

Date	P,O or I	Organisation	Text
13/05/2022	I		<p>Hello – The map showing on the website is too small to see clearly which roads/paths are being used on the approach to Cambridge. Could this be amended, please?</p> <p>Thank you [redacted]</p>
13/05/2022	I		<p>Hello,</p> <p>You really should provide a proper map of the route. The one that you display has terrible resolution making any detail illegible.</p> <p>Best regards</p>
14/05/2022	I		<p>[redacted]</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>Can you please send me a clear map of the proposed route of the new Cambourne to Cambridge link? The one on the website is rather unclear and not readable, especially the sections to the East of Coton.</p> <p>Thanks, [redacted]</p>

15/05/2022

I

I first attended a consultation event in relation to the Cambourne to Cambridge transport link under the then City Deal on Tuesday 15th September 2015, and here we are in May 2022 still/again involved in consultation activities.

Over this time I have lost track of and mostly lost interest in the number of "Consultations" there have been on the same subject: and in almost 7 years not a single inch of route or track has materialised. I have absolutely no idea what it is that the GCP actually spends its time doing apart from talking and spending enormous amounts of tax-payers money on staffing and yet more consultations.

It would be of real interest to me to know just how much money the City Deal and the GCP has to date spent on itself and on making no progress with the Cambourne to Cambridge transport link.

16/05/2022

I

[redacted]

I would like to give my views on the proposed Cambridge to Cambourne link. Your website (www.greatercambridge.org.uk/c2c-eia), unfortunately, does not seem to offer any means of doing so. The phone number you provide yields a recorded message which tells me to email you.

How do I provide my views? If it is not possible to do this online (in 2022!), please send two printed copies to:

[redacted]

16/05/2022

I

Hi,

I just received your note through the post about the consultation. I went to your website to view the preferred route, but can only find low resolution images that are impossible to consider. I also checked your ecology report and notices that both ponds [redacted] were indicated as no access. [redacted]the pond has been tested many times over the last few years, with multiple surveyors reporting it is the highest density of great crested newts they had ever seen – which raises significant doubt on quality of your report.

Can you please provide a link to a high resolution image of the proposed route, and respond as to why your ecological report appears incomplete?

Regards

[redacted]

18/05/2022

I

(email includes attached map) May I ask a question for clarification please

In the Consultation Brochure you describe two different scenarios for different ends of the St Neots Road?

Top of Page 25 “the current preferred route is proposed to run off-road through a green corridor separating St Neots Road from the A428”. This doesn’t touch the tree line west of Cambridge Road until you need to keep a distance from the A428. Then the available space disappears hence the need to either take out the trees or take out the traffic east of Cambridge Road. This seems still to be the case as the follow on comments state they relate to the east of Cambridge Road.

Page 27 second paragraph clearly relates only to the East of Cambridge Road, it states (thanks to the Active Travel BusGate proposal....) “East of Cambridge Road we are now proposing to take the route along St Neots Road. The reduction in through traffic would yield road safety, noise and air quality benefits for residents, at the cost of a loss of car access to the east” .. You don’t mention the traffic that would be pushed onto the narrower village roads with increased pollution, noise and jeopardy for other road users.

In the Questionnaire Question 17 you ask only about the whole route through Hardwick – choice is on or off road. No distinction about east or west of Cambridge Road.

What are you asking us to comment on, please? Not sure a single yes/no answer can be given to the routes as described in your brochure?

In relation to the lay-bys is the situation you announce in Question 17 is also not clear. Are you talking about both ends of St Neots Road? We received the following response from the County Active Travel Senior Project Officer, [redacted] ...”Our Active Travel

18/05/2022

I

Dear Sirs

I have looked at the proposed route for this and I am rather concerned about how this will affect the residents of Hardwick. Will this new route affect the Citi 4 that serves the village and Cambourne at the moment? The proposed site at Scotland Farm may be all well and good for those coming by car but what of those that rely on the Citi 4 and may not be able to get to Scotland Farm.

I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

21/05/2022

I

I have looked carefully through the EIA consultation document. It goes into detail (e.g. where bus stops are etc) which I find at odds with the overall purpose of this consultation which is supposed to be on the EIA itself. My comments refer to the EIA.

