

1) Please select one of the following statements:	If you are responding on behalf of a group or business, please state its name. If you are	2) How often, if at all, would you use any
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Daily, Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Babraham Research Campus	Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly

I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know



I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly

I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly



I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly, Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily, Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily, Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly

I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		
I am responding as an individual		Daily



I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Sawston Parish Council - Vice-Chairman Planning Committee	Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly, Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know





I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily, Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly



I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Lt Shelford PC	Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily, Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never



I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Suffolk Chamber of Commerce	Daily
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Never, Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Uttlesford District Council	Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know



I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative		
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Chair of the the Coppice Avenue Residents' Association ('CARA')	Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Cambridge Group of Ramblers' Association	Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Parish Clerk and RFO Great Shelford Parish Council	
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	British Horse Society - county Access & Bridleways Officer - Cambridgeshire. 25,500 horses in Cambridgeshire excluding the racing industry.	
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know



I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Never, Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	I am Chairman of Hobson's Conduit Trust.	Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Fortnightly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know



I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Shelford and District Bridleways Group - Access Officer	Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	The Green Group for Shelfords, Stapleford and Sawston (2G3S)	Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never

I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Daily
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Never
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Weekly
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Deal Land LLP	Weekly

I am responding as an individual		Monthly
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding as an individual		Don't know
I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative	Uttlesford District Council	Don't know



3) How far do you support the more detailed proposals	4) What are your views on the proposed stop locations?
Strongly oppose	Waste of taxpayer's money, the fundamental journey time into the City Centre will not change - the current bottle neck with the A1307 route is a result of the restrictions imposed in the redevelopment of the route from Addenbrookes along Hills Road, losing the bus lane to another cycle path was pointless and self-defeating as the buses and traffic have to queue in
Support	Don't know
Support	These are good
Strongly support	As long as the existing X13 service will feed into this and straight through I am happy. I am concerned that I might end up having to change at the hub then again at Cambridge South.
Support	I would use the Stapleford stop as it is near my house
Oppose	2 major employment sites without stops, Linton/Haverhill not even mentioned, babraham village no stop. You seem to be just encouraging people to drive to these hubs rather than trying to cut out the need for cars. For people at grantapark depending on the location it's a 30min+ walk to get to one of these so unlikely to be used.
Strongly oppose	
Strongly support	No view - I will be coming from Haverhill directly into Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Support	Think site B would be best, although all are ok
Strongly oppose	
Support	Stops are fine but the really critical thing is whether there is adequate car parking near them. Without that it's frankly not much help to most people
Strongly support	The stop locations seem logical. I think it makes sense to try and have stops as close as possible to Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park to encourage more people to use the service. It would then have large numbers of people using it in both directions which would be good for the economical impact.
Strongly support	They are all broadly ok. Site B looks the most promising location, being the Cambridge side of the A11 and on the A1307.
Strongly support	Pity it can't go through Shelford and Stapleford
Support	It would be better if the proposed public transport route extended further away from Cambridge than the A11/A505 junction. If the route went as far as Haverhill, then it would be far more useful.
Strongly support	
Oppose	How is that going to ease congestion from Haverhill, through Linton and the four way roundabout.

Strongly support	I think that the stop locations make sense even though they are currently a fair distance from housing. The proposed housing in Sawston would see the greatest benefit and should be built in conjunction with the transport links.
Strongly oppose	No one will use them. Hinton Way is only used as a rat run by cars. push bikes don't use it as it is up hill & the road is narrow with cars parked on the kerbs forcing cyclist to move into the stream of traffic which often goes faster than 30mph. The pavements are poor. People with mobility issues would avoid walking up the hill. People are lazy so won't walk to the edge of the
Strongly support	seems sensible - don't need too many stops otherwise the route will be too slow
Strongly support	seems sensible - don't want too many stops
Strongly support	Great. Cover all of the villages, without making stops too frequent.
No opinion	
Strongly support	
Oppose	All of the stops lie outside the villages of Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston and as a result are inconveniently located for residents of these villages. The comparison with the existing times to travel by bus are misleading as they do not take into account the additional time to travel to the stops from the villages. I estimate these to be approximately 5-10 minutes by
Support	The stops in Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston are in good locations. Further thought needs to be given to the design at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to enable the route to be connected to the Cambridge Metro. The proposed route envisages two extremely sharp corners and close interactions with pedestrians - this shows that backward-looking bus-centric

