilometre at cruising speed. No wonder so many other cash-rich, time-poor Cambridge residents and workers just give up and take their car. Yes, most of us serious cyclists have cars too. The solution is to eliminate the cars and allocate the road space to environmentally friendlier alternatives – the bicycle!
 - ② Cambridge is woefully under-served by cycle parking. This morning at 09:05 there was (again) no parking space near the central Post Office. Cambridge needs 4-5 times as many cycle racks as it has. There should always be a secure parking spot for a cyclist. Without that we can expect the creative (and undesirable) use of street furniture and railings to continue. This really rankles with me – what am I paying my *Vehicle Excise Duty* (VED) for? I do 20-25% of my personal miles on my bike so use 20-25% of VED to fund cycle racks! We all have cars as well as bikes. We need to be persuaded/forced to use the bike more and the car less. Controlling marginal costs is a vital part of this.
 - ② Something needs to be done about how public transport is priced. In a car, the marginal cost is the same for 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 passengers making the same journey together. For public transport to be competitive it needs to offer the same deal for less money. | Concretely, when my wife and I travel together by bus it should cost us less than the marginal cost of

	<p>using either of our cars. Achieving that will need measures to increase the marginal cost of car use, perhaps by taking steps to transfer what are currently fixed costs to per-mile costs. Smart road charging can help to do that.</p> <p>When I was a student here 1971-74 there was no problem for buses. When I returned in 1983 it was very clear that an explosion in private car use had blighted the City. Tame or eliminate the private cars from the City and we will not need bus schemes there. There's plenty of road space for pedestrians, cyclists and the buses we need.</p>
060	<p>I have just completed the online consultation regarding Cambourne to Cambridge bus routes but felt that I needed to write independently to express my concern about this consultation.</p> <p>This is an extract (S.16) from my completed consultation:</p> <p><i>I am very concerned that this consultation is being presented as a tick box exercise with limited information about how the proposals have been developed, what evidence has informed them or what implications they might have for the areas affected or other road/route users including cyclists and pedestrians. Most fundamentally, they are being presented without any reference to a joined up approach to what happens when the routes hit the City Centre where there are real pinch points. I understand that a City Access Study is underway currently and it seems to make no sense to view these proposals in isolation from this.</i></p> <p>I am dismayed that I was alerted to this consultation by the residents of Madingley Road rather than being informed directly as Bursar of a college whose land abuts Madingley Road. All in all, I feel that this is a flawed exercise and one that does not really appear to be concerned with establishing the best way forward for a joined up approach to infrastructure issues in the City and its surrounds.</p> <p>I hope that I will be kept informed of future proposals.</p>
061	<p>I write in connection with the proposed bus routes that were outlined in a leaflet recently delivered to my house and others in the area. I live in [REDACTED], and have done so for 25 years. During that time, we have seen a huge increase in traffic congestion along the Barton Road, Grange Road and many adjacent streets used as rat-runs (such as Grantchester Street) at peak periods. Clearly something does need to be done. However, I am not convinced that the proposals outlined will decrease the density of traffic or, indeed, get people to their destinations quicker. While all of them suggest a reduction in time to destinations, they will end up in the city at points where congestion is at its keenest.</p> <p>I have a particular concern about proposal area 1 south, which suggests cutting through virgin territory (and green belt) on its journey from the north of Coton into Cambridge, across the West fields and onto Grange Road. Quite apart from the enormous cost, the disruption and the devastation to the environment and to local communities (Coton in particular, although the diagram did not indicate where it would cut through the village), this route will end up on Grange Road where the traffic in the mornings and evenings is already frequently at a standstill. West Road which is adjacent to the Sidgwick Site is used by many students on their bicycles and by drivers and, as for Silver Street, you will know that it is an extremely narrow street (of considerable historic value), which has already seen numerous accidents, and even fatalities in the past. It is also used by hundreds of pedestrians and tourists daily. In fact, it has become almost impossible to walk on the pavements here during the day, as one is forced to the street in order to avoid the crowds.</p> <p>While the problem of congestion is truly a difficult one, there are alternatives strategies which could be employed as illustrated by examples in cities in the US and Europe. For instance, cars could be banned from the city during peak periods (unless drivers share rides with other commuters), with <i>free</i> buses from park and rides taking people into and out of town. Schools could be encouraged to provide their own transport, etc. The <i>free</i> cost of buses and the unimpeded journey into town</p>

	would incentivise commuters to use these routes, and the city would be a quieter, safer and more enjoyable environment for its many visitors and increasingly frustrated citizens.
062	Just a quick question - who designed the survey on the Cambridge to Cambourne bus route? Did the survey incorporate the discussions and decision by the city deal assembly?
063	<p>Enquiry details: 1. A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Make a complaint</p> <p>The villages described in the leaflet are not part of Cambridge, as described in the leaflet. Please call back to discuss further. Customer lives in Hardiwick.</p>
064	<p>I am writing [REDACTED], but also as someone who was, at the County Council's request, called in as consultant to design a system of retrospective mitigation on the Cambridge Guided Busway (CGB) when it became clear that substantial damage was being done to a significant amphibian breeding site at Histon/Impington. My recommendations were implemented along the affected section of the CGB. Failure to design appropriate mitigation into the system from the outset (even after concerns had been raised at the planning stage), then having to install it retrospectively, had an unnecessary impact on local wildlife and was also an avoidable waste of resources. These problems highlighted some serious defects in the overall design of the busway that substantially, and in part unnecessarily, increase its impact on surrounding wildlife.</p> <p>Concerns about the potential use of a Guided Busway (of similar design to the CGB) adjacent to Madingley Wood.</p> <p>Guided busways have a combination of features that render them particularly hazardous to wildlife: Bus traffic is discontinuous so, unlike a busy road, wildlife tends not to be scared away. Busses run particularly quietly along the guideway, often at considerable speed, so there is little advance warning of the approaching hazard. Bus drivers are unable to manoeuvre around 'wildlife targets' to avoid them. The guideway design (as implemented on the CGB) acts as a giant, linear, pitfall trap: Soil is backfilled up to the top of the outer edge of the guideway (mainly for aesthetic reasons), thus there is no barrier whatsoever to deter smaller wildlife species from inadvertently dropping into it. Once on the guideway, there is no design provision for the escape of anything that is unable to climb back out over the smooth vertical curb. Breaks in the guideway curbs are particularly few and far between, so don't realistically offer a means of escape. Trapped animals tend to concentrate close to the curb whilst attempting to escape; on a guideway, this is a far more dangerous location than on a typical carriageway because of the proximity of the bus wheels to the curb. Animals that aren't killed directly by being crushed, or struck, tend to succumb through dehydration (as seen on the CGB). Trapped and dead animals within the guideway attract predatory species and scavengers, amplifying the problem.</p> <p>In the past, cattle grids represented a substantial hazard to wildlife, as they acted as pitfall traps; a particular concern was the number of hedgehogs killed (in the literature, one is documented as having contained the remains of 52 dead Hedgehogs). Very successful changes were thus made to cattle grid design to enable escape. It is regrettable that this concept has not been applied to guided busway design, particularly in view of the scale, and lifespan, of such structures.</p> <p>During construction of the CGB, 'wildlife tunnels' were installed at intervals along the guideway. All of those that I have had the opportunity to inspect have very serious design flaws (in entrance design/siting), to the extent that they are not fit for purpose, offering little, or no, protection to</p>

animals attempting to cross the busway. This doesn't instil any confidence that future schemes will be competently designed to protect wildlife.

In summary, the CGB is far from being 'environmentally friendly' from the perspective of many wildlife species, acting as:

A fatal trap, compounded by being repeatedly 'baited' with a food supply.

An impenetrable barrier to smaller species along much of its length.

Madingley Wood SSSI is ancient woodland rich in wildlife, some of which, due to its scarcity, is afforded the highest level of legal protection. Any guided busway (of similar design to the CGB) that passes close will act as a pitfall trap, hinder movement of many smaller species in and out of the wood and attract larger species (such as the badgers found there and a variety of birds) into the guideway to feed on the readily available food resource (with predictable consequences). Unless very carefully designed to reduce wildlife casualties, it would act as a permanent wildlife 'sink', and be highly likely to have an impact on populations in the surrounding area by causing a 'zone of depletion' along either side.

For the above reasons, I am most concerned at any proposal to run a busway, especially if it employs a guideway, adjacent to Madingley Wood, and would strongly oppose it.

Concerns about the proposal to site a new Park and Ride at Madingley Mulch.

Increased traffic through Madingley, due to construction of a new Park and Ride at the Madingley Mulch roundabout, will further damage the significant breeding colonies of amphibians there. Currently, hundreds of individuals are killed in Madingley on the road annually, despite very substantial time and effort to reduce this carnage. Four amphibian species are present, with road-kill rates of two of these causing particular concern:

Several hundred Common Toads (a Biodiversity Action Plan species, due to ongoing declines nationally) are killed here annually.

A concerning proportion of highly protected Great Crested Newts attempting the road crossing are crushed (in one instance, over 3 evenings, 27 Great Crested Newts were killed within the village).

Considerable numbers of the amphibians killed are gravid females, migrating towards their breeding site, increasing the impact of their loss.

In summary, without a considerable investment for mitigation, increased traffic flow through Madingley will further raise casualty rates for the 4 species of amphibian breeding there, increasing the threat to their breeding colonies. The Madingley Toad Rescue Project thus strongly opposes a new Park and Ride at Madingley Mulch.

I would support the location of a Park and Ride north-east of the A428 Hardwick/Scotland Road junction, for the reasons given by the Village Highways Working Group. Also the development of a bus lane along the existing A428 and A1303, development of the cloverleaf at Girton to provide a six-way junction allowing traffic from the West to use the A428 and particularly to be able to turn south onto the M11, and the construction of Park and Rides at Barton and Bar Hill. I strongly support the closure of The Avenue at Madingley, to reduce rat running.

065 I am a resident of [REDACTED] and write to object in the strongest terms to the manner in which the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' is being conducted. The consultation documents are unclear, inaccurate and misleading written in a biased way designed to encourage people to support the Area 1 South option.

First, it is unclear what we are being consulted on. Is this a busway, a bus road or a dedicated

busway? What is the proposed route? How close does it come to our village? Does it dissect our village? Where will these buses stop and will people from Coton be able to use them? I believe failure to provide clarity on these fundamental aspects of the scheme calls into question the validity of this consultation process and the public's ability to respond.

Second the consultation documents are highly misleading. The argument in support of the Area 1 South route, and thus spending an extra £50 million of public money, is guaranteed quicker and more reliable journey times. Yet the information given on this is bound to mislead respondents. The consultation leaflet states that the journey time for the Area 1 South option is 7 minutes shorter than for the other options, but the comparisons are clearly unfair. The North and Central routes end at Northampton Street, while the South route ends at Grange Road, further from the city centre. For buses to negotiate West Road and Queens Road at rush hour could take most, if not all, of the 7 minute difference. In a consultation document which deliberately provides only the most approximate, 'fuzzy' information on route options, it is frankly absurd to provide journey times to the nearest minute. A fair document would have journey times in the range of 10-15 minutes for all three options. Promoting the South option as superior to the others on the basis of faster access to the city centre can only be taken as intentional bias.

Equally misleading is the map of Coton. Those parts of the village to the north and the east that are most affected by this scheme are completely missing. The clear impression to a reader who does not know the village is that the route would by-pass it and consequently have no local impact. It is not good enough simply to say 'the map is indicative'. Unless the City Deal team can definitively rule out the route passing through any part of Coton, the map needs to show that the route may dissect the village, so that respondents can appreciate the potential impact.

Third, key information vital to an informed response is missing. No mention is made of the following important issues:

- The enormous ecological or environmental damage the Area 1 South would cause - the route is simply drawn through a void
- The potential visual, noise, and pollution impacts on the village of Coton
- How people living in villages along the route, including Coton, Comberton, Madingley, Toft and Hardwick, might use these buses. Do they have to drive to the Park and Ride?

Finally I believe this document has been written in a biased manner in order to justify the enormous extra cost of the Area 1 South route. Even the line drawn for this route is green! Therefore, for all the reasons above I believe this process to be flawed, biased and so any conclusions drawn as a result of this process will be open to serious challenge.

066 Thank you for your time presenting the proposals at Coton Village Hall on Thursday. It was greatly appreciated.

My company [REDACTED], employs nearly 60 people on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] And I am a member of the local community living in [REDACTED] I am writing to you as in both respects I will be acutely affected by the proposed road improvements. I say road improvements as this consultation appears to be only about better bus journeys and does not make any of the necessary connections into a wider transport solution for West Cambridge - for example sorting the Girton interchange.....

I have some issues with the process and the proposals. There has been no information forthcoming to employers based in the affected areas. Leaflets have only gone to households. There is little information about congestion. Journey times appear to be fabricated. I do not understand the information provided. It seems like some of the suggested routes terminate halfway along Grange Road. No one can seriously believe that anyone in Cambourne would like to be deposited half way

along Grange Road? What seems more of an issue to me is that the travel time suggested (7 minutes) is completely unfair when being compared to the other routes which terminate somewhere more constructive. A clear factual error in my view.

In addition the proposal for Area 1 South suggests major improvements for cyclists. We have an excellent cycle path into Cambridge. A bit of lighting might be nice but that's all. The 100+ residents of Coton that came to the exhibition seemed to agree.

The document seems to leave out more information than it leaves in. Where is Ada Lovelace Road - a road the university clearly expects to connect into Route Area 1 South? I support Area 1 North as it uses an existing bridleway and does not ruin the community (Area 1 South - I am strongly opposed to this) of Coton.

What seems to make more sense is Area 1 Central. But it needs further thought. Why not make it tidal in the morning AND evening? And given the City Deal seems to have £100m to spend on this why not make Madingley AND Barton Road tidal at the same time rather than building unproven bus ways? The whole thing just seems like a plan to unlock the west fields development area for the University.

Madingley Road is not nearly as congested after the M11 access south junction. Really doing something significant with Madingley Road along its entire length makes most sense. I understand City Deal has a huge pot of money and wants to be seen to do something 'significant' with it. But really. A bus route ending on Grange Road. It is so far fetched.

I do hope you are giving both the process and the proposals your attention. As an employer, and a believer in the importance of growing the City as a global academic and commercial success story we need radical transport solutions. But a bus ending on Grange Road is not it.

The only people I have seen come up with some sensible suggestions is Cambridge Bold and the excellent suggestions put forward by Francis Burkitt and his team. I urge you to review the process behind this consultation and support the Cambridge Bold ideas.

067 As resident of [REDACTED] I have become aware of the consultation regarding the bus services on the Madingley Road corridor. Having studied the plans and knowing the area quite well I wish to object in the strongest possible way to the potential new bus road over the Westfields (Option Area 1 South).

As you well know, the green corridor of land from Coton to King's College Chapel has huge value in terms of local landscape, amenity and biodiversity. A new road dissecting the Westfields will devastate this part of the Green Belt and lose forever an irreplaceable and unique aspect of Cambridge's special character.

This was recognised by the High Court in 2008 when it ruled that "the relationship between the Historic Centre and the Countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge"

I am astounded by the myopic views of the planners and proponents of this destructive idea when they and Council decision takers should realize they are, in many ways, the custodians of a fragile heritage which is vastly more important than the convenience of commuters.

It may be of course there are darker forces at work which by subtle means (such as colouring the Westfield option green!) and less subtle oversights and errors (such as ignoring the Silver Street bottleneck) introduce a bias that whets the appetite of landowners and developers alike.

One may well ask more fundamental questions whether it is in the long term feasible to continue bringing in vast and concentrated numbers of commuters into the centre of a City with medieval constraints. There are no easy options but a long-term strategy is essential.

In conclusion I would ask you to ensure that Option Area 1 South is firmly rejected to preserve this crucial aspect of the unique character of Cambridge.

Also and for the sake of transparency it would be beneficial for all concerned if the consultation documents were presented without potentially misleading bias, and appropriate amendments were made to give more weight to considerations of ecology and heritage as well as to the impact on those most affected, including residents in West Cambridge and Coton.

068 I am a resident of Cambridge, living [REDACTED] and am writing in connection with the above consultation. I have examined the plans and know the site well, and I wish to object strongly to the potential new bus road over the West Fields (Option Area 1 South).

The green corridor of land from Coton to King's College Chapel has a huge value in terms of local landscape, amenity and biodiversity. A new road cutting across the West Fields will destroy part of the green belt, and lose forever an irreplaceable and unique feature of Cambridge. The High Court confirmed in 2008 the importance of the West Fields when it ruled that 'the relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge.'

The integrity of this rural environment where no major residential or commercial development has been allowed would subsequently be lost by urbanisation of the West Fields. This landscape should also be given the highest protection in the forthcoming reappraisal of the greenbelt sites under the Local Plan review.

The 'Area 1 South' bus route across this land would have disastrous consequences as follows:

- a huge environmental impact on the West Fields and large-scale loss of flora and fauna
- a huge costs, estimated at £67million (more than 3 times the cost of other options)
- a catalyst for housing development North and South of Barton Road
- a loss of green space, which currently brings countryside into the hear of the city
- a cause of congestion on Grange Road, history Silver St and Downing Street
- a loss of setting and damage to the special character of Cambridge
- a severe impact on Coton Village
- a new bridge over the M11 causing disruption to the traffic during the construction and costing a substantial amount of money at a time of budget cut
- an obstacle to the creation of a West Cambridge Countryside Park, which is currently under discussion.