1. Review of the past 7 years

2015: City Deal launched C2C project with a range of off-road and on-road options proposed for consultation

Public strongly opposed the "southern" off-road proposal through Coton and West Fields

2016: City Deal "carefully assesses" 5 options in more detail, concluding that Option 3, an off-road busway through Coton, is best

2017: Residents propose optimised on-road "Option 6". This was endorsed by the LLF (although it was repeatedly misrepresented by GCP in scheme reports)

2017-18: GCP consults on off-road "Option 3" vs two sub-optimal on-road variants

Public still prefers on-road by 2:1 margin

2019: Feasibility study supports development of £4bn Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) system

2019: East-West Rail consults on major heavy rail link between Bedford and Cambridge & possible duplication of other schemes connecting Cambourne and Cambridge noted

2021: CAM abandoned

2020-22: Pandemic dramatically changes working practices and commuting patterns; traffic surveys shows Madingley Rd runs freely even during morning peak hours; effect of housing growth & East-West Rail as yet unknown

2022: Environmental Impact Assessment on off-road scheme

2. Conclusions

The above history shows that the outcome of many consultations have been ignored by GCP; when forensically examined it makes one think that public consultations are a charade and that there is a drive within the GCP to do what it wants notwithstanding

23/05/2022

I

Firstly, I do not understand the need for a dedicated busway on St Neots road, the traffic is not heavy on this road. The busway could, if necessary, be started after the Comberton Long Rd junction.

Secondly. More consideration needs to be given to the traffic that is going to be 'forced into Cambridge Rd, Hardwick. At present the shop causes hold ups- some extensive especially in the morning and evening. If St Neots road is closed then traffic will use Cambridge Road as a Rat Run to Cambridge and I do not think this has been taken into consideration in any of the reviews.

Thirdly. If a busway is forced upon us, then I believe the whole of St Neots Road should become one way westward from the Madingle turn to the end of St Neots Rd to reducing the traffic of non Hardwick residents using Cambridge Rd as a short cut.

Whatever is adopted I believe more consideration needs to be given to the concern of Hardwick residents.

[redacted]

26/05/2022

I

What is the carbon footprint for this development and how are you mitigating this in the short, medium and long term?
Some numbers and methodology here would be appreciated.

There is perceived locally to be no traffic issues along St Neots road Hardwick, so why are you not running buses along the existing carriage way? A full explanation, criteria and data would be appreciated.

Thank you
[redacted]

27/05/2022

I

I listened to the Zoom last night about the environmental issues wrt the Camborne Cambridge busway.

Having been out of the loop for a little while I was bitterly disappointed to see that the planned route still goes over a new bridge, through West Fields to Grange Road and Silver Street. When cycling I have frequently been involved in a traffic jam in Silver Street because it's not wide enough to take buses. Surely one of the proposed alternatives using Madingley Road has to be a more viable alternative for many reasons.

[redacted]

PS. Couldn't make your survey work so sent this instead.

01/06/2022

I

(Email includes embedded map) This is a query about the Camborne to Cambridge (C2C) project. My wife and I are the owners of and living in the property at address [redacted] which I have shown with red rectangle in the image below on the map of the project I took from greatercambridge website:

As I noticed from the project details from the greatercambridge website and as indicated in the above picture, it appears that there is a proposal for an active travel path, going in front of our house shown with the dark blue line. While we don't have any objections on that, we have the following questions:

1. Does this project affect our property and our right of access in any shape or form?
 2. On the project map from your website there is a black line moving over some properties, including ours. As we understand, the project map indicates that this is "Enhanced Footways New Public Right of Way"? Can you please advise what does the area covered by that line mean and what implications this does have for us?
- I appreciate your reply to the above and look forward to hearing from you.

[redacted]

01/06/2022 I

(Two emails in close succession) Further to my last below, I think going through Bourn would be a great idea! Particularly of how close parts of CAMBOURNE (particularly upper CAMBOURNE where I live) are joined up to Bourn.

Kind regards

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

> Good afternoon

>

> Could you advise on how long the proposed new route would take from upper CAMBOURNE to CAMBRIDGE?

>

> The current route I take takes an average of over 45mins as it stands ([redacted], upper CAMBOURNE to Emmanuel street, CAMBRIDGE) which I feel is an incredibly long journey which essentially only takes 20 mins or less to drive.

>

> I don't think that any changes to the route which would involve a longer bus journey would be used.

>

> Kind regards

>

[redacted]

04/06/2022

I

Good morning,

Firstly ime not really against the proposed transport link but ime keen to know what is happening near the Childerley Gate/St Neots Rd area [redacted]at that junction and the map is not entirely clear. If you could confirm if or not the link passes along the St Neots Rd or the Dual carriageway at that area, I can then just be concerned about the rail link, BP Service station expansion, St Neots road roundabout alterations and the Bourn airfield East site !

Kind regards

[redacted]

The plan for this bus route would ruin the area of West Cambridge. The majority of votes on the plan by the public have resulted in a preferred route north of Cambridge, not this option. This option was imposed on us by the GCP, in spite of several meetings on the subject, where we made our views known.

