



**GREATER
CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP**

Cambourne to Cambridge

**Better Public Transport
and Active Travel**

Appendix F Full Theme Table



Q2. Do you have any comments on the proposed Active Travel route for cyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
Support for the scheme	63	8%
Alternative suggestions	61	7%
Opposition towards the scheme	46	6%
Support for active travel investment	46	6%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	34	4%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	33	4%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	33	4%
Questions, more information or more data required	31	4%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	31	4%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	29	4%
No demand, no need for active travel	27	3%
No comment/ N/a	26	3%
The scheme is a waste of money	23	3%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	21	3%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	19	2%
The scheme focuses too much on active travel	15	2%
Concerns with future traffic and congestion	15	2%
The need to retain existing green spaces	13	2%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	12	1%
The scheme is too expensive	12	1%
The need for segregation between buses and cyclists / pedestrians	12	1%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	12	1%
No congestion observed on roads currently	11	1%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	11	1%
The need for segregation between vehicles and equestrians	10	1%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	9	1%
Hardwick - Concerns with traffic, congestion, and rat-run	9	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	8	1%



The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	8	1%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	8	1%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	8	1%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	6	1%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	5	1%
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	5	1%
Concerns with closing roads to traffic	5	1%
Negative impact on old people	5	1%
Proposal for the active travel path is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	4	0.5%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	4	0.5%
Comments about the positioning of solar studs	4	0.5%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	4	0.5%
Proposals do not offer enough provision for equestrians	4	0.5%
Hardwick - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots/ A428)	4	0.5%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	4	0.5%
Support for the design	3	0.4%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	3	0.4%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	3	0.4%
Comments about flooding and water management	3	0.4%
Support for the addition of solar studs	3	0.4%
Proposals offer good provisions for equestrians	3	0.4%
Hardwick - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution, as well as loss of trees)	3	0.4%
Hardwick - Comments about the active travel provisions and the on-road cycling provisions	3	0.4%
Scheme is needed or there is demand for scheme	2	0.2%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	2	0.2%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	2	0.2%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	2	0.2%
Connections to other travel modes should be safe and easily accessible	2	0.2%
Negative impact on non-drivers	2	0.2%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Retaining or not impacting on existing routes for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	2	0.2%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Concerns with traffic, number of HGVs and rat-run	2	0.2%
Scotland Road - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Dry Drayton residents)	2	0.2%

West Cambridge to Grange Road - Concerns with traffic and congestion	2	0.2%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	1	0.1%
Scheme is an environmental improvement	1	0.1%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	1	0.1%
More bus stops needed (general)	1	0.1%
The need to plan for appropriate parking to ensure impact on villages, houses and residents is minimal	1	0.1%
Concerns with current speeds	1	0.1%
Suggestions for speed limit enforcements (present situation)	1	0.1%
Suggestions for speed limit enforcements (future situation)	1	0.1%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	1	0.1%
Using the bus is too expensive	1	0.1%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Comments about using the existing route	1	0.1%
Bourn Airfield - Location of bus stops should consider the new development and the proximity to houses and users	1	0.1%
Childerley Lodge area -The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents and access (especially Highfields Caldecote residents)	1	0.1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for addition of a cycle path and footpath and implementing better links to cycle paths and footpaths	1	0.1%
Scotland Road - Wrong location for those it should serve	1	0.1%
Scotland Road - Consideration of speed restrictions	1	0.1%
Scotland Road - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution)	1	0.1%
Hardwick - Support for this section	1	0.1%
Hardwick - Support for the bus gate	1	0.1%
Hardwick - Parking should be maintained as it is required	1	0.1%
Hardwick - The bus gate and restricting car access will result in loss or reduction of access to services and long detours for residents	1	0.1%
M11 through West Cambridge - Support for this section	1	0.1%
M11 through West Cambridge - The need for segregation between cyclists and pedestrians	1	0.1%
West of Cambridge to Grange Road - Safety concerns	1	0.1%
Junction with Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	1	0.1%
Total number of coded comments 819		
Respondents 425		



Q3. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED FACILITIES OF THE BUS STOPS ALONG THE ROUTE?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	76	16%
The need for bicycle parking and lockers	32	7%
Support for the scheme	31	7%
Consider passenger safety (including appropriate lighting, levels of crime)	21	4%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	19	4%
Suggestions regarding the bus stop design (having off road bus stops, floating bus stops, incorporating sustainable features, ticket sales, zebra crossings in proximity, natural materials)	19	4%
The need to plan for appropriate parking to ensure impact on villages, houses and residents is minimal	18	4%
The need for sheltered stops	17	4%
The need for real time information	15	3%
Concerns with future traffic and congestion	15	3%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	14	3%
Alternative suggestions	14	3%
Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	13	3%
More information required or questions relating the bus stop facilities	11	2%
The scheme is a waste of money	9	2%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	9	2%
Opposition towards the scheme	8	2%
Concern about vandalism in relation to the bus stop facilities	8	2%
The need to provide waste/ litter bins	8	2%
North of Coton - Comments about the location of bus stops and addition of bus stops	7	1%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	6	1%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	6	1%
More bus stops needed (general)	5	1%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	5	1%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	4	1%
Integrating solar or sustainable energy in the plans for the bus stop facilities	4	1%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	4	1%
Negative impact on old people	4	1%
Using the bus is too expensive	4	1%
Scheme is needed or there is demand for scheme	3	1%

Questions, more information or more data required	3	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	3	1%
Broadway to Sterling Way - More bus stops needed	3	1%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	3	1%
Hardwick - Parking should be maintained as it is required	3	1%
North of Coton - Oppose measures	3	1%
North of Coton - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Coton residents)	3	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	2	0.4%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	2	0.4%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	2	0.4%
Proposals should consider connection to other active travel routes	2	0.4%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	2	0.4%
Negative impact on non-drivers	2	0.4%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	2	0.4%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	2	0.4%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	1	0.2%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	1	0.2%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	1	0.2%
Travel Hub is not needed	1	0.2%
Travel Hub will need electric vehicle charging	1	0.2%
Travel Hub is not accessible	1	0.2%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	1	0.2%
Construction concerns (general)	1	0.2%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	1	0.2%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	1	0.2%
Positive impacts on old people	1	0.2%
Positive impacts on people with limited mobility	1	0.2%
Bourn Airfield - Opposition for the section	1	0.2%
Bourn Airfield - More bus stops needed	1	0.2%
Bourn Airfield - Location of bus stops should consider the new development and the proximity to houses and users	1	0.2%
Childerley Lodge area - More bus stops needed	1	0.2%



Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Scotland Road - Support for this section	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots/ A428)	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Comments about the active travel provisions and the on-road cycling provisions	1	0.2%
North of Coton - Comments about the active travel provision	1	0.2%
North of Coton - Support for the bus stop	1	0.2%
Junction with Grange Road - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Total of coded comments 470		
Respondents 330		

Q4. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON PROPOSED BUS STOP LOCATIONS?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	74	14%
Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	40	8%
Alternative suggestions	34	6%
Support for the scheme	30	6%
More bus stops needed (general)	28	5%
The need to plan for appropriate parking to ensure impact on villages, houses and residents is minimal	26	5%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	21	4%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	19	4%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	15	3%
Questions, more information or more data required	15	3%
Broadway to Sterling Way - More bus stops needed	14	3%
Opposition towards the scheme	13	2%
Negative impact on old people	12	2%
Concerns with future traffic and congestion	11	2%
Negative impact on non-drivers	10	2%
North of Coton - Comments about the location of bus stops and addition of bus stops	10	2%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	9	2%
Bourn Airfield - More bus stops needed	9	2%
North of Coton - Against the bus stop	8	2%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	7	1%

West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	7	1%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	6	1%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	6	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	6	1%
Bourn Airfield - Location of bus stops should consider the new development and the proximity to houses and users	6	1%
Hardwick - Preference for Option 2	6	1%
North of Coton - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Coton residents)	6	1%
The scheme is a waste of money	5	1%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	5	1%
Hardwick - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots/ A428)	5	1%
North of Coton - Oppose measures	5	1%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	4	1%
Hardwick - Preference for Option 1	4	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	3	1%
The need to retain existing green spaces	3	1%
More information required or questions relating the bus stop facilities	3	1%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	3	1%
Hardwick - Support for the section	3	1%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	3	1%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	2	0.4%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	2	0.4%
The scheme is too expensive	2	0.4%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	2	0.4%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	2	0.4%
Missed connections (multi-modal or existing bus)	2	0.4%
Connections to other travel modes should be safe and easily accessible	2	0.4%
No congestion observed on roads currently	2	0.4%
Bourn Airfield - Support for this section	2	0.4%
North of Coton - Support measures	2	0.4%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	1	0.2%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	1	0.2%



Travel Hub is not needed	1	0.2%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	1	0.2%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	1	0.2%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	1	0.2%
The need for sheltered stops	1	0.2%
Consider passenger safety (including appropriate lighting, levels of crime)	1	0.2%
Suggestions regarding the bus stop design (having off road bus stops)	1	0.2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Support or need for this section	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Comments about the active travel provisions and the on-road cycling provisions	1	0.2%
Hardwick - The bus gate and restricting car access will result in loss or reduction of access to services and long detours for residents	1	0.2%
North of Coton - Comments about the active travel provision	1	0.2%
M11 through West Cambridge - Busway should use Madingley Road (less environmental impact, better option)	1	0.2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Environmental concerns	1	0.2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Concerns with traffic and congestion	1	0.2%
Total number of coded comments 531		
Respondents 361		

Q6. DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE TRAVEL HUB?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
Alternative suggestions	57	11%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	53	10%
No comment/ N/a	49	9%
Opposition towards the scheme	33	6%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	31	6%
Support for the scheme	21	4%
Travel hub is not needed	18	3%
Concerns with future traffic and congestion	18	3%
Questions, more information or more data required	16	3%
Travel Hub will need electric vehicle charging	14	3%
Parking provided will encourage too many cars to the area	14	3%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	12	2%
The scheme is a waste of money	12	2%

Travel Hub is not accessible	11	2%
Travel Hub will need security	10	2%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	9	2%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	9	2%
Travel Hub should incorporate sustainable features (e.g., solar)	8	2%
The need to retain existing green spaces	8	2%
Travel hub is needed	7	1%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	6	1%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	6	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	5	1%
The scheme is too expensive	5	1%
Hardwick - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution, as well as loss of trees)	5	1%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	5	1%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	5	1%
Construction concerns - general	4	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	4	1%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	4	1%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	4	1%
Support for active travel investment	3	1%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	3	1%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Wrong location for those it should serve	3	1%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Needs to consider connectivity / direct connections	3	1%
Scotland Road - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution)	3	1%
Travel Hub will need food options	2	0.4%
The parking provided will not be sufficient for the scheme	2	0.4%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	2	0.4%
No congestion observed on roads currently	2	0.4%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Needs to be safe (including appropriate lighting)	2	0.4%
Scotland Road - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Dry Drayton residents)	2	0.4%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	2	0.4%
Hardwick - Concerns with traffic, congestion, and rat-run	2	0.4%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	1	0.2%



Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	1	0.2%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on environment (air and noise pollution)	1	0.2%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.2%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	1	0.2%
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	1	0.2%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	1	0.2%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	1	0.2%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	1	0.2%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	1	0.2%
The need for bicycle parking and lockers	1	0.2%
The need for real time information	1	0.2%
Concern about vandalism in relation to the bus stop facilities	1	0.2%
Consider passenger safety (including appropriate lighting, levels of crime)	1	0.2%
Proposals should consider connection to other active travel routes	1	0.2%
Concerns with closing roads to traffic	1	0.2%
Negative impact on old people	1	0.2%
Negative impact on non-drivers	1	0.2%
Positive impacts on people with limited mobility	1	0.2%
Using the bus is too expensive	1	0.2%
Bourn Airfield - Comments about using the existing route (along A428)	1	0.2%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Concerns with traffic, number of HGVs and rat-run	1	0.2%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Traffic has improved based on the works	1	0.2%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Safety concerns	1	0.2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Support or need for this section	1	0.2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Maintain hedge rows and drainage	1	0.2%
Scotland Road - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Scotland Road - Consideration of speed restrictions	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Support or need for this section	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Comments about the active travel provisions and the on-road cycling provisions	1	0.2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	1	0.2%
Total of coded comments 527		

Respondents 326

Q7. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THE CONSTRUCTION APPROACH INCLUDING PROPOSED LOCATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION COMPOUNDS?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	66	13%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on environment (air and noise pollution)	53	11%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on traffic and delays	38	8%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	32	6%
Construction concerns - general	31	6%
The need to retain existing green spaces	23	5%
Construction concerns regarding the impacts on buildings, homes, structures, and residents	23	5%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	22	4%
Opposition towards the scheme	20	4%
Alternative suggestions	18	4%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	13	3%
Support for the scheme	10	2%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	10	2%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	10	2%
Questions, more information or more data required	9	2%
The scheme is a waste of money	9	2%
Construction concerns regarding timings of works and working hours	9	2%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	8	2%
North of Coton - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Coton residents)	8	2%
The scheme is too expensive	7	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	7	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	6	1%
Construction concerns regarding tourism and business	5	1%
Hardwick - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution, as well as loss of trees)	5	1%
Support for active travel investment	4	1%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	3	1%