Strongly oppose	The impact to the countryside is unacceptable, and this does not alter a key issue with traffic which is commercial vehicles
Strongly oppose	you keep fiddling with the a1307 but you dont take the bull by the horns average speed between haverhill and cambridge around 630 is 39 mph the road is to over crowded to many more houses are being built along the a1307 corridor but nothing is being done to up grade the road all you do like what you have planed arounmd linton is to piss of the motorist im a
Strongly support	
Support	
Strongly support	Sensible.
Support	Good
No opinion	They are not relevant to me.
Support	Living in linton I am not sure if I would use this service as I would still have to travel to the Hub to get the bus and if the journey via the bus will take 30 minutes I might just as well carry on driving into Cambridge. Good for commuters from Sawston and beyond though.
Strongly oppose	Reading this YOU have already made your minds up where transport links will be so why on earth do you even have the audacity to even waste the general publics time and the small idea that we the public actually have a say What a load of rubbish let's forget where food comes from oh I know it comes from overseas but sadly only the fat cats will be able to afford it,

Support	Positive
Strongly oppose	It will spoil the village
Strongly support	No strong views either way
No opinion	Proposed stops are okay but to be of benefit it needs to go to either the Babraham park and ride or the new proposed A11 park and ride. Also should really link to within easy walking distance to Granta park.
Oppose	the proposed route is of no use to residents of Great Shelford, Stapleford or Sawston as the proposed stops are completely outside the villages/town. This looks like a publicly funded Addenbrookes and AstraZeneca staff transport only.
Strongly support	It was save on congestion around all areas so very good idea
Strongly support	In principle support the stops as can see it takes account of main customer group but wondered if Little Shelford/Hauxton could benefit more?
Strongly support	the fewer the better

Support	No strong preference.
Support	They all have different relevance. Site C is really for those coming from the East ie Haverhill and beyond and the other 2 are for the medical sites.
Support	For this to be a worthwhile investment, I think it is important that there is a stop giving good access to the Babraham and Granta Park campuses. I also think it is vital that such a huge investment is built in a way that will facilitate future expansion of the CAM system to Linton and to Haverhill to serve the substantial communities of commuters coming from this direction with a
Strongly support	Babraham Road in Sawston
Strongly support	It's hard to see where else you could have stops although it rather misses out the Abingtons and it would be good to have strong walking / cycling routes to those villages.
Strongly support	As I live in Linton I would definitely use the park and ride and also the proposed cycleway.
Strongly support	As a resident of Trumpington the stop by the bus stop would be very useful, especially if the existing guided bus can also use it. I also have family near the [village] stop so very useful also.
Support	These are sensible locations. It should include the starting point of Granta Park.
Strongly support	Would not use A (travelling on A1307)

Support	To promote significant uptake of the public transport route the stops and hub termination needs to be within reasonable reach of employment centres. As things stand the route only favours movements into Cambridge, in particular to the CBC. Neither Granta Park (>3000 staff) or Babraham (>1700 staff) will have reasonable walking distances from the nearest stop/hub unless hub
Strongly support	A brilliant idea to reduce congestion
Strongly support	I would like to see how this route links to further plans for the rail network. If it is not joined up then this is a fail.  The route should link to an EXISTING station - probably at Shelford.
Oppose	Proposed Shelford and Stapleford stops are an intrusion into unspoilt green belt and traffic light junctions on the roads are unacceptable
No opinion	The critical part is getting a fast reliable transport link in to the centre. The scheme only goes half way in.
Strongly support	Better if linked to Granta Park
Support	
Strongly support	All excellent locations.
Strongly support	Without frequent and reliable connecting bus services, I fear that those with reduced mobility may find some of the stops (e.g. for Sawston, Stapleford, and Great Shelford) beyond their reach.