The cost at £160m is far too much to spend on a road plan. The additional bridge over the M11 is an unnecessary expense, apart from causing further damage to the West Cambridge environment, both visual and natural. The proper answer to traffic problems would be to run the bus on the Maddingley road and A428.

Increased working from home has considerably reduced the traffic in and out of Cambridge, suggesting a smaller scale operation is called for.

Particular damaging aspects are:

The damage to the historic Cotton orchard and the village.

The proposed Bin Brook crossing would be a desecration of a rural stream. We value the existing bridge.

The destruction of long stretches of the Cotton footpath, used as a quiet walk from Cambridge to surrounding fields.

The damage to the fields in Green Belt land to the west of Wilberforce road, through which the proposed route would travel.

Perhaps worst of all, is the prospect of building development along the bus route in the West Fields. Colleges are already planning to build on Green Belt land along the route. Having allowed a bus road across open fields, it is certain residential building will follow.

The proposed rail link from Cambridge to the west will make the busway redundant.

Much of the land over which the proposed bus route would pass is owned by Cambridge

08/06/2022

I

(jpg of alternative suggestion attached to email) DESIGNERS GREATER CAMBRIDGE
PARTNERSHIP SCOTLAND FARM PARK & RIDE

Dear Sir/Madam

We have just come from a Parish council meeting where the new Scotland Farm Park & Ride was discussed.

Simply we were shocked at the proposal to locate the new connective pathway from Dry Drayton village on the western side of Scotland road as it runs down into the village as currently the existing footpath & verge is not suitable due to restrictive width & this will mean compulsory purchase of the fronts of properties adjacent will need to happen or an already over burdened road will need narrowing, also the drainage specifically running from Keepers end down to Solway is wholly inadequate due to the fact that there is a long standing flooding issue to the verges & the road as a result of the western fields of Scotland farm water run off into the irrigation ditches running down into the village of dry Drayton & the blocked culverts beyond causing thousands of gallon of water to bubble up through the ground flooding the road & verges every time there is a substantial rain falls. Simply if these verges are tarmacked then the water will simply bubble up further back within the boundaries of the properties herein mentioned causing substantial flooding & structural damage to those properties.

The highways & environmental officers know all about this & to place the new pathway adjacent & outside the fronting properties would be a disaster.

Also in addition to the aforementioned the simple fact is that the danger to users of the pathways & the traffic jams that would ensue due to residents trying to enter their properties over the pathways would be substantial as vehicles would have to wait for pedestrians, cycles, horses to pass before proceeding to enter their property causing traffic chaos.

A far better solution would be for the pathway to continue its course into the centre of the village on the eastern side behind the hedgerow & then curl back over the land that does not have the irrigation ditch as it stops some way before the roundabout. This would

08/06/2022

I

To Whom it may concern

It has come to my attention that the new connective pathway from Dry Drayton village has been proposed to go on the western side of Scotland Rd. I was extremely surprised that this was the preferred place and not the eastern side. My worries are completely based on safety. The footpath on the western side is very narrow as it is, walking two abreast is impossible and when walking single file you feel you might get hit by a car's wing mirror, and if a lorry goes past that is just frightening. There is no obstruction to the alternative footpath on the eastern side, so that would not be any issue for pedestrians. Also there is considerable flooding on the western side, the road is constantly breaking up and needing fixing, many cars are badly damaged and this will just get worse if the new route is just tarmacked, making cycling, or walking impossible. The other factor that concerns me is the fact there are 9 houses on the western side, plus the cricket pitch behind them, all who would have to cross the new pathway to get into their houses, coming from Hardwick end or the A14 end. This will cause the owners to have to stop causing traffic build up and possibility of crashes.

The other issue is that Dry Drayton has an abundance of lorries driving through and this would also cause the possibility of accidents for anyone using the pathway. The village surely should have a 7.5 ton weight limit. Also cars that come into the village from Hardwick, if we are lucky slow down to go the correct way round the speed reducing area, but a lot don't even bother to do that, they just go on the wrong side of it and don't slow up, then they all speed up again until the mini roundabout at High St. There are children that walk along the narrow footpath as it is and it just doesn't seem safe, it will be worse if the cars still speed, plus cyclists using it, plus possibly horses. If the pathway was placed on the Eastern side of Scotland Rd most of the safety issues I raised would not arise.

If the footpath was placed on the eastern side it would also be far safer for the crossing

14/06/2022

I

Dear Greater Cambridge

I am writing with regard to the following consultation 'Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport and Active Travel Environmental Impact Assessment - Public Consultation' which extends until 11th July 2022.