Comments about flooding and water management	3	1%
Negative impact on old people	3	1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	3	1%
North of Coton - Busway should use Madingley Road (less environmental impact, better option)	3	1%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Environmental concerns	3	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	2	0.4%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	2	0.4%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	2	0.4%
Concerns with closing roads to traffic	2	0.4%
Negative impact on non-drivers	2	0.4%
Bourn Airfield - Comments about using the existing route (along A428)	2	0.4%
Hardwick - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots/ A428)	2	0.4%
North of Coton - Concerns with existing fauna and flora, existing wildlife habitats and a preference for natural landscapes are better	2	0.4%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	1	0.2%
Support for the design	1	0.2%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	1	0.2%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	1	0.2%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	1	0.2%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	1	0.2%
Proposal for the active travel path is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	1	0.2%
Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	1	0.2%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	1	0.2%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	1	0.2%
No congestion observed on roads currently	1	0.2%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	1	0.2%
Using the bus is too expensive	1	0.2%
Negative impact on mental and physical health	1	0.2%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Speed limits are not respected	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	1	0.2%
North of Coton - Oppose measures	1	0.2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	1	0.2%
Total number of coded comments 499		

Respondents 279

Q8. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE ROUTE FROM BROADWAY TO STERLING WAY?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	105	33%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Support or need for this section	20	6%
Alternative suggestions	17	5%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Concerns about cars parked on road, congestion, and traffic	16	5%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Retaining and not impacting on existing routes for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	15	5%
Broadway to Sterling Way - More bus stops needed	14	4%
Questions, more information or more data required	8	2%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Opposition or no need for this section	8	2%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Comments about using the existing route	8	2%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	7	2%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	7	2%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	7	2%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	6	2%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	5	2%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	4	1%
The need to retain existing green spaces	4	1%
Construction concerns regarding the impacts on buildings, homes, structures, and residents	4	1%
The need for segregation between buses and cyclists / pedestrians	4	1%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	4	1%
The scheme is a waste of money	3	1%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on environment (air and noise pollution)	3	1%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	3	1%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	3	1%
The need to plan for appropriate parking to ensure impact on villages, houses and residents is minimal	3	1%
Concerns with future traffic and congestion	3	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	2	1%



Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	2	1%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	2	1%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	2	1%
Construction concerns - general	2	1%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	2	1%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	2	1%
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	2	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	2	1%
More bus stops needed (general)	2	1%
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	2	1%
No congestion observed on roads currently	2	1%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	2	1%
Opposition towards the scheme	1	0.3%
Scheme is too expensive	1	0.3%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on traffic and delays	1	0.3%
The need for segregation between vehicles and equestrians	1	0.3%
Support for active travel investment	1	0.3%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	1	0.3%
Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	1	0.3%
Consider passenger safety (including appropriate lighting, levels of crime)	1	0.3%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	1	0.3%
Missed connections (multi-modal or existing bus)	1	0.3%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	1	0.3%
Negative impact on non-drivers	1	0.3%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.3%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	1	0.3%
Total of coded comments 321		
Respondents 230		

Q9. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE ROUTE THROUGH BOURN AIRFIELD?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	99	36%
Bourn Airfield - Location of bus stops should consider the new development and the proximity to houses and users	25	9%
Bourn Airfield - Support or need for this section	14	5%
Bourn Airfield - Opposition or no need for this section	12	4%
Alternative suggestions	11	4%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	8	3%
Bourn Airfield - Comments about the EWR/ rail would be better	8	3%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	6	2%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	6	2%
Questions, more information or more data required	5	2%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	5	2%
Negative impact on non-drivers	5	2%
Bourn Airfield - Concerns with traffic, congestion, and rat-run	5	2%
Support for the scheme	4	1%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	4	1%
Bourn Airfield - Comments about using the existing route (along A428)	4	1%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	3	1%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	3	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	3	1%
The scheme is a waste of money	3	1%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	3	1%
Opposition towards the scheme	2	1%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	2	1%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	2	1%
The need to retain existing green spaces	2	1%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	2	1%
No congestion observed on roads currently	2	1%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	2	1%
Bourn Airfield - More bus stops needed	2	1%
Bourn Airfield - Retaining and not impacting on existing routes for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	2	1%



Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	2	1%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	1	0.4%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	1	0.4%
The scheme is too expensive	1	0.4%
Travel hub is needed	1	0.4%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	1	0.4%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.4%
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	1	0.4%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	1	0.4%
Support for active travel investment	1	0.4%
Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	1	0.4%
The need to plan for appropriate parking to ensure impact on villages, houses and residents is minimal	1	0.4%
More information required or questions relating the bus stop facilities	1	0.4%
Broadway to Sterling Way - More bus stops needed	1	0.4%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.4%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.4%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	1	0.4%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	1	0.4%
Total number of coded comments 273		
Respondents 223		

Q10. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE ROUTE THROUGH THE CHILDERLEY LODGE AREA?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	92	26%
Alternative suggestions	20	6%
Childerley Lodge area - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots)	20	6%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	15	4%
Childerley Lodge area - Opposition or no need for this section	15	4%
Childerley Lodge area - Environmental concerns	15	4%
Childerley Lodge area - Comments about the active travel path	15	4%
Childerley Lodge area - Support or need for this section	10	3%
Childerley Lodge area -The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents and access (especially Highfields Caldecote residents)	10	3%

No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	9	3%
The need to retain existing green spaces	9	3%
Questions, more information or more data required	8	2%
No congestion observed on roads currently	8	2%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	8	2%
Childerley Lodge area - More bus stops needed	6	2%
The scheme is a waste of money	5	1%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	5	1%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	5	1%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	4	1%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	4	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	4	1%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	4	1%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	4	1%
Childerley Lodge area - Comments about EWR	4	1%
Childerley Lodge area - Concerns with traffic and congestion	4	1%
Opposition towards the scheme	3	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	3	1%
Comments about flooding and water management	3	1%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	3	1%
Support for active travel investment	3	1%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	3	1%
Bourn Airfield - Location of bus stops should consider the new development and the proximity to houses and users	3	1%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	3	1%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	2	1%
The scheme is too expensive	2	1%
The need for segregation between buses and cyclists / pedestrians	2	1%
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	2	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	2	1%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	1	0.3%
Construction concerns - general	1	0.3%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	1	0.3%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	1	0.3%



Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	1	0.3%
The need for sheltered stops	1	0.3%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	1	0.3%
Negative impact on non-drivers	1	0.3%
Bourn Airfield - More bus stops needed	1	0.3%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.3%
Scotland Road - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.3%
Hardwick - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots/ A428)	1	0.3%
Total of coded comments 349		
Respondents 230		

Q12. NOW THE A14 WORKS ARE SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE, ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC PROBLEMS RELATING TO THROUGH TRAFFIC FROM THE A14 IN DRY DRAYTON?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	56	22%
No congestion observed on roads currently	49	19%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Concerns with traffic, number of HGVs and rat-run	36	14%
Alternative suggestions	19	7%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Speed limits are not respected	13	5%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	10	4%
A14 in Dry Drayton - The current road surface is poor/needs repair	9	3%
Opposition towards the scheme	8	3%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for addition of a cycle path and footpath and implementing better links to cycle paths and footpaths	7	3%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Traffic has improved based on the works	5	2%
Parking provided will encourage too many cars to the area	4	2%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	4	2%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Safety concerns	4	2%
Support for the scheme	3	1%
Questions, more information or more data required	3	1%
The scheme is a waste of money	3	1%
Future road speed should be enforced	3	1%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Opposition or no need for this section	3	1%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	2	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	2	1%

Scotland Road - Consideration of speed restrictions	2	1%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	1	0.4%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	1	0.4%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	1	0.4%
The scheme is too expensive	1	0.4%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	1	0.4%
Support for active travel investment	1	0.4%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	1	0.4%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	1	0.4%
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	1	0.4%
Concerns with current speeds	1	0.4%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.4%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Needs to consider connectivity / direct connections	1	0.4%
Scotland Road - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution)	1	0.4%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.4%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	1	0.4%
Total number of coded comments 260		
Respondents 200		

Q14. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS FOR AN ACTIVE TRAVEL PATH BETWEEN THE TRAVEL HUB AND DRY DRAYTON?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	68	23%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Support or need for this section	22	7%
Alternative suggestions	17	6%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Needs to consider connectivity / direct connections	11	4%
Support for active travel investment	10	3%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Needs to be safe (including appropriate lighting)	10	3%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	9	3%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Opposition or no need for this section	9	3%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Wrong location for those it should serve	9	3%
Questions, more information or more data required	8	3%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for addition of a cycle path and footpath and implementing better links to cycle paths and footpaths	8	3%
Support for the scheme	6	2%



Opposition towards the scheme	6	2%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	6	2%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	6	2%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	6	2%
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	6	2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	6	2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Maintain hedge rows and drainage	6	2%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Concerns about the active travel path not being used/ Suggestions for enforcing the use of the active travel path	6	2%
The need to retain existing green spaces	4	1%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	4	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	4	1%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	4	1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Speed limits are not respected	4	1%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - The need for segregation between buses and cyclists	4	1%
Proposals offer good provisions for equestrians	3	1%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	3	1%
Scotland Road - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Dry Drayton residents)	3	1%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	2	1%
The scheme is a waste of money	2	1%
Comments about flooding and water management	2	1%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	2	1%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	2	1%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	2	1%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	2	1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Concerns with traffic, number of HGVs and rat-run	2	1%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	2	1%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	1	0.3%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	1	0.3%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	1	0.3%
The scheme is too expensive	1	0.3%
Travel hub is not needed	1	0.3%

Travel hub is needed	1	0.3%
Travel Hub should incorporate sustainable features (e.g., solar)	1	0.3%
No demand, no need for active travel	1	0.3%
The need for segregation between buses and cyclists / pedestrians	1	0.3%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	1	0.3%
Concern about vandalism in relation to the bus stop facilities	1	0.3%
Proposals do not offer enough provision for equestrians	1	0.3%
Negative impact on non-drivers	1	0.3%
Scotland Road - Concerns with taking private land and ruining the countryside	1	0.3%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.3%
Total of coded comments 301		
Respondents 207		

Q15. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THE SCOTLAND ROAD PROPOSALS?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	68	23%
Scotland Road - Wrong location for those it should serve	26	9%
Scotland Road - Opposition or no need for this section	19	7%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	13	4%
D - Scotland Road – Support or need for this section	13	4%
Scotland Road - Concerns with taking private land and ruining the countryside	13	4%
Alternative suggestions	12	4%
Opposition towards the scheme	10	3%
Questions, more information or more data required	8	3%
Design is not sustainable /environmental aspects have not been considered	8	3%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	6	2%
Scotland Road - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution)	5	2%
The scheme is a waste of money	4	1%
The need to retain existing green spaces	4	1%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	4	1%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	4	1%
Support for the scheme	3	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	3	1%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	3	1%
Missed connections (multi-modal or existing bus)	3	1%



Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Opposition or no need for this section	3	1%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Needs to be safe (including appropriate lighting)	3	1%
Scotland Road - Consideration of speed restrictions	3	1%
Scotland Road - improve or provide provision for active travel	3	1%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	2	1%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	2	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	2	1%
Comments about Maddingly P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	2	1%
Travel Hub will need security	2	1%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	2	1%
Comments about flooding and water management	2	1%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	2	1%
Support for active travel investment	2	1%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	2	1%
Connections to other travel modes should be safe and easily accessible	2	1%
Concern with closing roads to traffic	2	1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Concerns with traffic, number of HGVs and rat-run	2	1%
Scotland Road - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Dry Drayton residents)	2	1%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	2	1%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	2	1%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	2	1%
Support for the design	1	0.3%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	1	0.3%
The scheme is too expensive	1	0.3%
Travel hub is not needed	1	0.3%
Travel Hub will need food options	1	0.3%
Travel Hub will need electric vehicle charging	1	0.3%
Parking provided will encourage too many cars to the area	1	0.3%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	1	0.3%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	1	0.3%
Using the bus is too expensive	1	0.3%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for addition of a cycle path and footpath and implementing better links to cycle paths and footpaths	1	0.3%

Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - The need for segregation between buses and cyclists	1	0.3%
Travel Hub and Dry Drayton - Wrong location for those it should serve	1	0.3%
E - Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.3%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	1	0.3%
Total number of coded comments 290		
Respondents 201		