The City Deal Consultation documents also appear to be biased in favour of the West Fields route in several respects:

- claims about 7 minute journey times ignore the delays beyond reaching Grange Rd; the journey time does not compare like for like;
- the plans are geographically misleading and inaccurate;
- major cycleway improvements are already due under the West Cambridge Site section 106 and have been kept silent, overstating the advantage of this option
- there is not attempt to present the obvious shortcomings of the Silver Street/Pembroke Street/Downing Street leg
- there is no description of the environmental damages.

I therefore would ask you to chose the much less damaging Area 1 Central proposal, which involves just one bus lane going down Madingley Road which could be potentially a tidal route.

Madingley Road can accommodate a single bus lane and even dual bus lanes if required. The character of Madingley Road has changed significantly in recent years with the West Cambridge Site, North West Cambridge and the Park and Ride. A single bus lane can easily be accommodated

	<p>whilst still allowing excellent dual cycle and pedestrian lanes. In various meeting of the West Cambridge Site there has been the implication that Madingley Road will be widened anyway therefore this is the reversible option, which can be implemented whilst other initiative are being considered.</p> <p>The Save the West Fields campaign and our local councillors objected to the potentially biased presentation of the options at the various City Deal meetings before the consultation, and yet the bias appears to remain.</p> <p>I would ask you to please ensure that the Option Area 1 South is firmly rejected so that we can preserve this crucial feature of Cambridge for the future.</p> <p>Can you also please investigate why the consultation documents have been presented in a way that is potentially misleading and see to it that appropriate amendments are made?</p> <p>Can you also ensure that considerations of ecology and heritage form part of the consultation process and that more weight is given to the impact on those most affected, not least West Cambridge and Coton residents?</p>
069	<p>Thank you for your reply to my initial email in which I expressed strong opposition to Option Area 1 South.</p> <p>Since I emailed you, a team of independent experts published its report on the Local Plan, after being tasked to study the soundness of the development strategy set out by Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils.</p> <p>Our local councillors informed us of the main outcome of the study by circulating a news release on this matter. Here are the most relevant paragraphs, which in my view should be taken into account as part of your consultation on the bus journey between Cambourne and Cambridge:</p> <p>"In the reports published today (Monday 9 November), independent experts have said that 33,500 homes would be needed by 2031 to meet local needs – just 500 more than originally put forward. The reports also state that the extra work commissioned has confirmed the two Councils' strategy to deliver growth through new towns and villages and protecting the green belt is the right plan for the Greater Cambridge area. During the extra work carried out to check the plans, independent analysis has supported the proposals not to release significant areas of the green belt for development. One additional piece of green belt land may be used to expand the Cambridge Biomedical Campus – subject to public consultation and final work to assess the site. This would use a field south of land that has already been allocated for employment and would allow the Biomedical Campus at the Addenbrooke's site to expand by just over 10%."</p> <p>There is a clear statement that the green belt around Cambridge should be protected and that only one additional piece of green belt could be used to expand the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. This rules out the use of the green belt on the west of Cambridge for future development. Therefore the plan of using part of the green belt to built a dedicated bus route and to construct a new bridge over M11 (Option Area 1 South) would appear to be in contradiction to the recommendation of these independent experts.</p> <p>I would like to hear how you intend to include the study carried out by these independent experts in your analysis of the consultation responses.</p> <p>I take this opportunity to express how extremely disappointed I have been by your presentation of the costs and benefits of the various options for this bus journey consultation.</p>

Having worked as a senior economic advisor in the civil services and in regulatory agencies I am aware that any new measures to be introduced by local authorities are to be supported by evidence-based cost-benefit analysis. The leaflet I received sets out 3 options for each of the two trunks of the journey and for each option a brief summary of some costs and benefits is given. A quick read of the leaflet conveys the impression that these costs and benefits are comparable across options and are reasonably representative of the costs and benefits of each options. However a careful reader will be able to spot clues that this impression is false: the costs and benefits listed in the leaflet are not comparable and are far from being exhaustive. A very interested stakeholder will take the time to look at the draft interim report on your webpage and will note that it acknowledges not considering all costs and benefits at this stage.

How can this report form the basis of a consultation? And if there are more documents considering all the costs and benefits as well as a broad brush quantification of their costs and values, why are they not made available to the public? To launch a consultation on several options without supplying an well researched list of costs and benefits and an initial costing of their ranges shows a significant lack of professionalism from the part of the Cambridge City Deal team. This approach is implicitly suggesting that the missing elements of the analysis will be negligible and that the costs would be obviously higher than the costs. To me, this is close to misinformation. I believe that residents have the rights to be adequately informed and if some information is still missing or cannot be provided, residents should be told explicitly so and why.

Let me take the example of the impact on environment. I think that the decision of the team not to mention explicitly the difference in impact on the environment of these various bus journey options was not acceptable, especially given the existing green belt status of some of the land that would be used by some options (including Option Area 1 South) and given the Local Plan having set it out as protected (though under re-assessment by a team of independent experts at the time the consultation got launched). I am of the view that residents would have responded differently about the consultation if they had been told that impact on environment would differ significantly among options; and for Option Area 1 South in particular that it would cut through a green belt that the Local Plan seeks to protect. Now that the team of independent experts has confirmed that the green belt is to be protected (except for one piece of land close to the Biomedical Campus), the question of impact on environment is made even more salient.

I am copying in my local councillors and other persons with a vote on this matter so that they are aware of my questions and concerns and may benefit from any answers you may provide me.

I look forward to receiving a reply to my above request and the various questions I raised and thank you very much in advance for your help.

070 Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this survey. I tried to do this online but was dismayed to find that it seemed to ignore everyone except those people who use the route so I gave up and decided instead to write because decisions made here ultimately affect everyone trying to get in, out and across the city. I also found the six options difficult to follow both online and in the hard copy leaflet.

For example, various journey times are offered (in green) ranging from 7 minutes to 14 minutes. It is not entirely clear to me what these refer to. Are we comparing estimated times, from one point to another over different routes or between different points over different routes? I can't believe I am the only one not to understand this so I think you should take this into account when collating the responses.

The biggest defects in all these proposals are firstly that they demonstrate a piecemeal approach.

How can you possibly consider this corridor into Cambridge without also considering all other routes into and out of the city and from one part of the city to another? Secondly it does not offer any other options such as intelligent traffic management or congestion charging. Thirdly, these proposals all offer increased road capacity which will merely transfer the congestion further into the city. What we need are steps to reduce demand for road use. Few if any new roads will then be necessary.

Option 1 North. This would appear to threaten an important wildlife area, Madingley Wood and the University's 800 Wood, and to disfigure what is now and should surely remain, a relatively peaceful vista to the N of the American Cemetery. Didn't a post war government make some promises to the Americans that the surroundings of their cemetery would not be developed? Large numbers of American tourists are drawn to Cambridge partly because the cemetery is here. It would be stupid and unnecessary to upset them. What is the point of building a bus-only road at an estimated cost of £20m which will merely speed buses during the peak hours into what will remain a congested road into the city? This a dreadful option. Strongly oppose.

Option 1 Central. What is the point of building a bus lane at an estimated cost of £18m which may reduce journey times during the morning peak hours into what will remain a congested city? Strongly oppose.

Option 1 South. The last thing we want or need is a new road bridge over the M11. What is the point of building a bus-only road at an estimated cost of £67m which will merely speed buses during the morning peak hours into what will remain a congested city? It would badly degrade what are at present relatively peaceful wildlife areas on both sides of the M11. Future generations would never forgive us. This is easily the worst option. Strongly oppose.

Option 2 North. What difference will this make? Once at the new P & R, the buses will join the congestion. Strongly oppose.

Option 2 Central. Not necessary. What is the point of building a bus-only road at an estimated cost of £11m which will merely speed buses during the peak hours into a P & R site from which the buses will then have to join a congested road into the city? Strongly oppose.

Option 2 South. New road through rural landscape. Unnecessary. What is the point of building a bus-only road at an estimated cost of £26m which will merely speed buses during the peak hours into a P & R site from which the buses will then have to join a congested road into the city? Strongly oppose.

I am sorry if these comments appear to be so negative but surely it is obvious that a piecemeal approach that increases capacity without reducing demand in one corridor will never work for the city and its surroundings as a whole?

Please may I add that although I have retired and now live in the city centre, I used to live in Great Shelford and cycled to work in the city for 20 years so I know how awful it is for cyclists to share congested roads.

Lastly, I have seen and carefully read the response from the Cambridge BOLD Campaign. I very much hope that this will be roundly rejected. It seems to combine the worst two options above - a new road through a very sensitive area and a costly bridge over the M11. Very strongly oppose.

071 I say NO to any bus route over the West Fields = Option Area 1 South

The High Court in 2008 confirmed the importance of this green corridor of land viz: 'the

relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge'. We must preserve it. Dissecting it would be an irredeemable disaster.

How can you even begin to think of a bus route here? And who on earth came up with the idea of sending guided buses on such a misconceived route into Cambridge down Grange Road or West Road/Silver Street/Pembroke Street/Downing Street etc. (Not a fast route either) What an absurd idea? Not to mention the huge cost.

The much less damaging route would be the **Area 1 Central proposal** at far less cost and almost certainly far more reliable in timing.

The West Fields must absolutely be protected. I beg you simply to delete this option. Future consequences of ignoring this could be dire. (Madness even to consider it and its huge expense). Let's preserve this area of countryside and green belt for future generations.

Please go for the **Area 1 Central proposal**.

072 I am a resident of Cambridge. I write in connection with:

- the various options that have been presented for improving bus transport between Cambourn and Cambridge;
- the Green Belt and housing strategy;
- views expressed by various Councillors in a local paper on the class make-up of those who express their views to the various Councils.

Let me start with the Green Belt, and the long term reasons why Green Belts were created and need to be preserved, because this is fundamental to the other matters.

Over the past 200 years England has been steadily built on. This has resulted in the creation of horrible huge cities such as London, Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool; I have personal experience of living in both London and Manchester for a number of years, and wouldn't wish either on anybody. The Green Belts around many cities (including Cambridge) were created in order to ensure that those living in those cities continued to have such local access to such green countryside as hadn't already been wrecked by earlier uncontrolled house-building. In the particular case of Cambridge the entire character of the University and the Western part of the city is dependent upon this easy access to the countryside within walking distance; I note that the High Court has agreed with this view within the last decade.

The natural economic forces associated with some places being nicer to live in than others result not only in house price differentials, but also in steady migration out of the places humankind has already wrecked to places that are still nice to live in - reminiscent of herd animals that having eaten all the nice grass in one part of their field (and left their droppings all over it) move on to do the same to other parts of the field that are still pleasant (except that houses, unlike droppings, don't lead to more green grass growing). In consequence there are now plenty of unwanted houses in e.g. Blackpool, parts of Liverpool, etc... but none in Cambridge - yet. If you just build more houses to solve today's problems, then in a century or so Cambridge will be just like Manchester, Liverpool, etc are today.

If this oft-repeated pattern is to be stopped, as it seems to me self-evident that it must be, Green Belts need to be preserved. If one asks how to deal with the consequent house price rises, the answer - surely - is that these are the natural, and entirely appropriate, mechanism by which it

becomes uneconomic for yet more jobs to move into the still-nice places, and which make it viable for companies to be able to attract people to live in the places where there are currently unwanted houses. If the house price rises are insufficient to achieve this, then councils need to make additional planning decisions to deter yet more jobs being created in places where there isn't enough housing - and NOT build more houses there. I.e. councils need to reduce demand, not increase supply of housing, because if they do the latter they will just turn e.g. Cambridge into another mega-metropolis that once was nice but no longer is.

My objections - which are strong - to the option to run a busway across Cambridge's West Fields at or South of the Coton footpath come from these same considerations. If you must make yet more bus transport - and hence more (not less !) congestion (because no busway will run buses right into the centre, and the economics of bus transport mean that they are only attractive if they are frequent and hence mostly empty), at least do it without wrecking more green countryside - i.e. put it along Madingley Road.

However, what actually needs doing is to create smaller, self-contained small towns including both jobs and houses - by moving jobs out of Cambridge and into the small towns or further afield (Blackpool, ...). To achieve this you need it to be unattractive to set up more jobs in Cambridge, for example by allowing houses to become expensive and motorised commuter transport unattractive. Royston seems to be a good example of what can result with e.g. Johnson Matthey.

Finally, the front page article in the Cambridge News on 28th October: here it was reported that some councillors complain that "Cambridge is dominated by self-appointed middle-class NIMBY minorities"; at least it noted that they had "heard overwhelmingly that preserving the Green Belt completely was the preferred option" (and presumably they had so heard from a *majority* of those responding).

I'm not actually sure how one appoints oneself to be a minority, or to be in one social class or another. However, councillors should surely accept that if they conduct a consultation, and hear overwhelmingly one particular answer, then that answer is what is preferred by the consultees. Either that, or they haven't conducted the consultation properly and need to do it again.

Further, if the purpose of the consultation is to hear and take into account the views of the consultees, then that view should surely be attended to even if it happens not to coincide with the views of the particular councillors concerned.

073 I am writing as a Cambridgeshire resident to complain about the consultation for the Cambourne to Cambridge – Better Bus Journeys proposed City Deal schemes.

For a start, the consultation is scheduled for a short period of time, and in our location Coton gets just 2 hours on 27 October. I will be working away on that date so unable to attend. I am particularly concerned about the wider implications for Greater Cambridge from these schemes.

Secondly the schemes offered seem to have been prepared in an unfair and unrealistic way – you could say potentially biased to achieve a particular conclusion. The outline proposals appear to ignore the need to spend public money in a responsible and cost-effective way. For example, the Area 1 North scheme from the proposed Madingley Mulch Park and Ride round the American Cemetery violates covenants to protect the environment of the Cemetery, as well as apparently cutting through the newly planted University Millennium Wood – this is not a realistic option to put forward. Area 1 South has no detail of the route except a remarkably straight line, which somehow crosses through designated (and previously fought over) Green Belt land and then through residential roads to Queens Road (The Backs) for Silver Street – without detail this cannot be realistically reviewed.

Thirdly the schemes have not been prepared in sufficient detail for people to be fairly asked to comment upon them. The City Deal schemes for Milton Road and Histon Road have been fully investigated, right down to their affect on utilities, yet a similar scheme for Madingley Road has not yet been explored in any detail, and elements worthy of evaluation specifically excluded, so Area 1 Central becomes only an in-bound bus lane and no outbound measures. An independent evaluation has shown that a much better solution is possible for this road corridor. After your discussion of the City Deal schemes in June this year, a report was commissioned on improving bus access to Junctions 13 and 11 of the M11, and the study is already published, so there is no reason why these schemes for consultation could not have been investigated in time.

Fourthly, the schemes, as the name of the consultation indicates, are entirely about better bus journeys. Other transport methods – rail for example – are excluded, and there is no detail of what bus journeys are intended to be “better”. It is unlikely that traffic along Madingley Road is entirely headed for the City Centre, and bus passengers will be the same. The EastWestRail scheme is being researched by Network Rail and is at an advanced stage. The old rail route ran just south of Bourn and Cambourne and a modified route – parts of the old one are already built over – could serve Park and Ride stations for Cambourne and Bourn, providing a major transport provision to reach south, central and north Cambridge, moving large volumes of people quickly.

Fifthly, this is all occurring without a strategy to address the issues of Cambridge’s historic medieval core, and the traffic snarl ups all around it, and its relationship to Greater Cambridge. The Audit completed shows you plan to reduce car commuter journeys from 56% to 45% but these schemes seem designed to increase car capacity on Madingley Road, surely counter-productive? Sending buses onto over-crowded narrow streets for the last stage of their journeys in contention with pedestrians and cyclists is not the answer. Neither is creating jobs across Greater Cambridge without a strategy to genuinely handle the infra-structure requirements long-term. To 2031 seems very short term; spending money before 2020 from consultation in 2015 on schemes not yet investigated or evaluated is positively dangerous.

This consultation process needs a re-think, to be re-started with properly detailed and evaluated realistic options and delivering public value for money. I do not think you can put any reliance on the conclusions from the survey in its present undetailed form.

074 In addition to responding to the online survey, I would like to make the following comments about the proposals.

I object in the strongest terms to the proposed new bus route Option Area 1 North Blue and the location of a Park and Ride site at the Madingley Mulch roundabout.

I ask that you give the following plans careful consideration:

1. The proposed Park & Ride site at Madingley Mulch would be much better located north-east of the A428 Hardwick/Scotland Road junction for the following reasons:
 - a. There is better connectivity at this junction (the double roundabout system and slip-roads will enable motorists to move four ways both on and off, east and west along the A428 which is not possible at the Madingley Mulch roundabout which is only a 2-way junction).
 - b. This location would enable a much more versatile transport network with buses able to travel on two routes to serve Cambridge.
 - c. This Park & Ride site could be served by a shuttle bus for the population of Hardwick and

it has the benefit of the existing pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A428 to the village.