The extract below is from the attached brochure regarding the Childerley Gate Alignment.

I am trying to ascertain what is proposed in the area circled green, and in particular details of how cyclists/walkers are proposed to cross St Neots Road. Is someone able to provide me with this information? (or even better arrange a call to talk this through)

Regards

[redacted]

21/06/2022

I

Dear Madam, Sir,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed masterplan for the C2C project.

Improvements to the route into Cambridge along the west is a really good idea. Quick and easy access with high frequency buses and good cycle connection will make such a difference. However a few questions remain:

- Will the P&R at Scotland Farm is now definitely going ahead? An active travel route without a P&R is also an option.

Who is expected to use the P&R in Dry Drayton? Residents of Cambourne and the villages along the new C2C travel path won't need a P&R as they can hop on directly and don't need to park a car?

Cars coming from the M11 will not want to drive back to Scotland Farm so where will they park if the Eddington site is being closed?

Wouldn't cars coming from St Neots be better off joining the C2C at its beginning in Cambourne?

The most likely users will be cars coming from the A14 who will access the new P&R through Dry Drayton village. (The traffic has already increased greatly and cars travel at high speed. Further traffic calming measures will be necessary and measures to discourage 'the rat run')

Local users from the surrounding villages have a problem:

- Will the adjacent villages definitely be connected to the C2C travel path? Will Caldecote, Bourn, Madingley and Dry Drayton get a cycle path to make it safe to join the C2C route? I can only see a proposed cycle path to Dry Drayton 'with permission of the landowner' which is more than vague. The villages of Caldecote, Bourn and Madingley are completely left out of consideration. How can all this be addressed?

22/06/2022

I

Dear [redacted]

We write further to the consultation meeting held at Coton last week. While you know our views on the busway running through the green belt to save a mere few minutes, we would like to speak to you about mitigation if this busway is to go ahead.

You said at the meeting that you would consider mitigating the affect of the busway if residents didn't want to see the busway. When we met council officers in 2014 they suggested that an easy solution would be for the busway to be located in a cutting (surrounded by trees) so that we do not see buses going by. We note that you have not made provision for this, can we discuss this please? In the scheme of things we would suggest the cost of this would be negligible.

Further at the meeting you were challenged about the route running through the ancient orchard and you said that you genuinely wanted to hear views about the route and where it potentially could be changed. You pointed out that it couldn't move north near the Cemetery as this had already been looked at but that you would look at the current route as it stands. We would ask that you reroute away from our back garden. This is not a big ask as this could be done by going further south upon entry at the waterworks rather than running diagonally across as it currently runs.

We would be happy to meet you to discuss the above options.

Kind regards

[redacted]

20/06/2022

I

Dear [redacted]

The zoom meeting June 9th was very useful. Prior to it, I responded to the on line questionnaire and expressed a concern which has not been replied to. Therefore please assist me with one.

The proposal plan map refers in area H to a temporary Balk road for the construction undertakings.

Very close to the route in area H is one anciently uncultivated field, I believe owned by Jesus College. It is very precious in its biodiversity and unique ecology and therefore needs specific protection from any disturbance. It incorporates grid references TL 43645 58199 TL 43623 58134 TL43581 58130 TL43530 58073 TL 43597 58237

Please will you direct me to the ecological survey pertinent and specific to this field and assure us that this is being recognised and safeguarded?

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

26/06/2022

I

Dear Sir / Madam,

Improvement in public transport to serve existing communities and those developments already agreed is obviously to be welcomed but the following should be borne in mind:

1. This catch up measure should not be leveraged by others to undertake widespread development of the western approach to Cambridge, fundamentally altering the character of the area. A particular concern would be further development between the proposed travel hub and Dry Drayton creating a "sprawl"
2. Many elderly and vulnerable people and others will continue to need to access Cambridge by car and no measures should be taken to make this more difficult or expensive, citing the availability of an improved bus service.
3. The potential of the travel hub will not be fully realised unless there are suitable cycle and footpaths connecting the hub to the wider travel network. Unfortunately the recent improvements to the A14 including the development of cycle and footpaths into Cambridge, have not benefited Dry Drayton. Residents can only access the new footpaths and cycle paths via very busy roads. This would be a good opportunity to address this anomaly.
4. The proposed travel link shown on P23 of the public consultation document appears to join the existing road just before Dry Drayton's traffic calming measures. There is also a busy farm entrance at this site with increasing traffic volumes including heavy farm machinery and lorries. The Highways Agency has also approved an additional access just within the traffic calming for my house. Obviously there are enormous risks in combining different vehicle types - as you know there have been fatalities on the Guided Bus route. The road is also very narrow at this site and there is a ditch on the western side. The active travel path therefore needs to continue on the other side of the hedge and ideally join the new A14 active travel routes.