Q19. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE ROUTE THROUGH HARDWICK?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments	Hardwick n	Hardwick %
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	135	13%	92	15%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	96	9%	64	11%
Hardwick - Concerns with traffic, congestion, and rat-run	92	9%	68	11%
Hardwick - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots/ A428)	79	7%	37	6%
Hardwick - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution, as well as loss of trees)	71	7%	44	7%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	64	6%	36	6%
No congestion observed on roads currently	42	4%	27	4%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	36	3%	20	3%
Hardwick - Comments about the active travel provisions and the on-road cycling provisions	36	3%	17	3%
The need to retain existing green spaces	33	3%	19	3%
Hardwick - The bus gate and restricting car access will result in loss or reduction of access to services and long detours for residents	33	3%	18	3%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	30	3%	19	3%
Alternative suggestions	29	3%	13	2%
No comment/ N/a	26	2%	3	0.5%
Questions, more information or more data required	20	2%	11	2%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	17	2%	9	1.5%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	14	1%	9	1.5%
Hardwick - Parking should be maintained as it is required	14	1%	11	1.8%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	13	1%	5	0.8%
The scheme is a waste of money	13	1%	5	0.8%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	12	1%	8	1.3%



Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	12	1%	7	1.2%
Hardwick - Support or need for this section	12	1%	4	0.7%
Hardwick - Comments about the bus gate and restrictions	11	1%	6	1.0%
Hardwick - Support for the bus gate	9	1%	5	0.8%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	8	1%	3	0.5%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	6	1%	1	0.2%
The scheme is too expensive	6	1%	3	0.5%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	6	1%	2	0.3%
Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	6	1%	3	0.5%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	6	1%	1	0.2%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	6	1%	1	0.2%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	6	1%	4	0.7%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	5	0.5%	3	0.5%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	4	0.4%	3	0.5%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	4	0.4%	0	0.0%
Concern with closing roads to traffic	4	0.4%	2	0.3%
Using the bus is too expensive	4	0.4%	2	0.3%
Opposition towards the scheme	3	0.3%	2	0.3%
The need to plan for appropriate parking to ensure impact on villages, houses and residents is minimal	3	0.3%	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Preference for Option 1	3	0.3%	2	0.3%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	2	0.2%	0	0.0%
Parking provided will encourage too many cars to the area	2	0.2%	2	0.3%
Comments about flooding and water management	2	0.2%	0	0.0%
Construction concerns - general	2	0.2%	2	0.3%
Construction concerns regarding the impacts on buildings, homes, structures, and residents	2	0.2%	2	0.3%
Support for active travel investment	2	0.2%		
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	2	0.2%		
More bus stops needed (general)	2	0.2%		
Negative impact on old people	2	0.2%		
Negative impact on non-drivers	2	0.2%	1	0.2%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	1	0.1%		

Travel Hub is not accessible	1	0.1%		
Scheme is an environmental improvement	1	0.1%		
Construction concerns regarding the impact on environment (air and noise pollution)	1	0.1%	1	0.2%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	1	0.1%		
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.1%		
The need for segregation between buses and cyclists / pedestrians	1	0.1%		
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	1	0.1%		
Support for the addition of solar studs	1	0.1%	1	0.2%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	1	0.1%		
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	1	0.1%	1	0.2%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	1	0.1%	1	0.2%
Suggestions regarding the bus stop design (having off road bus stops)	1	0.1%		
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	1	0.1%		
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.1%		
Hardwick - Preference for Option 2	1	0.1%	1	0.2%
Total number of coded comments 1065			602	
Respondents 387				

Q21. WE WOULD LIKE TO CARRY OUT PROPOSED LANDSCAPING AND BIODIVERSITY MEASURES NORTH OF COTON. DO YOU HAVE COMMENTS ON THIS?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments	Coton n	Coton %
North of Coton - Concerns with existing fauna and flora, existing wildlife habitats and a preference for natural landscapes are better	60	14%	25	19%
North of Coton - Oppose measures	56	14%	20	15%
North of Coton - Support measures	45	11%	3	2%
No comment/ N/a	40	10%	0	0%
North of Coton - Concerns about the impact of view and that landscaping is not sufficient	38	9%	22	17%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	35	8%	20	15%
Alternative suggestions	20	5%	5	4%
North of Coton - Busway should use Madingley Road (less environmental impact, better option)	20	5%	6	5%
The need to retain existing green spaces	16	4%	6	5%
North of Coton - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Coton residents)	13	3%	7	5%



Opposition towards the scheme	9	2%	2	2%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	8	2%	1	1%
Questions, more information or more data required	6	1%	1	1%
North of Coton - Suggestions for planting	6	1%		0%
The scheme is a waste of money	5	1%	3	2%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	4	1%		0%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	4	1%	3	2%
Scheme is an environmental improvement	4	1%		0%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	4	1%	3	2%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	3	1%	2	2%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	2	0.5%		0%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	2	0.5%		0%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	2	0.5%		0%
North of Coton - Comments on the active travel provision	2	0.5%		0%
The scheme is too expensive	1	0.2%		0%
Comments about flooding and water management	1	0.2%		0%
Support for active travel investment	1	0.2%		0%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	1	0.2%		0%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	1	0.2%	1	1%
Using the bus is too expensive	1	0.2%	1	1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.2%		0%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	1	0.2%		0%
North of Coton - Against the bus stop	1	0.2%	1	1%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	1	0.2%		0%
Total number of coded comments 414			132	
Respondents 230				

Q23. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON NORTH OF COTON PROPOSALS?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments	Coton n	Coton %
North of Coton - Busway should use Madingley Road (less environmental impact, better option)	64	11%	23	11%

North of Coton - Oppose measures	51	9%	18	8%
No comment/ N/a	48	8%		0%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	47	8%	22	10%
North of Coton - Concerns with existing fauna and flora, existing wildlife habitats and a preference for natural landscapes are better	37	6%	18	8%
North of Coton - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Coton residents)	31	5%	16	8%
Alternative suggestions	25	4%	8	4%
The need to retain existing green spaces	19	3%	9	4%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	19	3%	8	4%
Questions/more information/more data required	17	3%	7	3%
North of Coton - Support measures	14	2%	1	0%
The scheme is too expensive	13	2%	9	4%
North of Coton - Against the bus stop	13	2%	8	4%
Opposition towards the scheme	11	2%		0%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	11	2%	5	2%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	11	2%	4	2%
North of Coton - Concerns about the impact of view and that landscaping is not sufficient	11	2%	6	3%
The scheme is a waste of money	10	2%	2	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	9	2%	4	2%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	9	2%	2	1%
North of Coton - Comments on the active travel provision	9	2%	4	2%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	7	1%	1	0%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	6	1%		0%
Comments on the consultations (how it is run etc)	6	1%	2	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	6	1%		0%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	6	1%	2	1%
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	6	1%	2	1%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	5	1%		0%
Support for active travel investment	5	1%	1	0%
No congestion observed on roads currently	5	1%	2	1%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	4	1%	1	0%
Using the bus is too expensive	4	1%	3	1%