- d. Locating this facility further to the west (1.5 miles), traffic would be caught earlier – traffic is already queuing on the slip road off the A428 and this will be further exacerbated as a result of the additional homes being built at Bourn and Cambourne.
 - e. The outcome will be reduced traffic flow on the A1303, an improved quality of life for residents living alongside Madingley Road, and reduced rat running through the narrow, winding roads of Madingley Village.
2. The best option is for the Area 1 Central Red Route to be implemented (rejecting Option Area 1 North Blue). A bus lane(s) developed along the existing A428 and A1303 from Cambourne to Cambridge is clearly more advantageous as it uses an existing road network which will be cheaper to construct and maintain. It will be quicker in use and respect the local environment – both key aims of your proposal – by not building on the 800 Wood or imposing on the tranquility of the American Military Cemetery:
 3. The Area 1 North (blue) route would ruin the 800 Wood which was planted to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the University, is intended for the public to enjoy and makes a significant environmental and ecological contribution to one of the least wooded counties in the country. My husband and I walk there regularly and look forward to seeing the wood mature. It will also impact on the adjacent SSSI ‘Madingley Wood’ which, together with the 800 Wood, is the focus of unique, long-term research within several departments of the University of Cambridge.
 4. The Area 1 North Blue route continues southwards through fields in full view of the American Military Cemetery which is the only permanent American World War II Cemetery in the UK with the site selected for its beauty and tranquility on a hill overlooking fields. A letter from Anthony Eden to the American Ambassador (dated 21st June 1954) sets out the terms of agreement, including a reference to the surrounding fields: ‘the area coloured yellow will be restricted to agricultural use’. This agreement cannot and should not be ignored.
 5. Selection of the cheaper Area 1 Central Red Route should allow for investment in improvement of the cycle path network, including adding a cycle path from Madingley along Cambridge Road to improve safety and reduce traffic.
 6. Other points critical to your aim of reducing traffic congestion and reducing travel times are:
 - f. The development of the cloverleaf at Girton to provide a six-way junction allowing traffic from the west to use the A428 and particularly to be able to turn south onto the M11.
 - g. The construction of Park and Ride sites at Barton and Bar Hill as part of a strategy of outer ring car parking management

Thank you for taking notice of local concerns.

- 075 The City Deal organisation has invited local residents to comment on the proposals made in its ‘Better Bus Journeys’ leaflet. As a resident of [REDACTED] and user of local roads as a motorist, bus-user, cyclist and pedestrian I write to object in the strongest terms to the proposed new bus route Option Area 1 North Blue and siting of a Park and Ride site at the Madingley Mulch roundabout. The following points deserve careful consideration:
1. The proposed Park & Ride site at Madingley Mulch would be much better located north-east of the A428 Hardwick/Scotland Road junction for the following reasons:
 - a. There is better connectivity at this junction (the double roundabout system and slip-roads will enable motorists to move four ways both on and off, east and west along

the A428 which is not possible at the Madingley Mulch roundabout which is only a 2-way junction).

- b. This location would enable a much more versatile transport network with buses able to travel on two routes to serve Cambridge.
- c. This Park & Ride site could be served by a shuttle bus for the population of Hardwick and it has the benefit of the existing pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A428 to the village.
- d. By providing this facility further to the west, traffic would be caught earlier – traffic is already queuing on the slip road off the A428 and this will be exacerbated by the additional homes being built at Bourn and Cambourne.
- e. A further real benefit will be reduced traffic flow on the A1303, an improved quality of life for residents living alongside Madingley Road, and reduced rat running through the narrow, winding roads of Madingley Village.

2. The best option is for the Area 1 Central Red Route to be implemented (rejecting Option Area 1 North Blue). A bus lane(s) developed along the existing A428 and A1303 from Cambourne to Cambridge is clearly more advantageous as it uses an existing road network which will be cheaper to construct and maintain. It will be quicker in use and respect the local environment – both key aims of your proposal – by not building on the 800 Wood or imposing on the tranquillity of the American Military Cemetery:

- a. The Area 1 North (blue) route would devastate the 800 Wood which was planted to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the University, is intended for the public to enjoy . and makes a significant environmental and ecological contribution to one of the least wooded counties in the country It would also have profound impact on the adjacent SSSI 'Madingley Wood' which, together with the 800 Wood, is the focus of unique, long-term research within several departments of the University of Cambridge.
- b. The Area 1 North Blue route continues southwards through fields in full view of the American Military Cemetery which is the only permanent American World War II Cemetery in the UK with the site selected for its beauty and tranquillity on a hill overlooking fields. A letter from Anthony Eden to the American Ambassador (dated 21st June 1954) sets out the terms of agreement, including a reference to the surrounding fields: 'the area coloured yellow will be restricted to agricultural use'.

3. The existing Madingley Road Park & Ride site at Junction 13 should be retained, possibly as a smaller site, for traffic exiting the M11 and as a coach/school bus hub close to the city.

4. Other points critical to the aim of reducing traffic congestion and reducing travel times are:

- The development of the cloverleaf at Girton to provide a six-way junction allowing traffic from the west to use the A428 and particularly to be able to turn south onto the M11.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <u>construction of Park and Ride sites at Barton and Bar Hill</u> as part of a strategy of outer ring car parking management and, to protect our own village, <u>the closure of The Avenue in Madingley</u> to help prevent rat running. <p>I trust that you will take my concerns into account when considering the outcome of the consultation.</p>
076	<p>This proposal does not adequately deal with the problem of traffic congestion along the A428 and Madingley Hill due to the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current and planned housing developments between Cambridge and St Neots are merely dormitory towns that do not provide adequate mass rapid transport or indeed jobs. So most people have to travel to Cambridge or beyond to Adenbrookes to get to work. 2. This only helps people starting journeys from Cambourne but beyond so the traffic that clogs the A428 from St Neots and Papworth and beyond will continue to use this route. 3. Until something is done about the lack of junction between the A428 and the M11 southbound and a junction off the M11 (west Bound) the crisis in traffic congestion will continue. 4. Something needs to be done about the state of the local roads (e.g. through Highfield Caldecote) which are in a dire state of repair due to cars 'rat running' thorough country villages 5 The proposal through Highfields Caldecote (a new bus route) has not been considered properly as the public exhibition is using a 1999 map which doesn't show all the new housing - through which the proposed new bus route appears to go - residents of highfields caldecote were told at the exhibition that 'compulsory purchases' would be made of the housing - which means that most of a development of less than 15 years would have to be bought up! This is absolutely ludicrous! It gives me no faith, whatsoever in these plans 6. The reference to 'modal shifts' to diferent forms of transport is simply naieve. Cambridgeshire needs viable alternatives to car use such as mass rapid transportation rather than just a few bus routes. 7. The maps in the proposal are incomprehensible for people who are colour-blind - so you are discriminating against people who will not be able to complete the survey
077	<p>I wish to draw your attention to, and ask for your help with what I perceive to be the flawed consultation process which has been initiated by the Cambridge City Deal.</p> <p>The object of this letter is neither to support nor object to any of the proposed solutions. The point is that I am severely concerned by what I believe is a biased process with misleading documentation.</p> <p>For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Routes are far from properly described ? Maps offered are illustrative (the document says "indicative") and not based on up-to-date maps so the impact of the various routes is impossible to assess ? The proposed carriageway is unclear (guided busway, bus road or dedicated bus lane) ? Cycle routes are not explained in detail – one route is heralded as adding benefit to cycling but at one of the consultation meetings the project managers were unable to evidence what this meant (nor can I) ? Costings are unevidenced. Again when questioned at a consultation meeting the project officers said they were broad brush and were not specific to either a guided busway, a single carriageway or anything else. If this is so how can they be pinpointed to the nearest million – and if they haven't been, how misleading to use it as a basis for making a judgement ? The interlinkage of these routes with other transport routes is not explained at all – particularly any wider cycle routes throughout northwest Cambridge ? Journey times posted do not all relate to the same start and finish points so are misleading

as evidence to use to assess benefits

- ? One route ends at Adams Road/Grange Road where there is no interchange. There has been mention of the buses continuing down West Road, Queens' Road and Silver Street. Really? Do we expect more double decker buses should go down Silver Street? Is that area not already congested? I believe the proposals have not been created holistically as part of the bigger picture - or if they have, why are we not given those plans in order to assess the effectiveness of the localised proposals?

For the above reasons, this consultation process is flawed: the information in it is vague and inaccurate and incomplete. Any conclusions drawn as a result of this process will be open to serious challenge.

078 Re. Proposed Park and Ride at Madingley and associated proposed bus routes

We object in the strongest terms to the proposed new bus route Option Area 1 North Blue and the location of a Park and Ride site at the Madingley Mulch roundabout.

We ask that you give the following plans careful consideration:

1. The proposed Park & Ride site at Madingley Mulch would be much better located north-east of the A428 Hardwick/Scotland Road junction for the following reasons:

a. There is better connectivity at this junction (the double roundabout system and slip-roads will enable motorists to move four ways both on and off, east and west along the A428 which is not possible at the Madingley Mulch roundabout which is only a 2-way junction).

b. This location would enable a much more versatile transport network with buses able to travel on two routes to serve Cambridge.

c. This Park & Ride site could be served by a shuttle bus for the population of Hardwick and it has the benefit of the existing pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A428 to the village.

d. Locating this facility further to the west (1.5 miles), traffic would be caught earlier – traffic is already queuing on the slip road off the A428 and this will be further exacerbated as a result of the additional homes being built at Bourn and Cambourne.

e. The outcome will be reduced traffic flow on the A1303, an improved quality of life for residents living alongside Madingley Road, and reduced rat running through the narrow, winding roads of Madingley Village.

2. The best option is for the Area 1 Central Red Route to be implemented (rejecting Option Area 1 North Blue). A bus lane(s) developed along the existing A428 and A1303 from Cambourne to Cambridge is clearly more advantageous as it uses an existing road network which will be cheaper to construct and maintain. It will be quicker in use and respect the local environment – both key aims of your proposal – by not building on the 800 Wood or imposing on the tranquility of the American Military Cemetery:

The Area 1North (blue) route would ruin the 800 Wood which was planted to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the University, is intended for the public to enjoy and makes a significant environmental and ecological contribution to one of the least wooded counties in the country. It will also impact on the adjacent SSSI 'Madingley Wood' which, together with the 800 Wood, is the focus of unique, long-term research within several departments of the University of Cambridge.

The Area 1 North Blue route continues southwards through fields in full view of the American Military Cemetery which is the only permanent American World War II Cemetery in the UK with the site selected for its beauty and tranquility on a hill overlooking fields. A letter from Anthony Eden to the American Ambassador (dated 21st June 1954) sets out the terms of agreement, including a reference to the surrounding fields: 'the area coloured yellow will be restricted to agricultural use'. This agreement cannot and should not be ignored.

3. Other points critical to your aim of reducing traffic congestion and reducing travel times are:

- The development of the cloverleaf at Girton to provide a six-way junction allowing traffic from the west to use the A428 and particularly to be able to turn south onto the M11.
- The construction of Park and Ride sites at Barton and Bar Hill as part of a strategy of outer ring car parking management and, to protect our own village, the closure of The Avenue in Madingley to help prevent rat running.

079

I would like to make the following comments in relation to the above consultation:

1. It is unclear from the consultation document why Madingley has been proposed as a potential P&R location and who is expected to use it. The consultation proposes a new bus route from Cambourne, so logically any residents in Cambourne and any of the intervening villages would board the bus directly rather than first drive to the P&R site. So presumably any potential users of the new P&R would be those living west of Cambourne (e.g. St. Neots), in which case it makes more sense to move the site further west in order to pick up such users earlier. I would support the Madingley Parish Council proposal to site the P&R further west at Hardwick, for the reasons they have presented (a much better A428 road junction, closer to the nearby population centres, less environmental impact, etc.).
2. I would like to know what other options were considered and then rejected in earlier rounds. There seems to be lack of joined-up thinking between different agencies. For example, some of the City Deal money could be better spent on helping to improve the Girton Interchange, specifically to address the fact that currently there's no proposal to have any connectivity from the A428 eastbound to the M11 southbound. Making Girton a true all-way junction would potentially allow a significant number of car users to avoid using Madingley Rise / Madingley Road / Cambridge City Centre altogether if, for example, they were travelling to Addenbrooke's or the Biomedical Campus.
3. Madingley is the village that is most affected by this proposals in the consultation. It the only proposed location of new a P&R site and so the only one potentially adversely impacted by not only the site itself but also the devastating environmental impact of some of the proposed bus routes (e.g. through the 800 wood and past the American Military Cemetery). There have been 11 local exhibitions organised to present the proposal, but Madingley is conspicuous by its absence from the list. There was also no attempt made to distribute the consultation survey forms to any house in the village. This is inexcusable and verging on scandalous because the only logical conclusion is that this omission was deliberate in nature.

080

I am writing in response to the consultation on the City Deal plans for the Madingley Road corridor. This reply is based on the questions in the online form but I am not using this form because some of my answers don't fit the options involved, and also I'm not sure whether it's possible to keep a record of my own replies that way.

Please note that I may have inadvertently submitted a reply to the online form with most of the

answers blank. Ignore this -- I had to go through the form to see all the questions and wasn't sure how to exit it.

I am [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED], which tries to promote sustainable transport in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and those parts of my reply below (the answers to questions 11, 14 and 15) which are starred are submitted on behalf of that organisation as well as in my personal capacity, and in this context I use the first person plural ("we" and "our") where relevant.

Q1: Yes.

Q2: Most days, both weekdays and weekends.

Q3: All times though rarely in the morning peak, and any journeys I do make then are outwards from Cambridge.

Q4: Bus or walk.

Q5: One end of my journey will almost always be either my home (Hertford St) or my office (Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Rd).

Leaving aside journeys from one to the other (which I usually walk, incidentally), the other end of my journey, in roughly decreasing order of frequency, will be St Neots, Cambridge city centre and Bedford; plus occasional journeys to Cambourne, Huntingdon and places on the X5 route beyond Bedford.

Q6: Both.

Q7: I rarely experience lengthy delays at any of the locations stated.

However I am often inconvenienced because buses arrive late because of delays on the section between Cambridge City Centre and Northampton St on the one hand, and places between Oxford and St Neots town centre on the other. Particularly frustrating are journeys from my office to evening meetings in Cambridge -- it's further than I'd wish to walk, but evening buses on the Citi 4 towards the city centre are very unreliable because of residual delays as a result of late running on evening peak journeys out of Cambridge.

My most frequent "on bus" delays are when I use the Citi 4 from the city centre (usually after a shopping trip) to my office, when the bus often gets tangled in traffic on the very convoluted route it takes from its starting point to Emmanuel Road; within Bedford or St Neots, or in the A1 area, on journeys to/from Bedford and beyond; and at various points west of Bedford on longer journeys.

Q8: I assume that "greater" in the question means "better". The most important factor is "none of the above" -- rather that the bus should arrive at the stop where I'm waiting closer to its scheduled time. Other relevant factors are as follows:

(a) Better connections with trains at St Neots. Since the Council facilitated the removal of buses from my home area to Cambridge station by abusing the Better Buses Area Fund scheme, I now almost always use St Neots as my railhead for London as well as the North (for which it has always been more convenient than Cambridge). However it's 10min walk between the Loves Farm stop and the station, and occasionally this makes all the difference as far as making a connection is concerned.

(b) More stops by inter-city trains at St Neots (thus avoiding the need for a further change at

Peterborough when travelling to/from the North, and also providing faster journeys to/from London).

(c) Earlier and later X5 journeys (usually in connection with longer distance journeys, including train journeys via St Neots to the North).

(d) More frequent Citi 4 journeys in the evenings and on Sundays, and restoration of a Sunday evening service. Better still, introduce such a service on the X3 running through to/from Huntingdon.

(e) X5 to stop somewhere in the Cambourne area.

9. No. I did use it once earlier this year to visit Bourn Windmill on one of its open days (which are all Sundays); I was travelling from London and, having arrived at St Neots, I had to backtrack from the park & ride site to Cambourne because the X5 doesn't stop at Cambourne. This route was nevertheless quicker than going via Cambridge station. The connection at the park & ride site was very tight and would probably have taken an extra hour but for the fact that the Citi 4 started to stop at the park & ride site when the nearby stop in Madingley Road was suspended because of the current long term roadworks.

10. Agree.

11. * We would like to make some general comments and then assess some of the options to see how they measure up to the relevant criteria.

(a) We believe that there is too much emphasis on capital spending when much smaller amounts of revenue spending would give much better value for money. There is a report commissioned by the Department for Transport itself which comes to this conclusion
<<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sustainable-travel-projects-revenue-and-capital-investment>>.

While the remit of the study only concerns itself with revenue support associated with enhancement schemes, We believe that the same applies to more general revenue support, which has suffered draconian cuts over the last few years which, however, have saved far less money than it is now proposed to spend.

The Council should lobby the Government to act on this report and allow City Deal money to be used for revenue support. In this context the best option for bus priorities would be the cheapest -- 2 North and 1 Central or North.

However, an alternative -- on which we shall have more to say in our response to the Congestion consultation -- would be to impose a workplace parking tax throughout the Cambridge travel to work area and use the proceeds to improve revenue support for buses. In this case capital and revenue enhancements would not be competing for money so this consideration would no longer be relevant.

It would not be appropriate to expound our priorities for revenue support here, but we plan to do so in our response to the Congestion consultation.

(b) Any new construction should try to be upwards compatible with a future east-west rail link between Bedford and Cambridge via St Neots and Cambourne.

We can't comment definitively on how the various options would compare in this respect, but I

suspect that viewed as part of a combined road/rail scheme the extra cost of Area 2 South over the other Area 2 options would be considerably reduced.

Looking at the map provided with the consultation, we would need to ensure that a railway following the busway could get through the Cambourne West site towards St Neots. There would be no difficulty in achieving this if the Cambourne West development is designed appropriately.

The Area 2 South option has some other advantages not mentioned in the consultation map (as well as major improvements for cyclists, which are).

These include the restoration of bus access to the south end of Hardwick and the Highfields/Caldecote area, and the opportunity to run B1046 corridor buses via Madingley Rd. (My preferred option would be to have a combination of a service between Cambourne and Addenbrookes via the B1046, serving the new station which the latter site needs; and services from Cambridge to Gamlingay, Potton and Biggleswade or Sandy both via Madingley Rd to Comberton and via the A603 corridor.)