Support	There needs to be an extra stop in Cambridge station (and ideally one further in town center) for this route to be more useful and more popular.
Strongly support	The stops seem to be appropriately spaced and at the right locations for access
Support	Better provision for cycling is required. Wider/Segregated paths more parking esp around bus stops.
Support	The proposals seem reasonable.
Support	They are sensible.
Oppose	They will encourage further development in the area and are remote, so will encourage more car parking.
Strongly oppose	The proposed locations do nothing to address the really transport issues in this area. The increased development and the growth of the industrial hub in Haverhill and the surrounding villages has greatly increased the traffic into Cambridge. These proposals will do nothing to solve/ease this issue. It merely helps the science park and create a greater bottle neck of traffic
Strongly oppose	too far away from village centres to be useful.
Strongly support	Due to the off-road nature of the route, it means the stop locations are located outside of the south Cambridge villages - there needs to be good pathways/cycleways to connect the routes out of the villages to the proposed stops to help users get there. If access to the stops is poor then it won't be a facility that is used or appreciated by residents of



Strongly support	I am happy with these stop locations as I live close to the [road name]. However, it is quite far from the majority of Sawston to this location which may mean that fewer people from the Pampisford end of the village will use this service.
Strongly support	they are fine to a point but do not go far enough to stop the bad congestion at Linton so I would suggest extending the service to Linton so as to free up that bottle neck.
Strongly support	I think that an additional bus stop could be considered near Granta Park, where hundreds of peopel commute everyday and could take advantage of this new route.
No opinion	
Strongly support	
Strongly support	As they are on the oustskirts of the villages, the proposed blue dotted connectors are essential
Strongly support	It must stop in all villages
Support	They are too far outside of the villages and should be closer to village edges, the remote locations will not encourage walking especially in poor weather.
No opinion	Why would anyone living in central Sawston walk for 15 minutes to catch a bus which only takes them to the Biomedical Campus, where they then have to wait for up to 15 minutes for a busway 'A', which takes at least 20 minutes to get to New Sqaure, a 6 minutes walk from the city centre? Total journey time: 51 to 68 minutes.

Oppose	Make the road better for car users not buses.. one bus every thirty minutes doesn't warrant its own road.. Congestion is already horrendous during peak work times and this work starting next week will add to the frustration already felt daily..
Oppose	Will slow traffic
Strongly oppose	Complete waste of money!!... surrounding towns are already serviced by stagecoach citylink buses. Your local SURROUNDING areas are crying out for rail connections NOT buses!
Strongly oppose	
Oppose	OK, but this whole scheme is a glorified park and ride service, as evidenced by the terminus which is not a destination in itself. I would prefer the old Haverhill railway to be reopened to Haverhill and intermediate stations developed.
Support	Stop locations look reasonable, although are a long way from the centres of the villages
Strongly support	
Strongly support	Just need to make sure people can access stops easily by foot and cycle, with somewhere secure to leave bikes. The Sawston stop is on the very edge of the village and quite a walk for some residents.
Strongly support	They seem well chosen for easy access to the villages.

Strongly support	These seem suitable given the constraints
Strongly support	Good locations
Strongly support	The stops would work well if the connecting bus and greenway are in place.
Strongly support	Very happy and think they are very good
Strongly oppose	The stops will not be used as they are all on outskirts. Cyclists will not use the route as shorter routes exist. Car drivers will not drive to the stops as existing park and ride are better. Nobody will walk 10 minutes to the outskirts of villages to save 10 minutes over existing buses.
Support	
Strongly oppose	Far too expensive. Money could be better spent elsewhere. The volume of traffic will only increase with your proposals and are detrimental to other road uses particularly given that buses only pass through hourly!
Support	They are in the middle of nowhere.
Strongly support	I think it's great that Granta Park will have a better public transport link to the Biomedical campus and the villages in between. It would be good if the stops could be as close to the villages as possible but having a stop for each village is great.

Oppose	Seem sensible
Strongly support	I support stop C as it's the most convenient to reach from Haverhill.
Support	
Support	Whilst I understand why the route (and consequently the locations of the stops) avoid the built up areas of villages, the size of Sawston means those people living at the southern end of the village (not even shown on the map) will be more than 1.5 miles from the only stop. Given the travel time for the City 7, most will inevitably continue to drive.
Support	Make sense in supporting local communities
Strongly oppose	Far to close to existing dwellings on Hinton Way in Great Shelford. Spoils beautiful green belt landscape.
Strongly oppose	Dreadful - they are nowhere near where anyone lives. The crest of a hill is a daft place to put public transport stops. The intention seems to be to reduce car use - yet by siting these stops outside the communities you will driving up car use.
Strongly support	All are very good idea
Strongly support	All options are good. Option C, if it had car parking could massively reduce traffic in from Haverhill to Cambridge, significantly improving the quality of life and ease of transport across the entire area.