West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	4	1%	1	0%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	3	1%	2	1%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	3	1%	2	1%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	3	1%	1	0%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	3	1%	3	1%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	3	1%		0%
North of Coton - Comments about the location of bus stops and addition of bus stops	3	1%		0%
North of Coton - Support for the bus stop	3	1%	2	1%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	2	0.3%	1	0%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	2	0.3%	1	0%
Comments about flooding and water management	2	0.3%	1	0%
Construction concerns - general	2	0.3%	2	1%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on environment (air and noise pollution)	2	0.3%	2	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	2	0.3%		0%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	2	0.3%		0%
Scheme is an environmental improvement	1	0.2%		0%
The scheme focuses too much on active travel	1	0.2%	1	0%
No demand, no need for active travel	1	0.2%	1	0%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.2%	1	0%
Support for the addition of solar studs	1	0.2%		0%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	1	0.2%		0%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	1	0.2%	1	0%
More bus stops needed (general)	1	0.2%		0%
Comments about maintaining or using the current bus stop locations	1	0.2%		0%
The need for bicycle parking and lockers	1	0.2%		0%
Suggestions regarding the bus stop design (having off road bus stops)	1	0.2%	1	0%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	1	0.2%	1	0%
Current road speed should be enforced	1	0.2%		0%
Concern with closing roads to traffic	1	0.2%		0%
Negative impact on old people	1	0.2%		0%
Negative impact on non-drivers	1	0.2%		0%
Negative impact on mental and physical health	1	0.2%	1	0%

A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.2%		0%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	1	0.2%		0%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	1	0.2%		0%
Total number of coded comments 598			213	
Respondents 262				

Q24. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE ROUTE OVER THE M11 AND THROUGH WEST CAMBRIDGE?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	60	13%
M11 through West Cambridge - Busway should use Madingley Road (less environmental impact, better option)	48	10%
M11 through West Cambridge - Opposition or no need for this section	46	10%
M11 through West Cambridge - Environmental concerns	31	6%
M11 through West Cambridge - Support or need for this section	25	5%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	24	5%
The scheme is too expensive	23	5%
Questions, more information or more data required	21	4%
Alternative suggestions	20	4%
The need to retain existing green spaces	17	4%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	9	2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	9	2%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	8	2%
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	8	2%
M11 through West Cambridge - The need for segregation between cyclists and buses	8	2%
The scheme is a waste of money	7	1%
Concerns with future traffic and congestion	7	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	6	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	6	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	6	1%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	6	1%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	5	1%



Support for active travel investment	5	1%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	5	1%
M11 through West Cambridge - The need for segregation between cyclists and pedestrians	5	1%
Opposition towards the scheme	4	1%
The scheme focuses too much on active travel	4	1%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	4	1%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	4	1%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	3	1%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	3	1%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	3	1%
More bus stops needed (general)	3	1%
Suggestions regarding the bus stop design (planning needed for the bus stop at Charles Babbage Road)	3	1%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on environment (air and noise pollution)	2	0.4%
Proposal for the active travel path is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	2	0.4%
No demand, no need for active travel	2	0.4%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	2	0.4%
The need for segregation between buses and cyclists / pedestrians	2	0.4%
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	2	0.4%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	2	0.4%
North of Coton - Concerns with existing fauna and flora, existing wildlife habitats and a preference for natural landscapes are better	2	0.4%
Support for the scheme	1	0.2%
Comments on the consultations (how it is run etc)	1	0.2%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	1	0.2%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	1	0.2%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	1	0.2%
Comments about flooding and water management	1	0.2%
Construction concerns - general	1	0.2%
Construction concerns regarding the impacts on buildings, homes, structures, and residents	1	0.2%
Construction concerns regarding the impact on traffic and delays	1	0.2%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	1	0.2%
No congestion observed on roads currently	1	0.2%

Negative impact on people with limited mobility	1	0.2%
Using the bus is too expensive	1	0.2%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	1	0.2%
North of Coton - Oppose measures	1	0.2%
North of Coton - Comments on the active travel provision	1	0.2%
Total number of coded comments 479		
Respondents 262		

Q25. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE ROUTE FROM WEST CAMBRIDGE TO GRANGE ROAD?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments	Newnham n	Newnham %
No comment/ N/a	68	13%		
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	62	12%	6	7%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	28	5%	11	13%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	28	5%		
Alternative suggestions	28	5%	2	2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Concern with traffic and congestion	28	5%	4	5%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Environmental concerns	27	5%	10	12%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Busway should use Madingley Road/ existing roads	24	5%	6	7%
H - West Cambridge to Grange Road – Support for this section	22	4%	2	2%
Connections to other travel options - not included in design	17	3%		
H - West Cambridge to Grange Road - Oppose/ Waste of money/ Not needed	17	3%	4	5%
Retain existing green spaces	15	3%	9	11%
Too expensive	14	3%	2	2%
Safety of pedestrians/cyclists/equestrians not properly considered	11	2%	1	1%
Pedestrian/cycle/equestrian crossings and safety at crossings and junctions	10	2%	2	2%
Questions/more information/more data required	9	2%	1	1%
No demand / no need for scheme/ upgrade or use current provision	8	2%	2	2%
Concern with future traffic/ congestion	8	2%	1	1%
Opposition towards the scheme	6	1%	1	1%