(c) A high priority should be the provision of somewhere in the Cambourne area where passengers could change between the X5 and local buses, and the option of putting a new park & ride here rather than at Madingley Mulch should be studied. In the longer term this site could also serve as a rail station for Cambourne. The provision of this site could be combined with the replacement of the existing site with one at Madingley Mulch.

Such a park & ride site could be served as follows:

A: Fast buses to existing park & ride (or Madingley Mulch, see above), Bulstrode Gardens and Northampton St (existing X5 stops), then via City Centre to Cambridge station, Addenbrookes and Babraham Rd Park & Ride -- with some buses running through to Haverhill, Saffron Walden or Stansted Airport. These would provide a sufficient frequency to cater for park & ride traffic. Many inter-urban X5 passengers would benefit greatly from a through service to Cambridge station.

B: Stopping buses to A428 corridor villages, West Cambridge and City Centre (existing Citi 4 and Whippet X3).

C: Hourly service to Bourn (some journeys to serve Caxton and/or Longstowe depending on the site of the interchange), then via B1046 corridor villages to Cambridge city centre or Addenbrookes.

D: Half hourly service to St Neots (preferably stopping close to station), Bedford and beyond (existing X5).

E: Hourly service to Papworth, Godmanchester and Huntingdon (with evening and Sunday service added). This is the existing X3. It could form part of the inter-urban network, running beyond Cambridge as suggested in A above (whether or not it ran express between the new park & ride and Cambridge).

F: Service to Papworth, Hilton and St Ives (existing Whippet 1). We believe that development of the interchange and park & ride potential for the site would help to support an hourly service on this route. Buses should certainly serve Cambourne Morrisons.

G: Service to Caxton, the Gransdens, Gamlingay, Potton and either Sandy or Biggleswade. This is a key "missing link" in our regional network and should have at least a 2 hourly service, though we would like to see a full hourly service.

H: New route Cambridge to Buckden via Coton, Madingley, Dry Drayton, Bar Hill, Elsworth, Boxworth, Cambourne, Papworth and the Offords, serving other villages in the area on a demand responsive basis. We would like this to connect with trains at a new station at Offord. This route would extend the existing Whippet 8.

The above network would form part of a programme to ensure that every community in Cambridgeshire had access to public transport -- which we believe should be the focus of the county's transport strategy.

This scheme could provide an "add on" to any of the options, and I don't see that it provides a basis for distinguishing between them.

(d) Congestion on the A1303 between the M11 and Madingley Mulch could be reduced if through traffic was provided with slip roads between the M11 and A428 at the Girton junction. Unfortunately the current A14 proposals for Girton are designed in such a way as to make the provision of an eastbound slip road much more difficult, but a westbound slip road (enforced by banning left turns off the M11 at J13) would reduce delays to outbound traffic this complementing the Area 1 Central option which would mainly benefit inbound traffic.

(e) We are not convinced of the merits of the Area 1 South option for buses as it is not clear how outbound buses would get to Silver St. However we believe that a cycle and walking route on this corridor deserves examination, together with improved links to the West Cambridge site (unless they have already been improved since I looked round the area several years ago).

Summing up, we suggest that, provided that money can be found from another source to support a comprehensive bus network which should be the main focus of the county transport strategy, the best combination is 2 South, 1 Central or North, and 1 South for cycles only, with the following modifications:

(1) Design of 2 South and Cambourne West so that part of the route can be shared with rail in future.

(2) Provision of a park & ride interchange at Cambourne, probably replacing Madingley Mulch.

(3) Provision of westbound slip road from M11 to A428.

12. Quite important.

13. I don't think so -- the only journey I tend to make which is short enough for me to cycle is between my office and home/city centre, and I regard Madingley Rd as having too much traffic for cycling to work for me.

14. * Precedence should go to our proposed Cambourne site. However it may make sense to move the current site to Madingley Mulch -- as suggested earlier.

15. * Depends on the choice of busway options. If 2 South or Central, then a southern site would enable through buses from Cambourne to stop there without having to negotiate the Madingley Mulch roundabout.

16. No, as I haven't used the official survey form I have been able to include everything I want to say within the answers to the questions.

17

18: 55-64

19: Not in paid employment but do have an office.

20. No

21. Strongly believe in sustainable transport. Find cycling in traffic very stressful.

22. First heard about it because am on county council email list.

081 I am writing to you as [REDACTED] to express my grave concern at how the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' consultation is being conducted. Your intervention in this matter would be very much appreciated.

I have lived and worked in and around Cambridge for 20 years and in general am highly supportive of investment into the area, especially transportation, however the consultation for this particular investment has a number of serious issues which render the consultation process flawed, with the potential for serious long term detrimental impacts.

1) The consultation is highly undemocratic.

We are asked for feedback on whether transportation should be improved and whether cycling and walking are important. Yes it should and of course they are. Given how the question is asked, I'm sure the responses will be highly supportive. But we are not given any real say on how this improvement is embodied. That decision is taken for us. We have to travel by bus using one of 3 unpalatable routes to a destination that we don't want to get to. This is not democracy. This consultation is not asking the real questions. The process seems to have been structured to falsely create the impression of support for three flawed bus routes, rather than genuinely trying to consult local residents and improve transportation.

2) There are a number of significant issues:

a) The consultation process and supplied documentation appear to be biased and misleading. For example we're shown three routes from the new P&R site into Cambridge. The first is then criticised for only providing a single lane and quickly getting snarled up in traffic. The second we're told can not happen because of agreements with the US government. Which apparently leaves just one viable option; an expensive route running through Coton, which is portrayed in a positive light, despite many significant issues (which are ignored).

b) A 4th route proposed by CambridgeBOLD has been ignored by the consultation, despite the considerable efforts which went into its creation and relative popularity.

c) Coton is misrepresented on the proposed route maps and the full outline of the village is not shown. The route via Coton is described as being to the North of the village whereas in reality, the route shown runs through the village. This is immediately obvious when an accurate village outline is used. In particular the outline of the village should be expanded to include key facilities such as the garden centre, recreation ground and pub. Note that the garden centre contains the post office, village shop, restaurant, and GP pharmacy pick-up point. Coton is a fragile community and these facilities are vitally important.

d) It should be made much more obvious to the public that a number of routes through Coton are

being considered, with varying degrees of impact on the village, cycle routes and Wimpole Way (a nationally recognised route from Cambridge through Coton, Hardwick and onto Wimpole). The route shown on the public consultation questionnaire is the least intrusive route being considered which is a misrepresentation of the situation.

e) The route through Coton into Cambridge is sold as being the quickest 'option', yet it has a different destination to the other two routes, ending up on Grange Road instead, which is a 20mph residential road with a number of school and university buildings, from where there will be significant delays to get to anywhere else.

f) There is insufficient information about the route via Coton. For example the public responding to the consultation may believe that the bus will stop in Coton, but my understanding is that this is not the case (impossible given the stated journey times). The impact on the local cycling and walking infrastructure is also not clear, for example at the moment Coton has a very good cycle/walking route into Cambridge via the Wimpole Way which I suspect would be replaced by the guided busway if run through Coton (yet this option is described as being far superior to the other options in terms of improvement to the cycling infrastructure..)

g) The consultation only considers routes into the town centre - rather than exploring other significant options such as an orbital route, or a route to the Science Park (including North train station and existing guided bus route to Addenbrooke's). I frequently drive on Madingley Road, but rarely with the town centre as my final destination. Instead this is the least worst option to drive to get elsewhere, given the many strange road junctions that unnecessarily restrict route options onto the M11 and A14. I know of many people who drive this route who likewise have no interest in stopping at the town centre. They go this way to drop their children at school, or to get onto the M11 heading south, or to head towards the Science Park, Histon etc. Furthermore the centre of Cambridge is congested. We have to stop using it as the star point for bus journeys.

h) The green space around Cambridge is very important. Once it's gone it's gone. The consultation doesn't seem to place any value on running the busway through unspoilt countryside vs. keeping it adjacent to the existing road networks. Additionally; important existing walking and cycling routes such as the Wimpole Way are not shown on the proposed route maps.

i) The consultation does not consider the impact on traffic through Coton. It is already difficult to get onto Madingley Road during rush hour, especially if traffic is coming off the M11 at junction 12 in order to avoid motorway congestion heading North. Guided bus routes cutting through Coton will make this considerably worse.

j) There is a particular problem with Madingley road at the moment due to roadworks, so any questions about traffic and journey times are distorted by this work. Without roadworks and outside of school term, this is a relatively quiet route into Cambridge once the M11 south traffic has departed.

I am deeply unhappy with this consultation. The proposals are ill thought through and a poor result for the money invested into them. Even worse the public documents are unclear, misleading, inaccurate and are written in such a way as to encourage respondents to believe an extra £50 million for option Area 1 South (via Coton) is a good use of public money. At the minimum the current consultation should be stopped until the above issues are resolved. Personally I would like all 3 proposed bus-routes to be sent back to the drawing board and to see evidence that we understand where the existing traffic is trying to get to. My personal suspicion is that public money would be better spent on a guided-bus route to the Science Park, North train station and then onto Addenbrooke's, in addition to improvements to the road junctions between M11, A428, A14 and

	<p>A1303.</p> <p>I hope you share my concerns and will take a stand to help get this consultation back on track.</p>
082	<p>I am very concerned about the proposals offered – here are some quick thoughts.</p> <p>What is needed is a fully co-ordinated/integrated approach to road and public transport, which would provide effective public transport and would avoid vehicles coming into areas unnecessarily so creating congestion for local traffic. Budgets ought to be able to be co-ordinated. Everything appears to be done seemingly on an ad hoc project basis with no apparent over-arching strategy for the area. The results are always costly with detrimental impacts to local people and to the environment. Once things are lost they are lost for good.</p> <p>Why isn't there a spur to take M11 traffic to the A14/M11 away from Madingley Rise which would substantially minimise the traffic using the Hill? I understand the percentages quoted at the local events were inaccurate according to a district councillor.</p> <p>Why isn't Scotland Farm being considered as a site for a new Park and Ride rather than Madingley – surely this would be far more practical and would prevent the pinch point at Madingley Mulch. Surely it could be designed in such a way to entice people to use it before getting to Madingley Rise ie bus lane/route.</p> <p>In fact, the main pinch point is at the Caxton Gibbet roundabout, but I see this is excluded from the current consultation.</p> <p>Queues down Madingley Hill for the last 18 months have been as a result of the roadworks going on and on at the bottom of the Hill where there are single lanes in and out. I currently drive through Barton at peak times.</p> <p>I have lived in [REDACTED] for many years and currently drive to work. I used to use the bus to commute to work, particularly when they came around the estate. The buses along the top road were always full of school children and were extremely unhealthy and uncomfortable. I only use the park and ride at the bottom of Madingley Hill in emergencies, because it is too close/uneconomical. I tried using it when I needed to get from Cambridge to my doctor's surgery in Bourn after work but I always ended up cancelling the appointments as the buses were too late. (My dentist is in Chesterton.) I often have to drive to appointments in or around town (osteopath/dentist etc) during work hours.</p> <p>I would be tempted to use buses more to Cambridge if there was a reliable bus service into and out of Cambridge including during the evening and at weekends. Also sensibly placed bus stops to avoid having to walk too far when carrying work or heavy shopping as I cannot carry heavy things due to a problem with my neck. Safety and security are paramount. Fare incentives would also help. I am in the 55-65 age bracket.</p> <p>Please take full and proper account of residents' views to safeguard the future for them and the environment. I hope to take this up further with our MP.</p>
083	<p>Thanks. I would be grateful if you would give me more information as to the journey times quoted. From which point to which point are they? And at what times of day, what is the peak journey time?</p>
084	<p>I am a [REDACTED] resident and I write to object in the strongest terms to the proposed new bus road that is likely to pass very close to the north of Coton (Option Area 1 South).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This scheme would cause irreparable environmental damage to the village of

Coton.

Although the map of Coton is unacceptably inaccurate, it would appear that a 16 metre-wide bus road is proposed, that would pass either very close to the north of the village, or even through it. This would link to a large new bridge over the M11, directly east of the village, that will dominate the countryside west of Cambridge. It is impossible to envisage how this will not have a serious visual impact on our village. Furthermore, it would certainly cause an increase in traffic noise. We already suffer high levels of noise from the M11 right across the village. This would be exacerbated by the construction of the new bridge since a large number of trees that currently part-protect the village from this noise will be lost.

- **The scheme would also cause irreparable damage to the land to the north of Coton, the Coton Countryside Reserve and the West Fields.**

The land to the north of the village is important green belt countryside protected by Natural Trust covenants. The West Fields form part of the special character of Cambridge, as was confirmed by The High Court in 2008 when development there was last proposed. I would like to see both these areas preserved as green belt and to enjoy continued protection from development.

- **The Area 1 South scheme is a colossal waste of public money that does not deliver sufficiently significant savings in journey times that would justify the high cost.**

The thrust of the argument in support of the Area 1 South route, and thus spending an extra £50 million of public money, is guaranteed quicker and more reliable journey times. Yet the information provided is fanciful, misleading and based on unjustifiable comparisons. Promoting the South option as superior to the others on the basis of faster access to the city centre is open to serious challenge.

- **This scheme appears to offer negligible benefit to the residents of Coton and other neighbouring villages.**

We are led to believe that these buses would be unlikely to stop in Coton, and a new crossing on Cambridge Road would actually slow down our own journey times into the city. Indeed it is unclear how residents in any of the villages closer to Cambridge than Cambourne will use these buses. Will it necessitate driving to a new Park and Ride? If so, how would this solve traffic congestion?

- **I believe traffic congestion could be solved by using an on-road solution on Madingley Road, and this could be a tidal scheme.**

A tidal scheme would cause minimal environmental and property damage, no loss of green belt and could be done at a fraction of the cost. Local people on local buses would be able to use this route, and so it would benefit far more residents to the west of Cambridge than the expensive off-road solution. Furthermore, some of the saved £50 million could be used to improve the cycling facilities along The Coton Footpath; putting a tidal route down Barton Road as well, and introducing electric buses to reduce pollution.

I would therefore would ask you to choose the much less damaging Area 1 Central proposal and reject Option Area 1 South. This will make best use of public money and preserve the unique character of West Cambridge for future generations.

085 I am a [REDACTED] resident, and I am writing to you to express my grave concern at how the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' consultation is being conducted. The proposed simplistic routes have not been defined well enough for residents to form opinions

within the current consultation questionnaire. The lack of detailed assessment to potentially commit £67million of public money is staggering. Until a little bit more money has been spent on fleshing out the detail, it would be ludicrous to reject any proposed route. The argument that the process does not warrant any more funded research at this point is invalid compared to the potential overall expenditure and impacts. No sensible procedure should decide on just one proposal after this consultation given the lack of detail, omissions and errors contained in the 'draft interim' report that appears to be the sole basis for the three loose proposals.

A fourth route proposed by CambridgeBOLD has been so far ignored by the consultation, despite the considerable efforts which went into its creation and relative popularity with a large number of residents. That the Executive Board has not taken the opportunity to engage this proposal into their consultation shows one of two things: either a lack of responsibility or the inability to consider this locally grown proposal at this stage. I would remind you that the Executive Board's current three proposals were generated by giving public money to Atkins consultancy firm where, most probably, just one or two individuals wrote what is entitled a 'draft interim' report. That the report was incompetent or, at best, lacking in local knowledge is suggested by the lack of clarity of the Area 1 South proposal map. In contrast, CambridgeBOLD is a proposal that has been generated by a number of local residents with major contribution from our majority elected local South Cambridgeshire District Councillor. At the very least it should be aired for public consultation on a par with the other proposals.

The Area 1 South route is described as a 'bus-only route north of Coton to Grange Road connecting to the West Cambridge University site'. If the development is to be a bus-only route, how can there be 'Major improvements' to the cycling routes, as indicated? What does 'connecting to the West Cambridge University site' mean? As Grange Road is East of this site, does this mean that the bus-route will go via the site before getting to Grange Road?

The Area 1 South route through Coton into Cambridge is sold as being the quickest 'option', yet it has a different destination to the other two routes, ending up on a notoriously busy road. The detail of the interface of each proposed route into Cambridge is paramount to assessing journey times and usefulness to the public. Where are the bus stops going to be?

Coton is misrepresented on the proposed route maps and the full outline of the village is not shown. The Area 1 South route via Coton is described as being to the North of the village whereas the route drawn runs through the village as it intersects with Cambridge Road, coming south off Madingley Road, at the point it zig-zags. This can only correspond to Coton High Street. The error that the original consultation document makes with this is a major mistake. Houses on Cambridge Rd, High Street (odd numbers), Brook Lane, The Footpath and St. Catherine's Hall, many of which are listed and within a conservation area, have been ignored. Also, the outline of the village should be expanded to include key facilities such as the garden centre, recreation ground and pub. Note that the garden centre contains the village post office, village shop, a restaurant, and GP pharmacy pick-up point. Coton has a large elderly demographic and access to the local facilities for the less mobile and the local community in general is vitally important.

There is insufficient information about the Area 1 South route via Coton. For example the public responding to the consultation may believe that the bus will stop in Coton, but my understanding is that this is not the case (impossible given the stated journey times). This one factor alone could be the difference between a resident being opposed to or in support of any of the proposals coming close to them. Furthermore, the impact on the local cycling and walking infrastructure is also not clear. Important existing walking and cycling routes such as the Wimpole Way are not shown on the proposed route maps.