I would be very grateful if you could let me know your views on the above.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

27/06/2022

I

Dear [redacted]

Thank you very much for your reply.

Is the proposed C2C scheme to disturb land "at the north of the field" as you say, or hopefully, north of the field?

It is indeed the potential construction of a temporary Haul, not Bauk Road, that I refer to, as cited in the last paragraph of page 36.

The existing biodiversity of Jesus College's historically undisturbed meadow, is in an outstanding and unique league. Reduction and loss of its specific entities, could not be compensated for by expansion of habitat composition in the separate area at the brook level.

Could the ecology researchers responsible for this specific area review and response?

Good wishes

{redacted}

To whom it may concern,

I write in relation to the proposed travel hub at Scotland Farm and active travel path to be delivered in connection with the C2C Better Public Transport Project from Dry Drayton's point of interest.

These developments are to be welcomed in so far as they genuinely complement and improve the existing infrastructure and transport links for the current residents as much as the future residents of the area. However, the following considerations should be noted:

1. The active travel path in its current form does not genuinely promote the vision of the Scotland Road travel hub. According to the current plans, the travel hub is only connected to a road and one of the least populated villages in South Cambridgeshire. It is therefore difficult to picture the "travel hub" as anything more than a park and ride, the likes of which in Madingley has better transport connections in fact to what is proposed at Scotland Road. In order to genuinely fulfil the vision of the "travel hub", the active travel route should therefore be expanded to offer more meaningful connections. This could very reasonably and cost effectively be achieved by extending the proposed active travel route through the remaining half of the village to connect it to the existing pedestrian and cycle routes running from Bar Hill to Cambridge. Neighbouring villages such as Caldecote and Madingley could also benefit from similar connections and these active travel paths would be welcomed whether or not the travel hub proceeds.

2. While I strongly welcome the development of the active travel route, the planned route will require some improvements in order to ensure the safety of its users and road traffic. As currently planned, the route crosses over a country lane with speed limits of 60 mph before the traffic calming measures and next to a farm entrance in constant use by

08/07/2022

I

Hi

I have tried my best to let everyone who lives in Hardwick know about the planned busway, so many people say they didn't receive the original flier, you were just relying on that one piece of communication to ask the opinion of so many residents. Many aren't on Facebook or do not regularly check it. Having hundreds of cars turning left at the junction of St Neots Rd/ Cambridge Road is crazy. It really is not that busy west bound along St Neots Rd to need a bus gate.

Please do consider the problems by the shop with people trying to drive past parked cars, particularly at busy times.

Thanks

[redacted]

08/07/2022

I

Morning

Please confirm if there will be a bus route put in place from West Cambourne to Cambridge and if so when?

Thank you

Yours sincerely [redacted]

undated

I

Dear Sirs

No right turn – busgate proposal (buses and cyclists only) at Cambridge Road – St Neots Rd Hardwick Junction

Re the above I have already completed and returned a questionnaire to you but felt there was insufficient room in the form to set out my full concerns.

This proposal is not in the public interest on the ground of Driver Cost, Environment and Safety

Cost

The present distance between the Cambridge Road junction and Madingley Mulch roundabout is 0.9 miles. A return journey to Coton/Eddington/Cambridge will therefore be 1.8 miles. Using the A428 diversion the equivalent mileage is 4.8 miles. That is an excess of 3 miles per journey. Taking a typical calendar month of 22 days plus say one journey each weekend, that equals 26 return journeys extra per calendar month. 26 journeys at 3 miles excess = 78 miles = approx. 2 gallons of petrol / diesel, at say £8.50 per gallon equals an additional cost to the commuting motorist of £17 each month. To put £17 in your pocket you have to earn £25 before tax (20%) and National Insurance (12%) or in annual terms £300 p.a.

This diversion is therefore going to cost the commuting motorist £300 pa at gross salary level. That is a cost that is totally unacceptable and just on its own is a reason not to proceed with this.

Environment

As above the average commuter doing 5 return journeys to Coton / Eddington / Cambridge per week plus one weekend journey is going to burn about 2 gallons of petrol / diesel extra, using the diversionary route, per month. Over a year that's 24 gallons (110 litres). I do not know how many vehicles make that journey but per hundred cars, that 2,400 gallons of petrol / diesel burnt into and polluting the atmosphere. We should be conserving our resources, not creating schemes that use more which at the same time increases pollution.

Notes