Segregation - The need to follow regulations/ LTN 1/20 guidance	6	1%	2	2%
H - West Cambridge to Grange Road - Keep Adams Road path	6	1%		0%
H - West of Cambridge to Grange Road - Safety concerns	6	1%	4	5%
Fundamental design change needed - re-routing or redesign	5	1%	2	2%
Should consider previous/alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	5	1%	1	1%
Support for active travel investment	5	1%	1	1%
Ensure needs of equestrians are properly considered	5	1%		0%
Waste of money	4	1%		0%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to be better	4	1%		0%
Madingley P&R should be integrated/ is preferred/ makes this scheme not needed	3	1%		0%
Preference/consideration for other travel modes - tram, e-scooters	3	1%		0%
Segregation - Buses and cyclists/ pedestrians	3	1%	1	1%
Segregation - Vehicles and cyclists/ pedestrians	3	1%		0%
No demand / no need for a bus	3	1%		0%
Connection to other active travel routes	3	1%	1	1%
Comments on the consultations (how it is run etc)	2	0.4%	1	1%
Flooding and water management	2	0.4%	1	1%
Upgrade/make sure surfaces and routes are suitable	2	0.4%		0%
Concern with closing roads to traffic	2	0.4%	1	1%
H - Junction with Grange Road - Impact on School	2	0.4%	1	1%
Noise concerns due to removal of trees / infrastructure closer to properties	1	0.2%		0%
Construction concerns - general	1	0.2%	1	1%
Scheme does not provide enough of a provision for active travel	1	0.2%		0%
Scheme provides too much infrastructure for active travel	1	0.2%		0%
No demand / no need for active travel	1	0.2%		0%
Segregation - Pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.2%		0%
Provision is not/should be continuous and direct	1	0.2%		0%
Not enough provision for	1	0.2%		0%
Interaction with EWR	1	0.2%		0%
Current road no congestion	1	0.2%	1	1%
Traffic on M11/Madingley Road and junctions	1	0.2%		0%
D - A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.2%		0%
E - Hardwick - Against Bus gate/ restricting car access	1	0.2%		0%
F - North of Coton - Comments on active travel provision	1	0.2%	1	1%

H - Junction with Grange Road - Concern with traffic/ congestion/ traffic management	1	0.2%		0%
Total of coded comments 519			83	
Respondents 258				

Q26. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THE JUNCTION WITH GRANGE ROAD?

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments	Newnham n	Newnham %
No comment/ N/a	67	16%	1	1%
Junction with Grange Road - Concern with traffic, congestion, and traffic management	49	12%	17	22%
Junction with Grange Road - Opposition or no need for this section	31	8%	6	8%
Alternative suggestions	28	7%	4	5%
Junction with Grange Road - Safety concerns	27	7%	7	9%
Junction with Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	25	6%	1	1.3%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	23	6%	6	8%
Junction with Grange Road - Concerns with the impact on the school	16	4%	8	10%
Questions, more information or more data required	14	3%	2	2.6%
Concerns with future traffic and congestion	12	3%	4	5.2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Opposition or no need for this section	10	2%	2	2.6%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	9	2%	3	3.9%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	7	2%	2	2.6%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	7	2%	1	1.3%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	7	2%	0	
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Environmental concerns	7	2%	3	3.9%
Junction with Grange Road - Support or need for this section	7	2%		
Opposition towards the scheme	6	1%		
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Support or need for this section	4	1%		
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Concern with traffic and congestion	4	1%		
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	3	1%	1	1.3%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	3	1%	1	1.3%
The scheme is a waste of money	3	1%		



Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	3	1%		
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	3	1%		
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	2	0.5%	1	1.3%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	2	0.5%		
The scheme is too expensive	2	0.5%	1	1.3%
The need to retain existing green spaces	2	0.5%		
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	2	0.5%		
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	2	0.5%	1	1.3%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	2	0.5%		
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	2	0.5%		
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	2	0.5%		
No congestion observed on roads currently	2	0.5%	1	1.3%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	2	0.5%	1	1.3%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Busway should use Madingley Road/ existing roads	2	0.5%		
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	1	0.2%	1	1.3%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	1	0.2%		
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.2%		
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	1	0.2%		
Concern with closing roads to traffic	1	0.2%	1	1.3%
Negative impact on old people	1	0.2%	1	1.3%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for by-passing the village	1	0.2%		
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	1	0.2%		
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	1	0.2%		
Total number of coded comments 408			77	
Respondents 227				

Q27. UNDER THE EQUALITY ACT 2010 WE WILL BE LOOKING AT THE PROPOSED SCHEME TO ENSURE THAT IT DOES NOT IMPACT ADVERSELY ON PEOPLE OR GROUPS WITH PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS. THESE ARE AGE, DISABILITY, GENDER REASSIGNMENT, MARRIAGE AND CIVIL PARTNERSHIP, PREGNANCY AND MATERNITY, RACE, RELIGION OR BELIEF, SEX, AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION. WE HAVE A DUTY TO ENSURE THAT OUR WORK PROMOTES EQUALITY AND DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE. PLEASE COMMENT IF YOU FEEL ANY OF THE PROPOSALS WOULD EITHER POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AFFECT OR IMPACT ON ANY SUCH PERSON/S OR GROUP/S.

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
No comment/ N/a	47	12%
Alternative suggestions	33	8%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	33	8%
Opposition towards the scheme	32	8%
Negative impact on old people	23	6%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	18	4%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	18	4%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	16	4%
Negative impact on non-drivers	11	3%
Negative impact on mental and physical health	11	3%
Support for the scheme	10	2%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	9	2%
The scheme is a waste of money	7	2%
Positive impacts on people with limited mobility	7	2%
Hardwick - Concerns with traffic, congestion, and rat-run	7	2%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	7	2%
Questions, more information or more data required	6	1%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	6	1%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	6	1%
Hardwick - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution, as well as loss of trees)	6	1%
Hardwick - The bus gate and restricting car access will result in loss or reduction of access to services and long detours for residents	6	1%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	5	1%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	4	1%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	4	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	4	1%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	4	1%
More bus stops needed (general)	4	1%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	4	1%
Positive impacts on old people	4	1%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	3	1%
The need to retain existing green spaces	3	1%
Support for active travel investment	3	1%



The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	3	1%
Using the bus is too expensive	3	1%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	3	1%
Scheme is an environmental improvement	2	0.5%
The scheme focuses too much on active travel	2	0.5%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	2	0.5%
Consider passenger safety (including appropriate lighting, levels of crime)	2	0.5%
No congestion observed on roads currently	2	0.5%
Concern with closing roads to traffic	2	0.5%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Support or need for this section	2	0.5%
North of Coton - Oppose measures	2	0.5%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	1	0.2%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	1	0.2%
The scheme is too expensive	1	0.2%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	1	0.2%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	1	0.2%
Construction concerns - general	1	0.2%
Proposal for the active travel path is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	1	0.2%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	1	0.2%
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	1	0.2%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	1	0.2%
Active travel provision should be continuous and direct	1	0.2%
Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	1	0.2%
Suggestions for speed limit enforcements (present situation)	1	0.2%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	1	0.2%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Concerns about cars parked on road, congestion, and traffic	1	0.2%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Retaining and not impacting on existing routes for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	1	0.2%
Bourn Airfield - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Hardwick - Support for the bus gate	1	0.2%
North of Coton - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Coton residents)	1	0.2%
North of Coton - Comments on the active travel provision	1	0.2%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.2%
Junction with Grange Road - Concerns with the impact on the school	1	0.2%
Total of coded comments 408		

Respondents 213

Q28. WE WELCOME YOUR VIEWS. IF YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSALS, INCLUDING ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR INCLUSION IN THE DESIGN, PLEASE ADD THEM IN THE SPACE BELOW.