I am deeply unhappy with this consultation given the risk that just one proposal may be selected for further assessment. The public documents are oversimplified, unclear, inaccurate and are written in such a way as to bias respondents to believe an extra £50 million for option Area 1 South (via Coton) is a good use of public money. The proposals are far too vague for question 11 of the consultation questionnaire to have any useful purpose. Other than individuals with enough wit and time to write personal comments, the only response you can expect is a general one of, 'not in my back yard',

which is of little help.

Given the expenditure, potential impact, and lack of detail it would be utterly negligent for just one proposal to be selected as the preferred option for full business case development after this first round consultation without further detailed development and assessment of all sensible proposals, with further consultation. I cannot believe that any member of the public could give a considered opinion to question 11 given the lack of detail currently provided.

086 **Re. Response of the [REDACTED] to the Consultation on improved bus services on the Madingley Road Corridor**

We are now writing to the City Deal Executive Board as the [REDACTED] to restate our view, which we have expressed at numerous public meetings and in correspondence. We wish to object strongly to any potential new bus road over the West Fields (Option Area 1 South) and to state that our strong preference is for Option Area 1 Central, if a bus road is required.

This objection extends to any alternative proposals or variations on Option Area 1 South which may now come forward which would also involve ploughing any new greenfield road down the Coton Corridor across pristine fields to Grange Road. [REDACTED] has shown there is overwhelming local opposition against any new scheme which harms this crucial green finger into the City, as it provides a positive soft/ green edge to the West Cambridge conservation area. Thousands have now signed a petition supporting our campaign to preserve this special space and such numbers show the local community is not divided as some have claimed.

[REDACTED] was set up with a series of conservation and ecology objectives. The green corridor of land from Coton to King's College Chapel has huge value in terms of local landscape, amenity and biodiversity. Green corridors are the most efficient way of preventing "sprawl and encroachment" (Policy P9/3b of the Structure Plan). John Preston at the FeCRA conference specifically felt this area alongside Grantchester deserves special protection. The development of the West Cambridge Site and North West Cambridge makes protecting this green space even more important. This iconic area of countryside is critical for recreation and biodiversity with many rights of way and several cycleways. There are City wildlife sites along various hedgerows and the Bin Brook. When Cambridge University delivers on its West Cambridge Site section 106 commitments, access will be even further boosted and the University should be encouraged to get on and deliver on their commitments.

A new road dissecting the West Fields would devastate this part of the green belt, and lose forever an irreplaceable and unique aspect of the special character of Cambridge. The High Court in 2008 confirmed the importance of the West Fields in terms of green belt when ruling that: 'the relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge.' The importance of the green finger into Grange Road has also been recognised in the new Inner Green Belt Study which has just been released (as at November 2015). LDA Design says that "the green corridor running into Grange Road emphasises the proximity of the countryside to the distinctive [historic] core of the city" and "makes a unique contribution to the setting of the city" and says that it is of "great importance that it is preserved". A new dual bus road would destroy this important part of Cambridge's distinctive character and it is not correct to suggest such damage could be mitigated by landscaping or tree screening in this location.

As well as opposing option Area 1 South, [REDACTED] also strongly disagrees with the Cambridge Bold proposal of going around the West side of the Cambridge University Athletics ground and then along a track to Grange Road North of the Cambridge University Rugby Club through the Coton Corridor. This would have disastrous implications for the most sensitive

section of the Coton Corridor which has been classified as distinctive Cambridge and is within 1km of the Backs. Our expert work has demonstrated that this area is hugely sensitive in terms of topography, open views, landscape, biodiversity and proximity to the historic core. It has many positive landscape features - a combination of hedgerows, trees, a water course, meadows and ploughed fields alongside sports pitches, which make it a very similar landscape to Grantchester Meadows. We understand from discussions with [REDACTED] CambridgePPF that his charity would also strongly object to this approach and [REDACTED] has said at various public meetings that he would sooner "die in a ditch" than see a new road ploughed through the heart of the West Fields up to Grange Road behind the Cambridge University Rugby Club. In particular the High Court in 2008 confirmed that "narrowing the Coton corridor... would render it almost meaningless as 'countryside'". A new bus road would have precisely the effect of devastating (and narrowing) the Coton Corridor where it has the greatest impact on the historic city. If the recommendations of LDA Design are to be followed no such development should be allowed and this option should be removed from any future discussions.

[REDACTED] (who for many years was Head of Research and Senior Ecologist at the RSPB) has produced an important ecological survey which we have also sent to you which identifies many protected and rare species in the immediate area behind the Cambridge University Rugby Club and on either side of the Bin Brook. He has identified badgers, grass snakes, hedgehogs, roe deer, many species of bat who benefit from close proximity to woods in Leckampton/ Robinson. In terms of birds on this part of the Coton green corridor, residents have observed Grey Partridge, Green Woodpeckers, Lesser Spotted Woodpeckers, Bullfinches, Jays, Song Thrush, Swifts. There are many birds of prey who hunt on the Old Rifle Range including Barn Owls, Kestrel and Sparrow Hawks. There are substantial numbers of butterflies/ dragon flies and moths (such as the Humming Bird Hawkmoth). This is not surprising as this area is the intersection of the Bin Brook (a County Wildlife Site) and the Coton to King's wildlife corridor. Wildlife would be meaningfully impacted by any new bus road in this critical location. Many believe that any new bus road through this area would become an ecological scandal as well as hugely damaging to the setting of the city. This was made clear again at the meeting held at St Mark's Community Centre on the 19th November.

'Area 1 South' bus route across this land, as presented, would have disastrous consequences as follows:

- A huge environmental impact on the West Fields and large-scale loss of flora and fauna.
- A huge cost; an estimated £67 million (approximately 4x cost of other options).
- A likely catalyst for housing development North and South of Barton Road in the long run (in any future Local Plan even if this is not included in the current local plan)
- A loss of green space, which currently brings countryside into the heart of the city.
- A cause of congestion on Grange Rd, historic Silver St and Downing St.
- A loss of setting, and damage to the special character of Cambridge.
- A severe impact on Coton Village.
- The new bridge over the M11 will be an expensive eyesore.
- The bus route would prevent the creation of a West Cambridge Country Park, which is currently under discussion with a number of stakeholders and local councillors

The City Deal consultation documents also appear to be biased in favour of the West Fields route in several respects. During the consultation, we have raised serious concerns about all the points below but we do not feel we have had satisfactory answers. Major issues include:

- Claims about 7 minute journey times ignore the delays on Grange Rd/ West Rd as this should have been included if presented on like for like basis (see below)
- The journey times do not compare 'like with like' (the green route does not go as far into town as

the Madingley Road route for example). This discrepancy has been confirmed.

- The plans are geographically misleading and inaccurate.
- Major cycleway improvements are already due under the West Cambridge Site section 106.
 - There is no attempt to present the obvious shortcomings of the Silver Street/Pembroke Street/Downing Street leg.
- The presentation of Option Area 1 South as the green route is potentially suggestive and misleading.

We therefore would ask you to choose the much less damaging Area 1 Central proposal, which involves just one bus lane going down Madingley Road.

Madingley Road can accommodate a single bus lane and even dual bus lanes if required. The character of Madingley Road has changed significantly in recent years with the West Cambridge Site, North West Cambridge and the Park and Ride. A single bus lane can easily be accommodated whilst still allowing excellent dual cycle and pedestrian lanes. In various meetings of the West Cambridge Site there has been the implication that Madingley Road will be widened anyway therefore this is the reversible option, which can be implemented whilst other initiatives (such as road pricing etc) are considered.

████████████████████ and our local councillors objected to the potentially biased presentation of the options at the various City Deal meetings before the consultation, and yet the bias has remained which has impacted the consultation. We have written separately to ██████████ ██████████ and to the City Deal Board to discuss some of our detailed concerns on the consultation leaflet and its presentation of the options.

We would ask you to please ensure that Option Area 1 South is firmly rejected (and indeed any other alternatives in the future which involve similar harm), so that we can preserve this crucial aspect of the unique character of Cambridge for the future. Can you also please ensure that considerations of ecology and heritage form part of the consultation process and that more weight is given to the impact on those most affected, not least West Cambridge and Coton residents. We appreciate comments in recent meetings, like the one at St Mark's on the 19th November, that the City Deal Board are now listening to local residents' concerns.

087 Please could you tell me why we are completing a survey for Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys, when i have seen in the media that there are so far over ten options, via many different parties concerning the traffic problems affecting Cambridge and the surrounding area associated with City Deal?

088 I am a ██████████ and I am writing to you to express my grave concern at how the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' consultation is being conducted.

The proposed simplistic routes have not been defined well enough for residents to form opinions within the current consultation questionnaire. The lack of detailed assessment to potentially commit £67million of public money is staggering. Until a little bit more money has been spent on fleshing out the detail, it would be ludicrous to reject any proposed route. The argument that the process does not warrant any more funded research at this point is invalid compared to the potential overall expenditure and impacts. No sensible procedure should decide on just one proposal after this consultation given the lack of detail, omissions and errors contained in the 'draft interim' report that appears to be the sole basis for the three loose proposals.

A fourth route proposed by CambridgeBOLD has been so far ignored by the consultation, despite the considerable efforts which went into its creation and relative popularity with a large number of residents. That the Executive Board has not taken the opportunity to engage this proposal into their consultation shows one of two things: either a lack of responsibility or the inability to consider this

locally grown proposal at this stage. I would remind you that the Executive Board's current three proposals were generated by giving public money to Atkins consultancy firm where, most probably, just one or two individuals wrote what is entitled a 'draft interim' report. That the report was incompetent or, at best, lacking in local knowledge is suggested by the lack of clarity of the Area 1 South proposal map. In contrast, CambridgeBOLD is a proposal that has been generated by a number of local residents with major contribution from our majority elected local South Cambridgeshire District Councillor. At the very least it should be aired for public consultation on a par with the other proposals.

The Area 1 South route is described as a 'bus-only route north of Coton to Grange Road connecting to the West Cambridge University site'. If the development is to be a bus-only route, how can there be 'Major improvements' to the cycling routes, as indicated? What does 'connecting to the West Cambridge University site' mean? As Grange Road is East of this site, does this mean that the bus-route will go via the site before getting to Grange Road?

The Area 1 South route through Coton into Cambridge is sold as being the quickest 'option', yet it has a different destination to the other two routes, ending up on a notoriously busy road. The detail of the interface of each proposed route into Cambridge is paramount to assessing journey times and usefulness to the public. Where are the bus stops going to be?

Coton is misrepresented on the proposed route maps and the full outline of the village is not shown. The Area 1 South route via Coton is described as being to the North of the village whereas the route drawn runs through the village as it intersects with Cambridge Road, coming south off Madingley Road, at the point it zig-zags. This can only correspond to Coton High Street. The error that the original consultation document makes with this is a major mistake. Houses on Cambridge Rd, High Street (odd numbers), Brook Lane, The Footpath and St. Catherine's Hall, many of which are listed and within a conservation area, have been ignored. Also, the outline of the village should be expanded to include key facilities such as the garden centre, recreation ground and pub. Note that the garden centre contains the village post office, village shop, a restaurant, and GP pharmacy pick-up point. Coton has a large elderly demographic and access to the local facilities for the less mobile and the local community in general is vitally important.

There is insufficient information about the Area 1 South route via Coton. For example the public responding to the consultation may believe that the bus will stop in Coton, but my understanding is that this is not the case (impossible given the stated journey times). This one factor alone could be the difference between a resident being opposed to or in support of any of the proposals coming close to them. Furthermore, the impact on the local cycling and walking infrastructure is also not clear. Important existing walking and cycling routes such as the Wimpole Way are not shown on the proposed route maps.

I am deeply unhappy with this consultation given the risk that just one proposal may be selected for further assessment. The public documents are oversimplified, unclear, inaccurate and are written in such a way as to bias respondents to believe an extra £50 million for option Area 1 South (via Coton) is a good use of public money. The proposals are far too vague for question 11 of the consultation questionnaire to have any useful purpose. Other than individuals with enough wit and time to write personal comments, the only response you can expect is a general one of, 'not in my back yard', which is of little help.

Given the expenditure, potential impact, and lack of detail it would be utterly negligent for just one proposal to be selected as the preferred option for full business case development after this first round consultation without further detailed development and assessment of all sensible proposals, with further consultation. I cannot believe that any member of the public could give a considered

opinion to question 11 given the lack of detail currently provided.

089 I am a [REDACTED] resident, and I am writing to you to express my grave concern at how the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' consultation is being conducted.

The proposed simplistic routes have not been defined well enough for residents to form opinions within the current consultation questionnaire. The lack of detailed assessment to potentially commit £67million of public money is staggering. Until a little bit more money has been spent on fleshing out the detail, it would be ludicrous to reject any proposed route. The argument that the process does not warrant any more funded research at this point is invalid compared to the potential overall expenditure and impacts. No sensible procedure should decide on just one proposal after this consultation given the lack of detail, omissions and errors contained in the 'draft interim' report that appears to be the sole basis for the three loose proposals.

A fourth route proposed by CambridgeBOLD has been so far ignored by the consultation, despite the considerable efforts which went into its creation and relative popularity with a large number of residents. That the Executive Board has not taken the opportunity to engage this proposal into their consultation shows one of two things: either a lack of responsibility or the inability to consider this locally grown proposal at this stage. I would remind you that the Executive Board's current three proposals were generated by giving public money to Atkins consultancy firm where, most probably, just one or two individuals wrote what is entitled a 'draft interim' report. That the report was incompetent or, at best, lacking in local knowledge is suggested by the lack of clarity of the Area 1 South proposal map. In contrast, CambridgeBOLD is a proposal that has been generated by a number of local residents with major contribution from our majority elected local South Cambridgeshire District Councillor. At the very least it should be aired for public consultation on a par with the other proposals.

The Area 1 South route is described as a 'bus-only route north of Coton to Grange Road connecting to the West Cambridge University site'. If the development is to be a bus-only route, how can there be 'Major improvements' to the cycling routes, as indicated? What does 'connecting to the West Cambridge University site' mean? As Grange Road is East of this site, does this mean that the bus-route will go via the site before getting to Grange Road?

The Area 1 South route through Coton into Cambridge is sold as being the quickest 'option', yet it has a different destination to the other two routes, ending up on a notoriously busy road. The detail of the interface of each proposed route into Cambridge is paramount to assessing journey times and usefulness to the public. Where are the bus stops going to be?

Coton is misrepresented on the proposed route maps and the full outline of the village is not shown. The Area 1 South route via Coton is described as being to the North of the village whereas the route drawn runs through the village as it intersects with Cambridge Road, coming south off Madingley Road, at the point it zig-zags. This can only correspond to Coton High Street. The error that the original consultation document makes with this is a major mistake. Houses on Cambridge Rd, High Street (odd numbers), Brook Lane, The Footpath and St. Catherine's Hall, many of which are listed and within a conservation area, have been ignored. Also, the outline of the village should be expanded to include key facilities such as the garden centre, recreation ground and pub. Note that the garden centre contains the village post office, village shop, a restaurant, and GP pharmacy pick-up point. Coton has a large elderly demographic and access to the local facilities for the less mobile and the local community in general is vitally important.

There is insufficient information about the Area 1 South route via Coton. For example the public responding to the consultation may believe that the bus will stop in Coton, but my understanding is that this is not the case (impossible given the stated journey times). This one factor alone could be

the difference between a resident being opposed to or in support of any of the proposals coming close to them. Furthermore, the impact on the local cycling and walking infrastructure is also not clear. Important existing walking and cycling routes such as the Wimpole Way are not shown on the proposed route maps.

I am deeply unhappy with this consultation given the risk that just one proposal may be selected for further assessment. The public documents are oversimplified, unclear, inaccurate and are written in such a way as to bias respondents to believe an extra £50 million for option Area 1 South (via Coton) is a good use of public money. The proposals are far too vague for question 11 of the consultation questionnaire to have any useful purpose. Other than individuals with enough wit and time to write personal comments, the only response you can expect is a general one of, 'not in my back yard', which is of little help.

Given the expenditure, potential impact, and lack of detail it would be utterly negligent for just one proposal to be selected as the preferred option for full business case development after this first round consultation without further detailed development and assessment of all sensible proposals, with further consultation. I cannot believe that any member of the public could give a considered opinion to question 11 given the lack of detail currently provided.

090

COMMENTS

Bus timetable from Bourne to
A North is not good. Long wait
for older people (55 mins)

A NEED FOR IMPROVED BUS SERVICES AND
MORE REGULAR

BENEFITS COULD BE BETTER FOR AREA 2
SOUTH.

Noise.

How close to a bus lane would existing houses in
Maddingly Road have to be to qualify for an

acoustic barrier?
And would it be high enough to prevent bus
passengers from looking into upstairs windows?

contact

details

on separate
list.

Some officials need to discuss
plans with — these present need
to identify the values

Need info re other routes being
discussed e.g. radial routes.

^{possibilities}
ID needs more consideration

Projected traffic speculative? wait, see

Current traffic fine without roadworks.

I STRONGLY ASSOCIATE THE BETTER CITY DEAR PROPOSALS.

Very disappointing exhibition — no new information
laughed at by City Council!!

This was a complete waste of time. We have the
ledger + this told us no more. We were laughed at when
we mentioned the 'monorail' in the Cambridge News

Just one request — quantified targeted
outcomes for each option in terms of
Travel to walk by bus, % share, the rest %
for Cambridge.

Very difficult to find - why no signs from the road?
No more information than on survey form I've
had through the door.
Why no residents parking in Northam?

The 'consultation' process has not happened as
leaflets have not been distributed to many
areas.

South of the road Mr. [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
i.) What has.

Live on Madingley Road & no leaflet received! Pls check
distribution company.

No more info than a questionnaire - was expecting a talk
from the Council.