Theme Description	Number of coded comments	Percentage of coded comments
Alternative suggestions	84	10%
Opposition towards the scheme	62	7%
Design is not sustainable or environmental aspects have not been considered	53	6%
No demand, no need for the scheme, suggestions to upgrade or use the current provisions	48	6%
The scheme is a waste of money	33	4%
Fundamental design change needed (re-routing or re-design)	26	3%
Comments about the consultations (including comments about materials, events, survey)	26	3%
Questions, more information or more data required	25	3%
The scheme is too expensive	24	3%
No comment/ N/a	22	3%
The need to consider previous or alternative proposals (for public transport, road developments)	21	3%
Proposal for the bus route is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	20	2%
Concern with future traffic and congestion	18	2%
The need to retain existing green spaces	17	2%
Hardwick - Opposition towards the bus gate and restricting car access	17	2%
Hardwick - Opposition or no need for this section	16	2%
No congestion observed on roads currently	15	2%
Concerns with traffic on the M11/Madingley Road and junctions	15	2%
Support for the scheme	14	2%
Preference for other travel modes (including tram, e-scooters)	13	2%
North of Coton - Busway should use Madingley Road (less environmental impact, better option)	13	2%
Connections to other travel options should be included in the design	12	1%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	11	1%
Proposals should plan for integration with existing bus routes and the EWR	10	1%
Comments about Madingley P&R (should be integrated with the plans, it is preferred, makes this scheme not needed)	9	1%
Support for active travel investment	8	1%
More bus stops needed (general)	8	1%
Hardwick - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots/ A428)	8	1%



Comments about timetabling and the frequency of the bus	7	1%
Bourn Airfield - Comments about using the existing route (along A428)	7	1%
Hardwick - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Hardwick residents)	7	1%
North of Coton - Oppose measures	7	1%
Proposals should be developed in conjunction with future housing, existing provisions, and existing and proposed transport	6	1%
Travel Hub should be in an alternative location	6	1%
Proposal for the active travel path is not suitable for those it is suggested to serve	6	1%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians	6	1%
Concern with closing roads to traffic	5	1%
Negative impact on non-drivers	5	1%
Construction concerns - general	4	0.5%
Scheme is not suitable for a bus / needs to consider alternative transport modes	4	0.5%
No demand or no need for a bus scheme	4	0.5%
The need to plan for appropriate parking to ensure impact on villages, houses and residents is minimal	4	0.5%
Negative impact on old people	4	0.5%
Negative impact on people with limited mobility	4	0.5%
Using the bus is too expensive	4	0.5%
Childerley Lodge area - Comments about using the existing route (along St Neots)	4	0.5%
Hardwick - Concerns with traffic, congestion, and rat-run	4	0.5%
Parking provided will encourage too many cars to the area	3	0.4%
Construction concerns regarding the impacts on buildings, homes, structures, and residents	3	0.4%
Scheme does not focus enough on active travel	3	0.4%
The need for segregation between vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians	3	0.4%
Support for the addition of solar studs	3	0.4%
Comments about upgrading and ensuring surfaces and routes are suitable for use	3	0.4%
Negative impact on mental and physical health	3	0.4%
Hardwick - Environmental concerns (including air and noise pollution, as well as loss of trees)	3	0.4%
Hardwick - Parking should be maintained as it is required	3	0.4%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Concern with traffic and congestion	3	0.4%
Travel hub is not needed	2	0.2%
The need to follow regulations (LTN 1/20 guidance)	2	0.2%
Concerns with safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians at crossings and junctions	2	0.2%
Consider passenger safety (including appropriate lighting, levels of crime)	2	0.2%
The need to consider equestrians throughout the proposals	2	0.2%

Missed connections (multi-modal or existing bus)	2	0.2%
Bourn Airfield - More bus stops needed	2	0.2%
Bourn Airfield - Location of bus stops should consider the new development and the proximity to houses and users	2	0.2%
Hardwick - More bus stops needed	2	0.2%
North of Coton - Concerns with existing fauna and flora, existing wildlife habitats and a preference for natural landscapes are better	2	0.2%
North of Coton - The need to consider how the scheme will impact residents (especially Coton residents)	2	0.2%
M11 through West Cambridge - Busway should use Madingley Road (less environmental impact, better option)	2	0.2%
Junction with Grange Road - Wrong location and end point, leading to loss of connectivity into city centre	2	0.2%
Travel hub is needed	1	0.1%
Travel Hub should incorporate sustainable features (e.g., solar)	1	0.1%
Scheme is an environmental improvement	1	0.1%
Concerns about noise due to loss of trees and proximity to houses	1	0.1%
Comments about flooding and water management	1	0.1%
No demand, no need for active travel	1	0.1%
The need for segregation between pedestrians and cyclists	1	0.1%
The need for segregation between vehicles and equestrians	1	0.1%
Comments about the positioning of solar studs	1	0.1%
Integrating solar or sustainable energy in the plans for the bus stop facilities	1	0.1%
Proposals offer good provisions for equestrians	1	0.1%
Connection to other active travel routes should be considered	1	0.1%
Suggestions for speed limit enforcements (present situation)	1	0.1%
Suggestions for speed limit enforcements (future situation)	1	0.1%
Broadway to Sterling Way - Opposition or no need for this section	1	0.1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Concerns with traffic, number of HGVs and rat-run	1	0.1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Safety concerns	1	0.1%
A14 in Dry Drayton - Suggestions for addition of a cycle path and footpath and implementing better links to cycle paths and footpaths	1	0.1%
Hardwick - Support or need for this section	1	0.1%
Hardwick - Comments about the active travel provisions and the on-road cycling provisions	1	0.1%
Hardwick - Comments about the bus gate and restrictions	1	0.1%
North of Coton - Against the bus stop	1	0.1%
West Cambridge to Grange Road - Busway should use Madingley Road/ existing roads	1	0.1%
Junction with Grange Road - Concern with traffic, congestion, and traffic management	1	0.1%
Junction with Grange Road - Concerns with the impact on the school	1	0.1%



Total number of coded comments 827

Respondents 278