More info required on the Western Orbital & Cambridge Access
projects - they are all linked - no decision can be made
on its own.

Great that things have been so open. The
posters were helpful & the people on hand
very knowledgeable.

My view is that we should go for Area 1
South - it costs more but is by far the
best investment for the long term. Cambridge
is a world class city and it
ought to think "big" and ambitious.

COMMENT

From the leaflet provided, option 1 South seems the odd one out as it has a very short journey time, much more so than the alternatives.

Using Google earth however, and the Atkins document on bus speeds etc, it is almost impossible to complete the sketched trajectory in 7 minutes. 1) the distance is 4.9 km, not 4.5, and 2) a dedicated busway cannot go all the way up to Grange Road, adding more time. With these corrections, the journey time becomes 9 minutes and the route loses almost all its appeal.

Despite raising this point on multiple occasions, no real answers were provided.

Option 1 South would force double decker buses onto Grange Road THIS IS DANGEROUS. children, dogs, students, bikes, pushchairs. There are 2 primary schools nursery student residences. PLEASE DON'T DO THIS.

All these routes bring buses into congestion in the city.
 Try the ~~at~~ Better City Deal ideas FIRST to cut congestion. All the bus line proposals are environmentally destructive, especially the 1 South across the water-bridges & will not address the main problems.


COMMENT

Better use could be made of Barton Road if no commuter cars + tour buses were allowed. The option to go 'thru' the West Fields site seems a ^{shame} " "

It is vital to preserve the West Fields and not to drive a road way through this important area of Cambridge's environmental and landscape heritage. The setting of the City is just as, or more, important than marginal improvements, at great expense, to traffic flow. The Green Belt around the City should be preserved in all areas; in the case of the West Fields the Green Belt is able to reach as far in towards the City Centre as Grouse Road. Preserving this is an integral part of the City's character and unique quality - as internationally recognised.

The issues at the end of all the routes in the City must be resolved before the routes are constructed.

Area 1 South proposal should be rejected. It is the least beneficial proposal on environmental grounds. The West Fields approach should be preserved as a green lung into Cambridge. Otherwise development will further encroach. In principle, existing road routes should be used where ever possible and traffic flow managed. Support notes of better bus services for commuters which should help manage car & commercial traffic needs

 attitude this evening is dismissive, patronising and disinterested in points made
to Kim

I wholly endorse the above comment.
H. K.

COMMENT

Options 1A & B infinitely preferable to 1C

What traffic studies have been done on Madingley Road to determine driver destination / reason for travel?

([REDACTED])
I echo V. Waddington in supporting 1A or 1B but oppose 1C (the "Southern") vehemently. Further, I am interested to understand why a simple congestion charge is not being actively considered. The point is, to keep additional and non-resident people out of the city, not to make it simpler for them to get in! Any decision should be delayed until the Cambridge Access Study is completed.

I am concerned that all these options will simply add to congestion in Northampton St, Magdalen St & Silver Street and squeeze out cyclists

We are deeply concerned that once a road has been driven across the West Fields, it will only be a few years before this precious green space is lost forever, taking our nature and heritage for future generations with it.

Option 1C is environmentally, culturally and economically unwise, and should be opposed. MC

CHILDREN NEED GREEN SPACES LIKE WEST FIELDS PLEASE DON'T LET THE NEW BUSWAY DESTROY THEM. WE CAN LEARN TO USE MORE BIKES AND ONE DAY MAKE A METRO. WE NEED NATURE TO BE HAPPY. THERE ARE TOO MANY CARS ALREADY ON GRANGE ROAD AND ALL OUR SCHOOLS WOULD SUFFER WITH MORE TRAFFIC. PLEASE DON'T CHOOSE 1C.

COMMENT

IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND HOW ANY OF THE PROPOSALS WILL IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW. WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO "SORT" THE MODELLING (IN AN ACCESSIBLE FORMAT) TO HELP TO UNDERSTAND WHY THE OPTIONS HAVE BEEN CHOSEN.

I would have welcomed more detail on how the CAMBRIDGE SPOKE plans interface with these proposals, especially the connections through to Addenbrooke's & East Cambridge.

There are 2 different types of bus users - (1) ^{peak time} working people (2) daytime travellers esp. the elderly, those with young children. Buses during the day from Cambourne are fine, though seats (not necessarily with shelter) would be a great help for elderly. How about just more buses at peak times. If buses stop at Lady Margaret Road how do sick/elderly etc get a bus to Addenbrooke's Hospital.

If the green route going past Cotton is chosen it might be reasonable to have a bus stop there. I would also like to be sure that some buses would go all the way from Cambourne to Cambridge and that it would not be necessary to change bus at the park & ride.

Dear Mr Heller

I object vehemently to the proposed Bus Route via West Fields - for all the obvious reasons you know yourself so well!

The Maddingley Rd-route seems to me the obvious reasonable and economic/ecological choice.

Please try to convince all others of that. Thank you

093 I am a resident of [REDACTED] and write in connection with the proposed new routes for buses into Cambridge from Cambourne.

I appreciate that something must be done to ease congestion along the Maddingley Road but I would urge that serious consideration is given to the protection of our lovely green spaces around the city on this side of Cambridge and that the route 1 Central becomes the preferred choice. This route is almost four times cheaper than the south route which should be a major consideration and I feel would cause much less environmental damage. Given the austerity measures currently in place and with more to come we should not be throwing such huge sums into one project but working to find the best value for money, which I believe the central route will achieve.

The south route will cause a great loss of the green space which goes right into the heart of the city, will cause a severe impact to the village of Coton, and will necessitate the building of a new expensive bridge over the M11; it will also be a catalyst for building houses along both sides of the Barton Road. This route will also prevent the creation of a West Cambridge Countryside Park, currently under discussion, which would be of great benefit to both local and city residents. The central route alongside the Maddingley Road seems a much more sensible route, much less expensive and much less damaging all round.

	<p>I would ask you to ensure that Option Area1 South is firmly rejected, so that we can preserve this crucial aspect of the unique character of Cambridge for the future and a green corridor into the heart of the city. It seems that the consultation documents have been presented in a way that is potentially misleading which is not helpful and should be addressed. I would ask that you ensure that considerations of ecology and heritage form part of the consultation process and that more weight is given to the impact on those most affected, not least West Cambridge and Coton residents</p>
094	<p>I wish to register my concern at the proposals envisaged for improving bus journeys between Cambourne and Cambridge. The proposals work on the assumption that the introduction of bus lanes will improve traffic congestion and speed up journeys into Cambridge. However, this assumption is entirely false for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people will not use buses and leave their cars at home unless the charges are reduced, making it a charge for car only, and this will not happen without substantial subsidies; • people use buses only if they take them where they want to go and it is far from clear that any of the bus lanes will achieve that (see below); • the bulk of traffic congestion occurs during the morning rush hour and does not occur when schools are on holiday, which means that parents driving children to school is a major factor and this is a problem that needs to be resolved first and foremost; • traffic congestion occurs at other times only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o when there are roadworks with accumulated traffic controls, as at present on both Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (reflecting poor planning) o or when the M11 or A14 are blocked and traffic is diverted through Cambridge. <p>In none of these cases would bus lanes help to alleviate the situation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a bus lane down Madingley Road will speed up nothing if the delay to the in-coming bus is caused, as it often is, by congestion on Newmarket road delaying the out-going bus, rather than congestion on Madingley Road itself. <p>In addition to the faulty basic assumptions underlying the proposals, the proposed scheme for bus lanes is also flawed. Strenuous representations are being made by others about the potential environmental impact of route Area 1 south (formerly 1c) across fields in west Cambridge, suggesting at the same time that Madingley Road routes Areas 1 North and Central (formerly 1a and 1b) present the better option. However, this is quite untrue, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madingley Road is also a designated conservation area and the anticipated bus routes will both impinge on that designation; • Madingley Road is already used intensively by cyclists and pedestrians who use the designated cycle paths on both sides of the road en route for the West Site and other university premises: the introduction of a bus lane would narrow the space available and make the road extremely dangerous; • Introducing a bus lane will require the reduction of verges, the re-positioning of lamp-posts and potentially involve the compulsory purchase of land at various points - all major costs not yet considered, and all detracting from the supposedly protected environmental character of the area; • Traffic build up has recently been caused by the modified traffic lights at Northampton Street, often backing up to the Queen's Road roundabout and beyond. Traffic feeding in from Lady Margaret Road and Queen's Road exacerbates this problem. Any bus traffic would inevitably grind to a halt at this point as there is no room for a third lane for buses. <p>In view of the above, I strongly support an alternative proposal to take a P&R bus route into the West Site at High Cross and thence off-road to Grange Road. It has the virtue of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving passengers better by taking them where they need to go (West site, Sidgwick Site, central Cambridge etc); • Avoiding further build up of traffic at the Northampton Street traffic lights; • Avoiding the immense disruption to both traffic and householders that would be caused by the installation of a bus lane on Madingley Road (already suffering more than its fair share of

	<p>disruption with the West site and North West Cambridge developments).</p>
095	<p>I wanted to write to you to express my concerns about the proposed new bus route Option Area 1 South that threatens the West Fields green belt between Cambridge and Coton. I am resident of [REDACTED] and a frequent user of the West Fields for walking; so I am intensely aware of the harm it would do to the setting of Cambridge and the local countryside. I also think that the proposal of adding a very considerable amount of bus traffic to the already extremely congested Grange Road, seems very ill thought-out and would bring about no time savings whatsoever (claims of a 7 minute journey time saving, seem totally disingenuous and misleading). I am also concerned that Grange Road which is already somewhat dangerous to cross, especially for young school children such as mine, will become significantly more perilous; this should be a key consideration given the number of schools and colleges on or just off Grange Road.</p> <p>As well as thinking that Route 1C absolutely fails on its own merits, I am also aware of the likelihood that developers would use the building of Option Area 1 South to argue that the West Fields green belt had now already been encroached upon and that they should therefore be allowed to build new houses upon the land. For the same reasons of destroying the green belt setting which is such an important part of Cambridge's tradition and nature I would be deeply opposed to that.</p> <p>You will no doubt have heard and be hearing from many other Cambridge residents about this matter in the near future. I would urge you to realise how seriously we take this matter and that we look to you for support and help in getting the Option Area 1 South proposal rejected. We would ask you to choose the much less damaging and costly Area 1 Central proposal.</p>
095 a	<p>I am a resident of [REDACTED] and write to object in the strongest terms to the manner in which the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' is being conducted. The consultation documents are unclear, inaccurate and misleading written in a biased way designed to encourage people to support the Area 1 South option.</p> <p>First, it is unclear what we are being consulted on. Is this a busway, a bus road or a dedicated busway? What is the proposed route? How close does it come to our village? Does it dissect our village? Where will these buses stop and will people from Coton be able to use them? I believe failure to provide clarity on these fundamental aspects of the scheme calls into question the validity this consultation process and the public's ability to respond.</p> <p>Second, the consultation documents are highly misleading. The argument in support of the Area 1 South route, and thus spending an extra £50 million of public money, is guaranteed quicker and more reliable journey times. Yet the information given on this is bound to mislead respondents. The consultation leaflet states that the journey time for the Area 1 South option is 7 minutes shorter than for the other options, but the comparisons are clearly unfair. The North and Central routes end at Northampton Street, while the South route ends at Grange Road, further from the city centre. For buses to negotiate West Road and Queens Road at rush hour could take most, if not all, of the 7 minute difference. In a consultation document which deliberately provides only the most approximate, 'fuzzy' information on route options, it is frankly absurd to provide journey times to the nearest minute. A fair document would have journey times in the range of 10-15 minutes for all three options. Promoting the South option as superior to the others on the basis of faster access to the city centre can only be taken as intentional bias.</p> <p>Equally misleading is the map of Coton. Those parts of the village to the north and the east that are most affected by this scheme are completely missing. The clear impression to a reader who does not know the village is that the route would by-pass it and consequently have no local impact. It is not good enough simply to say 'the map is indicative'. Unless the City Deal team can definitively rule out the the route passing through any part of Coton, the map needs to show that the route may dissect the village, so that respondents can appreciate the potential impact.</p>

	<p>Third, key information vital to an informed response is missing. No mention is made of the following important issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The enormous ecological or environmental damage the Area 1 South would cause - the route is simply drawn through a void • The potential visual, noise, and pollution impacts on the village of Coton • How people living in villages along the route, including Coton, Comberton, Madingley, Toft and Hardwick, might use these buses. Do they have to drive to the Park and Ride? <p>Finally I believe this document has been written in a biased manner in order to justify the enormous extra cost of the Area 1 South route. Therefore, for all the reasons above I believe this process to be flawed, biased and so any conclusions drawn as a result of this process will be open to serious challenge.</p>
095 b	<p>I say NO to any bus route over the West Fields = Option Area 1 South</p> <p>The High Court in 2008 confirmed the importance of this green corridor of land viz: 'the relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge'. We must preserve it. Dissecting it would be an irredeemable disaster.</p> <p>How can you even begin to think of a bus route here? And who on earth came up with the idea of sending guided buses on such a misconceived route into Cambridge down Grange Road or West Road/Silver Street/Pembroke Street/Downing Street etc. (Not a fast route either) What an absurd idea? Not to mention the huge cost.</p> <p>The much less damaging route would be the Area 1 Central proposal at far less cost and almost certainly far more reliable in timing.</p> <p>The West Fields must absolutely be protected. I beg you simply to delete this option. Future consequences of ignoring this could be dire. (Madness even to consider it and its huge expense). Let's preserve this area of countryside and green belt for future generations.</p> <p>Please go for the Area 1 Central proposal.</p>
096	<p>I am a resident of Cambridge and write in connection with the proposal to build a new road along the West Fields route. I have examined the plans and know the site well, and I wish to object strongly to the potential new bus road over the West Fields (Option Area 1 South).</p> <p>The green corridor of land from Coton to King's College Chapel has huge value in terms of local landscape, amenity and biodiversity. A new road dissecting the West Fields will devastate this part of the green belt, and lose forever an irreplaceable and unique aspect of the special character of Cambridge. The High Court in 2008 confirmed the importance of the West Fields when ruling that: 'the relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge.'</p> <p>The integrity of this rural environment, where no major residential or commercial development has been allowed, would subsequently be lost by urbanisation of the West Fields. This landscape should also be given the highest protection in the forthcoming reappraisal of greenbelt sites under the Local Plan review.</p> <p>The 'Area 1 South' bus route across this land would have disastrous consequences as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A huge environmental impact on the West Fields and large-scale loss of flora and fauna. A huge cost; an estimated £67 million (approximately 4x cost of other options).

2. A catalyst for housing development North and South of Barton Road.
3. A loss of green space, which currently brings countryside into the heart of the city. A cause of congestion on Grange Rd, historic Silver St and Downing St.
4. A loss of setting, and damage to the special character of Cambridge.
5. A severe impact on Coton Village.
6. The new bridge over the M11 will be an expensive eyesore.
7. The bus route would prevent the creation of a West Cambridge Countryside Park, which is currently under discussion.

The City Deal consultation documents also appear to be biased in favour of the West Fields route in several respects:

1. Claims about 7 minute journey times ignore the delays on Grange Rd/ West Rd.
2. The journey times do not compare 'like with like' (the green route does not go as far into town as the Maddingley Road route for example). This has not been clarified properly.
3. The plans are geographically misleading and inaccurate.
4. Major cycleway improvements are already due under the West Cambridge Site section 106. There is no attempt to present the obvious shortcomings of the Silver Street/Pembroke Street/Downing Street leg.
5. The presentation of Option Area 1 South as the green route is potentially suggestive and misleading.

We therefore would ask you to choose the much less damaging Area 1 Central proposal, which involves just one bus lane going down Maddingley Road, which could potentially be a tidal route.

Maddingley Road can accommodate a single bus lane and even dual bus lanes if required. The character of Maddingley Road has changed significantly in recent years with the West Cambridge Site, North West Cambridge and the Park and Ride. A single bus lane can easily be accommodated whilst still allowing excellent dual cycle and pedestrian lanes. In various meetings of the West Cambridge Site there has been the implication that Maddingley Road will be widened anyway therefore this is the reversible option, which can be implemented whilst other initiatives (such as road pricing etc) are considered.

The Save the West Fields campaign and our local councillors objected to the potentially biased presentation of the options at the various City Deal meetings before the consultation, and yet the bias appears to remain.

I would ask you to please ensure that Option Area 1 South is firmly rejected, so that we can preserve this crucial aspect of the unique character of Cambridge for the future. Can you also please investigate why the consultation documents have been presented in a way that is potentially misleading and see to it that appropriate amendments are made. Can you also ensure that considerations of ecology and heritage form part of the consultation process and that more weight

	<p>is given to the impact on those most affected, not least West Cambridge and Coton residents.</p>
097	<p>I am a resident of Cambridge and write in connection with 'save the West fields'. I have examined the plans and know the site well, and I wish to object strongly to the potential new bus road over the West fields (Option Area 1 South).</p> <p>The green corridor of land from Coton to King's College Chapel has huge value in terms of local landscape, amenity and biodiversity. A new road dissecting the West fields will devastate this part of the green belt, and lose forever an irreplaceable and unique aspect of the special character of Cambridge. The High Court in 2008 confirmed the importance of the West fields when ruling that 'the relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge'.</p> <p>The integrity of this rural environment where no major residential or commercial development has been allowed would subsequently be lost by urbanisation of the West fields. This landscape should also be given the highest protection in the forthcoming reappraisal of greenbelt sites under the Local Plan review.</p> <p>The 'Area 1 South' bus route across this land would have disastrous consequences as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A huge environmental impact on the West fields and large-scale loss of flora and fauna. A huge cost; an estimated £67 million A catalyst for housing development North and South of Barton Road. A loss of green space, which currently brings countryside into the heart of the city. A cause of congestion on Grange Road, historic Silver St and Downing St. A loss of setting, and damage to the special character of Cambridge. A severe impact on Coton Village. The new bridge over the M11 will be an expensive eyesore. The bus route would prevent the creation of a West Cambridge Countryside Park which is currently under discussion. <p>The City Deal consultation documents also appear to be biased in favour of the West fields route in several respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims about 7 minute journey times ignore the delays on Grange Rd/West Rd. The journey times do not compare 'like with like' (the green route does not go as far into town as the Madingley Road route for example). This has not been clarified properly. The plans are geographically misleading and inaccurate. Major cycleway improvements are already due under the West Cambridge Site section 106. There is no attempt to present the obvious shortcomings of the Silver Street/Pembroke St/Downing St leg. The presentation of Option Area 1 South as the green route is potentially suggestive and misleading. <p>We therefore would ask you to choose the much less damaging Area 1 Central proposal, which involves just one bus lane going down Madingley Road which could be potentially a tidal route.</p> <p>Madingley Road can accommodate a single bus lane and even dual bus lanes if required. The character of Madingley Road has changed significantly in recent years with the West Cambridge Site, North West Cambridge and the Park and Ride. A single bus lane can easily be accommodated whilst still allowing excellent dual cycle and pedestrian lanes. In various meetings of the West Cambridge Site there has been the implication that Madingley Road will be widened anyway therefore this is the reversible option, which can be implemented whilst</p>

other initiatives (such as road pricing etc) are considered.

The Save the West fields campaign and our local councillors objected to the potentially biased presentation of the options at the various City Deal meetings before the consultation, and yet the bias appears to remain.

I would ask you to please ensure that Option Area 1 South is firmly rejected, so that we can preserve this crucial aspect of the unique character of Cambridge for the future. Can you also please investigate why the consultation documents have been presented in a way that is potentially misleading and see to it that appropriate amendments are made. Can you also ensure that considerations of ecology and heritage form part of the consultation process and that more weight is given to the impact on those most affected, not least West Cambridge and Coton residents.

098	<p>Response to 'Cambourne to Cambridge – better bus journeys' consultation <i>This is a snapshot of our proposal, which is regularly updated in response to consultation and feedback. The latest version may be found at:</i> [REDACTED] [REDACTED] rejects all six bus route options proposed in the City Deal consultation <i>Cambourne to Cambridge – better bus journeys</i> as being inappropriate and incomplete solutions. It proposes instead a radically different scheme to deliver the primary objective of the City Deal proposal, to provide more attractive and reliable bus services along the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor.</p> <p>The City Deal options Within the City Deal proposal, we support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">☐ The intention to improve bus reliability and speed along this poorly-served transport corridor.☐ The intention to improve safety and convenience for cyclists and pedestrians.☐ The addition of a park-and-ride site to the east of Madingley Mulch roundabout. <p>However we reject the proposed options as they stand because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">☐ They destroy valuable green spaces and interrupt habitat corridors (see below for more detail). Is this what we should be doing in a city in the twenty-first century?☐ Building new road capacity of any kind generates more traffic (the Downs-Thomson Paradox). Taking buses, coaches and taxis off the main carriageway will create more capacity for cars, meaning more people will drive into Cambridge, worsening congestion and pollution in the city centre. This is true even as more people use buses: population growth in the area means that this is not a zero sum game: 4,700 new homes are planned for Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield, and 4,000 are being built in St Neots.☐ The sustainability objectives for the North West Cambridge development require a high proportion of cycling and walking. No option proposed enhances capacity, safety or convenience for cycling and walking along or across Madingley Road. Principle 10 from the Sustainability Statement is: "Create an accessible, pedestrian friendly site, with good connectivity to surrounding areas. Connect the site with existing public transport facilities and existing cycle ways and footways. Engender mode shift towards public transport, cycling and walking through measures to address security, journey time, comfort and perception." <p>We do not support widening Madingley Road east of the M11 (part of <i>Area 1 North and Central</i>) to accommodate a bus lane because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">☐ Widening Madingley Road, even to accommodate a single bus lane, will entail the permanent loss of a line of mature trees that form part of a valuable habitat corridor into the city.☐ Bus lanes do not prevent buses being delayed: every interruption to a bus lane (at a junction or owing to width constraints) can create delays at peak times. Newmarket and Trumpington Roads provide clear examples of this problem. A study by Mott MacDonald, commissioned by Liverpool City Council following its suspension of all bus lanes for nine months in 2013-14, concluded that,
-----	--

“bus lanes were generally only providing minor benefits to bus journey times, ... bus delay and unreliability was typically the result of other factors ...” Those factors include:

☐☐ negotiating the city centre;

☐☐ congestion at junctions and pinch points;

☐☐ traffic signals failing to provide enough time for buses to get through junctions;

☐☐ turning traffic blocking through movements;

☐☐ obstructive parking and loading;

☐☐ bus passengers paying with cash;

☐☐ localised congestion at school drop-off and pick-up times;

☐☐ buses pulling in at lay-by stops being unable to re-access the carriageway.

☐ The proposals indicate that there is insufficient width to provide segregated cycle lanes, the necessity of which the County Council has already recognised for Huntingdon and Hills Roads to improve real and perceived safety for cyclists and pedestrians, and therefore to “encourage less confident cyclists to start cycling within the city” (see Section 6.5.1 of the Cambridge Access Study). The Draft Interim Report states in 2.63, “It is proposed that [cycling and walking] facilities will remain largely unchanged, but the bus lane may provide an alternative option for those cyclists who choose to use the road.”

☐ The off-road alternative of the Coton cycle/footway is already at capacity and diverts cyclists through a narrow and busy pedestrian route (Burrell’s Walk, Garret Hostel Lane and Bridge, Trinity Lane and Senate House Passage).

☐ An inbound-only bus lane will do nothing to relieve congestion during the evening peak, even though this is identified in Section 6.3.1 of the Cambridge Access Study as being much more severe than during the morning peak. Do we value getting people to work on time over getting them home to their families?

☐ It will entail huge disruption to traffic and local residents for up to two years.

We do not support building a new busway through the fields north of the American Cemetery (*Area 1 North*) because:

☐ It will irreversibly damage the landscape in which the beautiful and widely appreciated American Military Cemetery is situated, breaking at least the spirit of the agreement entered into by Prime Minister Anthony Eden in 1954: “Arrangements shall be made by Her Majesty’s Government so that, during such time as the area defined in pink on the map is used as a cemetery, the area coloured yellow will be restricted to agricultural use, and the American Battle Monuments Commission will be consulted about any proposal to develop the area coloured blue.”

☐ There is significant risk of damage to Madingley Wood, an ancient woodland notified as a Site of Special Scientific Interest under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and which has significant research and educational value.

☐ Any route will have to cut through 800 Wood, planted in 2009 by the University of Cambridge as an “ecological resource for members of the University and residents of Cambridgeshire.”

☐ It provides benefit only to buses and only at peak hours.

We do not support building a new busway through the West Fields (*Area 1 South*) because:

☐ It will irreversibly damage the area known as West Fields. This includes a mosaic of valuable habitats and a number of County Wildlife Sites. Together they form a key green corridor from Coton Nature Reserve to the City (only the River Cam South and East of the City provide comparable habitat linkages). This is a vital green space providing current and future residents with a hugely valuable amenity within walking and cycling distance of the city centre.

There is no link from the busway to the M11, which implies that it will not form part of, or connect directly with, the Western Orbital bus route which is intended to provide a segregated bus link between the Biomedical Campus (Addenbrooke's, AstraZeneca et al) and the University North West Cambridge site.

The scheme envisages buses being routed from Grange Road "via West Road and Silver Street". That implies that many more buses will also be travelling down Pembroke and Downing Streets, which is frequently heavily congested with cars queuing to get into the Grand Arcade Car Park.

It is hugely expensive for a piece of infrastructure (which includes a new bridge over the M11) the benefit of which is essentially limited to peak hours.

Heavy investment in a busway would be unwise before the route of the East-West Rail link has been determined.

We note that the proposed schemes fail to deliver on objectives that we believe the City Deal should be aiming to deliver:

Improve the entire experience of bus travel.

Reduce vehicle traffic into the centre of the city.

Reduce pollution in the city.

Link up coherently with other schemes in the councils' transport strategies.

Enhance the built environment for the benefit of residents and visitors.

alternative

proposes the following measures as a realistic alternative to all six City Deal Options. In essence we believe that, rather than building new road capacity, we need to:

Make better use of existing road capacity, which is already sufficient for those vehicles, including buses, that *need* to drive into the city.

Provide attractive, comfortable and reliable public transport options for those who can use them.

Create safe (i.e. segregated wherever possible) and convenient cycle and pedestrian routes within the city and into rural transport hubs.

Please refer to the interactive map as an aid to visualising our proposal. The red line indicates the express bus route, with 'E' pins indicating stops. The pale blue line indicates a possible local bus route (at off-peak times, some local buses might continue into the city to provide a no-change service). The green line indicates new off-road cycle paths. Click on any pin or icon to see a description of what it marks.

Smart Traffic Management

Use Smart Traffic Management (STM) to regulate the flow of traffic onto the A1303:

S1. Install STM traffic lights on the A1303 (St Neots Road) 500m east of the Madingley Mulch roundabout (i.e. before Madingley Wood). Widen that section of road to include two extra eastbound lanes, one to serve as a bypass lane and one as a peak-time queuing lane.

S2. Install STM traffic lights at the Cambridge Road junction to regulate the flow of traffic from Madingley and Coton.

S3. Install STM traffic lights at the end of the M11 off-ramp at Junction 13. Widen the last 125m of the slip road to five lanes, to provide a lane for westbound traffic, a bypass lane, and three lanes for holding eastbound traffic at peak times.

Transport hubs

T1. Build a Madingley Outer park-and-ride site, accessed from the Madingley Mulch roundabout (as proposed by the City Deal).

T2. Relocate the existing Madingley park-and-ride to a site north-west of the M11 junction (13), with an entry/exit point opposite the M11 exit ramp.

T3. Build a park-and-ride site at the Girton Interchange.

T4. Create transport hub/interchanges (with facilities similar to a train station) close to A428 junctions at Cambourne, Bourn Airfield (once developed), and between Hardwick and Highfields Caldecote.

Road modifications

R1. Remodel the Girton Interchange as an all-ways junction (or at least provide connection in both directions between A428 and M11). Once completed, ban right-turns from the A1303 onto the M11 at Junction 13.

R2. Include Northampton Street in the Core Traffic Scheme, with through traffic limited to buses, cycles and permitted commercial vehicles.

Bus services

B1. Run express bus services along the following circular route in both directions: Cambourne Hub – Bourn Airfield Hub – Hardwick Hub – Girton P&R – Hauxton P&R – Cambridge South train station – Biomedical Campus (Addenbrooke's) – Cambridge Central train station – Emmanuel Rd – Chesterton Rd – Northampton St – Madingley Rd – Madingley Inner P&R – Madingley Outer P&R – Hardwick Hub – Bourn Airfield Hub – Cambourne Hub (28 miles).

B2. Run local services through the villages to take people to and from the transport hubs, where they can transfer to express services towards Cambridge or St Neots. A route serving villages south of the A428 could be: Caxton – Cambourne – Cambourne Hub – Highfields Caldecote – Toft – Hardwick – Hardwick Hub – Bourn Airfield Hub – Bourn Airfield – Bourn – Caxton (19 miles).

B3. At peak times, assign more buses to express routes and run infrequent local services. At off-peak times, run express services less frequently, releasing buses for more frequent local services.

B4. At Girton P&R, passengers can change to services to Cambridge North station and the Science Park; and to the north-west of the city via Huntingdon Road.

B5. At Hauxton P&R, passengers can change to services to London airports, and Granta Park (via A505).

Cycling and walking

C1. Provide high quality, safe cycle/footpaths connecting village transport hubs with homes, businesses and amenities in the local area.

C2. Build an off-road 2-way cycle path on the north side of Cambridge Road from the edge of Madingley village to the North-West Cambridge access road.

C3. Create a new cycle path through 800 Wood from the Madingley Mulch P&R to Cambridge Road, with a signed crossing to connect with the Madingley-Cambridge cycle path.

C4. Build a segregated eastbound cycle lane on the north side of Madingley Road from the Madingley Rd P&R entrance to Northampton Street.

C5. Build a segregated westbound cycle lane on the south side of Madingley Road from Northampton Street to High Cross. (Cyclists will need to be able to cross Madingley Road at the North-West Cambridge access road junction to reach the 2-way Madingley-Cambridge path.)

C6. Realign Coton cycle/footpath with the M11 overbridge on the east side to link with Ada Lovelace Road, and on the west side to eliminate the right-angle bends.

C7. Create a cross-country cycle way by upgrading existing bridle ways (Whitwell Way, Port Way and Harcamlow Way) and footpaths linking Coton, Hardwick, Highfields Caldecote, and Bourn. Surfaces should be all-weather (though not necessarily sealed); road crossing should be clearly visible to motorists, with appropriate traffic calming measures in place; and, where a staggered crossing is unavoidable, a segregated cycle/footway should be created alongside that section of road.

C8. Create a new cycle way between Highfields Caldecote and Cambourne via Bourn Airfield (as part

	<p>of the Bourn Airfield development).</p> <p><i>*Multi-modal: involving more than one mode of transport to complete the journey, e.g. catching one bus after another, or cycling to catch a bus, or taking a train then renting a bicycle. Most trips into London are multi-modal; indeed all trips are multi-modal if you include walking!</i></p>
099	<p>As a resident of [REDACTED] I am alarmed by the way the consultation “Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys” is conducted. The consultation documents are misleading, contradict information available on the City Council’s website and are written in a biased way to encourage responses for support of one particular option.</p> <p>Firstly, the consultation is narrow-minded. It focuses entirely on so-called “better bus journeys” without explaining what this entails. Apparently the only criterion seems to be the journey time, no consideration is given to how the busway will affect those living in the villages along the route regarding noise pollution, degradation of air quality, ecological and environmental damage, or even how people in Hardwick, Madingley, Coton, Comberton and Toft might use these buses.</p> <p>Secondly, it is unclear what we are being consulted on. Whether “busway” means a guided busway, a bus road, or a bus lane is not defined. Potential stop sites are not indicated. The lack of clarity on these fundamental issues makes it impossible for the public to respond in a well-informed way and questions the validity of the consultation process as a whole.</p> <p>Thirdly, the consultation documents are highly misleading. A very unfair comparison is made between the three route options for section 1. The route presented as having a 7 minute shorter journey time ends up at a different location requiring further travel compared to the other two. Apart from the fact that stating journey times with minute-level accuracy in the current stage of the process is bizarre, it turns out that, based on information freely available on the council website, the journey time is miscalculated and hence understated. A fair representation would be to assign journey times to a common destination for all route options to be in the 10-15 minute range. Putting one route option forward in such a favourable light can only be taken as intentional bias.</p> <p>Fourthly, one of the alleged benefits of a busway costing £ 50 million more than the others are better cycling provisions. In my opinion, the two are separate issues and should be treated as such. Improved cycle paths cannot justify the enormous extra cost of one particular busway route. For all the reasons given above I believe the consultation process to be flawed, biased, and any conclusions drawn from it will be open to serious challenge.</p>
100	<p>I am a resident of [REDACTED] and write to object in the strongest terms to the manner in which the ‘Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys’ is being conducted. The consultation documents are unclear, inaccurate and misleading written in a biased way designed to encourage people to support the Area 1 South option.</p> <p>First, it is unclear what we are being consulted on. Is this a busway, a bus road or a dedicated busway? What is the proposed route? How close does it come to our village? Does it dissect our village? Where will these buses stop and will people from Coton be able to use them? I believe failure to provide clarity on these fundamental aspects of the scheme calls into question the validity this consultation process and the public’s ability to respond.</p> <p>Second, the consultation documents are highly misleading. The argument in support of the Area 1 South route, and thus spending an extra £50 million of public money, is guaranteed quicker and more reliable journey times. Yet the information given on this is bound to mislead respondents. The consultation leaflet states that the journey time for the Area 1 South option is 7 minutes shorter than for the other options, but the comparisons are clearly unfair. The North and Central routes end at Northampton Street, while the South route ends at Grange Road, further from the city centre. For buses to negotiate West Road and Queens Road at rush hour could take most, if not all, of the 7 minute difference. In a consultation document which deliberately provides only the most approximate, ‘fuzzy’ information on route options, it is frankly absurd to provide journey times to</p>

the nearest minute. A fair document would have journey times in the range of 10-15 minutes for all three options. Promoting the South option as superior to the others on the basis of faster access to the city centre can only be taken as intentional bias.

Equally misleading is the map of Coton. Those parts of the village to the north and the east that are most affected by this scheme are completely missing. The clear impression to a reader who does not know the village is that the route would by-pass it and consequently have no local impact. It is not good enough simply to say 'the map is indicative'. Unless the City Deal team can definitively rule out the the route passing through any part of Coton, the map needs to show that the route may dissect the village, so that respondents can appreciate the potential impact.

Third, key information vital to an informed response is missing. No mention is made of the following important issues:

- The enormous ecological or environmental damage the Area 1 South would cause - the route is simply drawn through a void
- The potential visual, noise, and pollution impacts on the village of Coton
- How people living in villages along the route, including Coton, Comberton, Madingley, Toft and Hardwick, might use these buses. Do they have to drive to the Park and Ride?

Finally I believe this document has been written in a biased manner in order to justify the enormous extra cost of the Area 1 South route. Therefore, for all the reasons above I believe this process to be flawed, biased and so any conclusions drawn as a result of this process will be open to serious challenge.

100
a I am a resident of [REDACTED] and write to object in the strongest terms to the manner in which the 'Cambourne to Cambridge: Better Bus Journeys' is being conducted. The consultation documents are unclear, inaccurate and misleading written in a biased way designed to encourage people to support the Area 1 South option.

First, it is unclear what we are being consulted on. Is this a busway, a bus road or a dedicated busway? What is the proposed route? How close does it come to our village? Does it dissect our village? Where will these buses stop and will people from Coton be able to use them? I believe failure to provide clarity on these fundamental aspects of the scheme calls into question the validity this consultation process and the public's ability to respond.

Second, the consultation documents are highly misleading. The argument in support of the Area 1 South route, and thus spending an extra £50 million of public money, is guaranteed quicker and more reliable journey times. Yet the information given on this is bound to mislead respondents. The consultation leaflet states that the journey time for the Area 1 South option is 7 minutes shorter than for the other options, but the comparisons are clearly unfair. The North and Central routes end at Northampton Street, while the South route ends at Grange Road, further from the city centre. For buses to negotiate West Road and Queens Road at rush hour could take most, if not all, of the 7 minute difference. In a consultation document which deliberately provides only the most approximate, 'fuzzy' information on route options, it is frankly absurd to provide journey times to the nearest minute. A fair document would have journey times in the range of 10-15 minutes for all three options. Promoting the South option as superior to the others on the basis of faster access to the city centre can only be taken as intentional bias.

Equally misleading is the map of Coton. Those parts of the village to the north and the east that are most affected by this scheme are completely missing. The clear impression to a reader who does not know the village is that the route would by-pass it and consequently have no local impact. It is not good enough simply to say 'the map is indicative'. Unless the City Deal team can definitively rule out the the route passing through any part of Coton, the map needs to show that the route may

	<p>dissect the village, so that respondents can appreciate the potential impact.</p> <p>Third, key information vital to an informed response is missing. No mention is made of the following important issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The enormous ecological or environmental damage the Area 1 South would cause - the route is simply drawn through a void • The potential visual, noise, and pollution impacts on the village of Coton • How people living in villages along the route, including Coton, Comberton, Madingley, Toft and Hardwick, might use these buses. Do they have to drive to the Park and Ride? <p>Finally I believe this document has been written in a biased manner in order to justify the enormous extra cost of the Area 1 South route. Therefore, for all the reasons above I believe this process to be flawed, biased and so any conclusions drawn as a result of this process will be open to serious challenge.</p>
100 b	<p>I am a resident of [REDACTED] and write in connection with the above. I have examined the plans and know the area well and often walk along the West Fields. I strongly wish to object to the potential new bus road over the West Fields (Option Area 1 South).</p> <p>This green corridor of land between Coton and King's College Chapel has a huge value in terms of local landscape, amenity and biodiversity. In fact, it is one the last few pieces of land near Cambridge which is not an agricultural, faceless stretch of land. A new road dissecting the West Fields will devastate this part of the green belt, and we would lose forever an irreplaceable and unique aspect of the special character of Cambridge.</p> <p>The High Court in 2008 confirmed the importance of the West Fields when ruling that: 'the relationship between the historic centre and the countryside in this location is critical to the character of Cambridge.'</p> <p>I would ask you to please ensure that Option Area 1 South is firmly rejected, so that we can preserve this crucial aspect of the unique character of Cambridge for the future. Can you also ensure that considerations of ecology and heritage form part of the consultation process and that more weight is given to the impact on those most affected, not least West Cambridge and Coton residents.</p>
101	<p>[REDACTED] works for better, safer and more cycling in and around Cambridge and has nearly 1200 paid members. We scrutinise planning applications and proposals to assess whether they will facilitate safer cycling and encourage more people to cycle. Our response is limited to the effect of the City Deal proposals on cycling, as the remit of the charity.</p> <p>[REDACTED] objects to options Area 1 North and Area 1 Central. The addition of a bus lane in the limited space of Madingley Road rules out much-needed improvements for walking and cycling east of the M11. The NorthWest Cambridge site will add 3000 new houses and 2000 postgrad dwellings, and the West Cambridge site intensification will increase the amount of commuting in the area. The existing walking and cycling conditions are poor shared-use facilities which will cause conflict and discourage active travel under increased pressure.</p> <p>We have no objection to Area 1 South on the basis of cycling facilities.</p> <p>Whichever Area 2 proposal is pursued, the scheme should provide off-road cycle provision not only for Cambourne and Bourne, but also Highfields Caldecote, Hardwick, Comberton and other nearby villages. A safe cycle route, that can be used in volume by all ages, would connect these villages to each other as well as to Cambridge, something already enjoyed by many other villages in South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>The walking and cycling route into central Cambridge from the West Cambridge site also need improvements at Coton and close to the city centre if it is to carry not only more journeys from the</p>

edge of Cambridge, but from the villages beyond as well.

More generally, we would like to see options explored to reduce congestion city-wide. A whole-city approach would make single corridor measures for buses unnecessary.

Madingley Road: M11 to Cambridge

The existing cycle facilities on Madingley Road are shared with pedestrians.

Shared-use facilities on busy urban routes are disliked by pedestrians and people on bikes alike, as being a cause for conflict and a disincentive to walk or cycle. Cycling on pavements is reasonably criticised by pedestrians, and yet we frequently legitimise exactly this activity by putting a sign on an existing pavement. Walking and cycling routes should be separate, and separate cycle routes should be safe and suitable for everyone from parents with children to long-distance commuters.

A new bus lane would rule out the possibility of improving these conditions for walking and cycling.

Madingley Road is already very busy between Storey's Way and Lady Margaret Road. The new journeys generated by the Northwest Cambridge and West Cambridge developments will make this worse between the whole M11 to city centre part of Madingley Road. Cambridge would long ago have run out of capacity for additional travel if it had not been for the large number of local journeys undertaken by foot and cycle, which use much less space on the roads per person in the tight city streets.

Madingley Road needs dedicated cycling infrastructure, separating people on bikes from both pedestrians and motor traffic. In particular, junctions should separate the movements of people on bikes from motor traffic, as most collisions occur at junctions.

The Atkins Draft Interim Report suggests that a new bus lane on Madingley Road could be used by people cycling. This is completely unacceptable, especially in the city with the highest levels of cycling in the country. Few people are happy cycling in front of several tonnes of bus. New arrivals to Northwest Cambridge are unlikely to be persuaded to abandon the car and take up cycling under such conditions. Additionally, cycling in bus lanes holds up buses, reducing the effectiveness of bus priority measures.

Cambourne to Cambridge Cycle Routes

Current levels of cycling from Cambourne are low compared with other South Cambridgeshire districts of similar or greater distance from Cambridge. South Cambridgeshire as a whole has among the highest levels of cycling in the country, despite its status as a non-urban area. But with limited off-road cycle routes, very few of those journeys are from Cambourne, where few will dare to make the journey by bike on the road.

Recently published research on the Guided Busway walking and cycling track shows increased active travel and decreased car use when good provision is made.

A safe cycling route between the villages is not just about commuting to Cambridge. It will allow more people to cycle to local schools and shops. It allows community groups to meet without needing to drive. It allows children to safely visit friends without being reliant on parents for lifts. A safe cycling route along this corridor would enhance the community as well as improving links to the city.

To connect the villages we suggest surfacing the existing bridleways and routes known as Port Way / Whitwell Way. This would provide a direct link between villages in all weathers, without interaction with motor traffic. Surfacing these routes would also open up countryside access and local travel to people who cannot currently use them: for example those with prams or wheelchairs. Routes should be wide enough to avoid conflict between users at busy times.

Better facilities are also required along the St Neots Road and Madingley Road west of the M11.

This is the most direct route from Cambourne to Cambridge, and also takes in the villages of Hardwick and Highfields, and the northern end of Bourn airfields. The existing path is barely wide enough for two people cycling, or a pedestrian and a person on a bike, to pass each other. This is not for lack of space, but because surfacing does not go to the edges of the path. This road-adjacent path only exists between Hardwick and Cambridge: further west the off-road option is replaced with on-road advisory cycle lanes in a 40mph zone. A collision with a person on a bicycle at this speed would almost certainly be fatal to the cyclist. Further west still, the cycle lanes disappear

	<p>completely.</p> <p>Where there is a cycle path next to the road, side-road junctions are generally poor. Along this kind of fast route, crossings need to have good visibility and be set back from the road, so that turning intentions are clear and slow.</p> <p>We are open to other suggestions on how to achieve the goal of cycle connectivity. The principle should be: a route which is smooth, that can be safely used by people of all ages and abilities simultaneously, avoiding detours which will reduce use.</p> <p>Coton Path Connections</p> <p>The current walking and cycling route between Coton and Cambridge city centre is facing capacity problems.</p> <p>The section from the West Cambridge site to Adams Road is some of the best in the city: it is wide, direct, off-road and separates walking and cycling. Any changes to the area should not make this excellent and well-used route worse.</p> <p>However, the connections at both ends are of much lower quality. From Coton to West Cambridge the route is a narrow path shared with pedestrians, with blind right-angled bends. To deliver a route from the villages through to Cambridge this section will need to be upgraded with a wider surfaced path, and straightened route over the M11 with good visibility. This could connect with the new, wide route through the West Cambridge site, rather than skirting the fields as it does at the moment.</p> <p>The route from Adams Road past the University Library and along Burrell’s Walk and Garret Hostel Lane is extremely busy and shared with pedestrians. The section towards the city centre is popular with tourists due to the views of the river, an unhappy situation when the county council cycling counters indicate this is one of the busiest routes for cycling in the city. Additional journeys from inside and outside Cambridge need an alternative route, as existing historical buildings make widening this route impossible.</p> <p>The existing route pushes users through the busiest area of the city centre, even if their final destination is on the other side of the centre.</p> <p>The Coton path should not be considered as an alternative to providing high quality cycling provision on Madingley Road. The Coton path does not serve journeys to and from the north and east of the city as Madingley Road does.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ We are against Area 1 North and Central options on the basis of ruling out necessary walking and cycling improvements on Madingley Road east of the M11. ☑ New cycling routes to the west of Cambridge will encourage more active travel to replace car travel, as has been successfully demonstrated along the Guided Busway to the north of the city. One off-road route adjacent to the existing St Neots road would provide a direct long-distance option, while another directly connecting villages would encourage local travel by foot and bike, as well as providing a traffic-free option into Cambridge. <p>New routes for cycling between Coton and central Cambridge are needed to support increased travel from West Cambridge and the villages beyond.</p>
102	<p>Madingley Road – Western Orbital - Adams Road: Problems for Cyclists</p> <p>Recent discussions regarding possible Cambourne-Cambridge Bus Routes and the use of the proposed Western Orbital Route have led to suggestions, from for example Cambridge PPF, that some traffic could be diverted from Madingley Road to Grange Road via Adams Road. We are <u>not</u> residents of Adams Road but we do live and cycle locally. We believe that Adams Road should <u>not</u> be used as part of a bus route, primarily because of the numbers, safety and partial irresponsibility of cyclists in the area.</p> <p><u>Reasons For Not Using Adams Road For Buses</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adams Road is part of the main cycle route for the ever increasing number of cyclists

between the University's West Cambridge Site and the City Centre. The volume of cycle traffic will become further enhanced with the development of the North-West Cambridge Site.

2. Grange Road is not of uniform width. The stretch between Adams Road and West Road contains the narrowest section of Grange Road, where there are no cycle paths and a sudden narrowing on the West side of the road. Two cars find it difficult to pass there if there is even one cyclist on that stretch of Grange Road. In part because of that problem, several years ago a traffic management proposal to encourage student cyclists to go into town from Adams Road via Grange Road and West Road was scrapped because of the obvious danger to cyclists.
3. The Adams Road/Grange Road traffic lights are by no means unproblematic, primarily because of the irresponsibility of a minority of cyclists. The red lights are not well observed by some cyclists on both sides of Grange Road who ignore them either to turn left or go straight ahead.
4. The left turn into West Road from Grange Road is problematic for buses. They can only get into West Road by driving well into the far/south lane on West Road. If cars are waiting to exit on to Grange Road, buses have to wait until the cars succeed in exiting. Sometimes, to prevent a jam, cars on the south side of West Road have to reverse to allow a bus to enter West Road.

Alternatives to Adams Road

Particularly because of issues relating to cyclists, we think there are better alternatives than using Adams Road to get from Madingley Road to West Road via the Western Orbital Route. These would involve, just before Adams Road, the bus route from the West turning South towards the Cambridge University Rugby Ground or Cranmer Road. In declining order of desirability, in our opinion, they include:

- A. The submission by the Madingley Road Group to the Cambourne to Cambridge Consultation claims that a route for buses on to Grange Road could be created between the South side of the University's Rugby Ground and Selwyn College's Cripps Court. Such an access on to Grange Road would be below the dangerously narrow stretch of Grange Road and virtually opposite West Road, thus dealing with all four problems listed above.
- B. If A. is not feasible for any reason, buses could join Grange Road via the relatively unused Cranmer Road, which is currently a cul-de-sac for motor traffic. That exit would be well clear of the narrowest part of Grange Road and would deal with problems 1-3 above, but not 4.
- C. When the scheme to direct cyclists from the West Cambridge Site to the City Centre via Adams/Grange/West Roads was abandoned, there was talk of an alternative cycle route to emerge on to Grange Road from the lane on the North side of the CU Rugby Ground, but nothing more has been heard of that scheme. The end point of such a scheme is not particularly satisfactory since it is immediately adjacent to the sudden narrowing of Grange Road which produces the problematic stretch regarding safety of cyclists. It would however deal with points 1 and 3 above.

- 103 **RE: Consultation Response to Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys**
We write on behalf of [REDACTED] in response to the publication of the draft options for public transport priority on the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor. [REDACTED] is promoting growth on the Cambridge Fringe through the Local Plan process.
- Background**
The need to improve public transport connectivity to the west of Cambridge is evident from the high levels of private car use by Cambourne residents which arises in part from the failure of previous public transport provision in the A428 Corridor to attract and sustain viable patronage levels, allied with the dispersed trip patterns of Cambourne residents and employees. The draft Local Plan submissions identifies significant development growth in the Cambourne corridor, but it is clear that further growth in this corridor should not be contemplated until the existing recent

development (e.g. Cambourne) has been shown to be sustainable. [REDACTED] have consistently presented evidence which demonstrates this is an inappropriate spatial strategy, given the potential for more sustainable fringe development locations. The current consultation on bus priority offers options to deal with existing congestion, which are necessary, but as a consequence does not maximise the potential for public transport investment to support sustainable future growth across the City.

- 104 **City Deal Public Consultation Response - Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus A428/A1303 Improvements**
- Set out below are the proposals from [REDACTED] for improvements to the Cambourne to Cambridge bus journey. These should be read in combination with the comments in the letter to which this response is attached. The letter presents our concerns with the approach adopted by the City Deal Executive Board to the City-wide problem of traffic congestion whilst this response focuses on the specifics of the A428/A1303 Corridor. We present a package of measures to relieve congestion along this corridor, including our preferred bus route in response to the narrow focus of the consultation brief.
- [REDACTED] proposes a package of measures that collectively will relieve congestion on the A428/A1303 Corridor comprising:
1. A Congestion Charge to be paid by drivers who wish to use their cars, including journeys both within the city and into the city, which subsidises a reliable public transport alternative
PLUS
 2. A re-design of the Girton interchange so that vehicles on the A428 can access the M11 both Northwards and southwards without the need to use the A1303
PLUS
 3. A major new Park & Ride at the Madingley Mulch Roundabout (MMR) the exact location to be determined through consideration of landscape and ease of access considerations with free car parking and a rapid, reliable and cheap bus service into the city
PLUS
 4. The Area 2 Central option serving the proposed development at Bourn Airfield and other villages with the route along the existing but under-used old St Neots Road at minimal cost
PLUS
 5. The Area 1 Central option with a single-lane bus-lane along the A1303 using J13 over the M11 but with a tidal flow allowing buses rapid access into the city in the morning and out again in the evening
 6. A new high quality cross-country cycleway from the new P&R linking up with the existing Coton cycle path and bridge over the M11 into western Cambridge.
- Congestion Charge:**
1. A congestion charge, coupled with a fast, reliable and cheap P&R bus service subsidised by the charge, would probably render all other options for relief of the A428 Corridor redundant. The money could be re-used for other projects with greater social and economic benefits.
 2. [REDACTED] believes that the traffic problem along the A428/A1303 Corridor must be addressed in the context of a traffic management plan for the City and the Greater Cambridge Area as a whole. Addressing this specific bottleneck in isolation when it is just one of many traffic pinch-points, is not intelligent planning.
 3. At the City-wide level, [REDACTED] believes that the traffic congestion can be resolved only if the fundamental imbalance between demand and capacity is addressed - demand by drivers to use the roads and the capacity of the road network to absorb that demand. The City Deal approach is to increase capacity through civil engineering – more busways, bus lanes, dual carriageways, junction upgrades, revamped intersections etc. [REDACTED] belief is that demand reduction must form part of any balanced package, and this can best be delivered through some form of Congestion Charge.
 4. The income from the charge must be ring-fenced to provide a long-term sustainable source of funding to subsidise public transport throughout the whole Greater Cambridge area. The Congestion Charge should be combined with an Emission Charge so that larger more polluting