Strongly support	Stops are in great locations for me personally, living in east Sawston and daily commuting to Addenbrookes.
Strongly support	They are about right
Support	Locations in respect to villages they serve need consideration. I.e. lighting to and from on paths, drop off and collection facilities, safe cycle storage.
Strongly oppose	The stops in Haverhill Road and Hinton Way are likely to lead to increased on-road parking in Stapleford and Great Shelford by users of the new route.
Strongly support	Good
Strongly support	It is a pity the Great Shelford and Stapleford stops aren't closer to the village centres. I note the comments about construction disruption, but this will only be in the short term.
Support	Another stop in Great Shelford at the intersection with Granham's road would likely be of help to many users.
Support	
Strongly support	Improving connections between Cambridge, Shelford, Stapleford, Sawston and Babraham is crucial for the future of SE Cambridge. I had some initial concerns that the stops would be too far from the centre of the towns to be useful. However, upon reflection, I understand that putting them any closer would prove challenging, and undoubtedly keeping the route as completely

Support	Convenient for residents of Sawston, Stapleford and Gt Shelford
Support	The stop locations seem logical based on the proposed route, although none of them are particularly close to the towns. It would be better if the route could run closer to the edges of Sawston and Great Shelford. I would also ensure there is a bus stop as close as possible to Granta Park, so people don't have to walk far in bad weather.
Support	Option B would be my preferred location
Strongly oppose	The stop locations do not make sense - the Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston proposed stops are all well outside of the villages in question and it would take 10-15 mins for most of the residents to get to them. A better solution would be putting in a Cambridge South rail station so that the Shelford and Whittlesford (and even a new branch line to Sawston if req'd)
Support	
Strongly support	I favour B or C, since A may dissuade Haverhill traffic from diverting to use this site. I think that access to and exit from to B & C must be simple (in the face of traffic continuing to and from Cambridge) to encourage their use.
Strongly support	Good locations
Support	
Strongly oppose	Stops are too far away from centre of Shelford and Stapleford. The scheme does not improve connectivity for Stapleford, Great Shelford and Sawston: it bypasses them.

Support	Yes, stops are good locations
Strongly oppose	Strongly oppose this illconceived, unsustainable & environmentally destructive project.
Strongly support	The Greater Shelford stop seems to be quite far out. More information about the proposed Cambridge South Station would be very interesting.
Support	Seem sensible
Support	
No opinion	I am strongly opposed to the proposed site C. As a resident of Abington and [road], I have significant concerns about the traffic and pollution this site would cause. Not to mention the destruction of the village character. I would urge you to reconsider this site as an option.
Support	
Support	There needs to be adequate parking, easy access to and from A11
Strongly oppose	Haverhill is taking huge expansion with something like 4000 houses being built. These proposals are to throttle commuter and access routes through to try and force people to use public transport. In principle this should be a good idea for commuting generally. In practice the current bus routes are slow & inadequate, with the service

Support	These stops seem to meet the needs, apart from Sawston which appears to be well outside the village.
Support	They seem adequate, other than the stop at Sawston which appears somewhat outside the village
Support	Fine
Support	The positions of the stops look logical. The main concern I would have is ensuring safe pedestrian and bicycle access (i.e. good quality well lit footpaths and cycle paths)
Support	
Strongly oppose	I feel that these proposed stop locations will have a negative impact on the area.
Support	They seem reasonable
Support	They seems functional.



Support	No view - I will use as a cyclist
Support	There are major issues with the current busway buses: The runtime is too short, last bus leave train station at 8pm and missing many london commuters behind. The bus goes all way around the hospita before stopping before the bridge leaving many Trumpington resident frustrated with 15 mins longer journey around the hospital! Linking this to the proposed rout will only
Strongly support	
Strongly support	
Strongly support	They seem a sensible compromise between proximity to the settlements and not having to route the busway too close to existing housing.
Support	
Oppose	They will encourage over development of green land
Strongly support	The suggested Sawston stop is currently a fair way away from any housing; the route would then pass annoyingly close to future housing. Could we plan for the future and have Sawston East and Sawston West stops, please? Not all stops need to have car parking - a Sawston West stop could be a simple car-free stop, like the Fen Drayton Lakes stop on the northern guided
Strongly support	Good

Strongly oppose	<p>They're in completely the wrong places. They lie outside (well outside) the populated area; distances from housing to them are far too high to encourage usage - we're talking typically a mile, or a 20 minute walk.</p> <p>And there are no stops at Babraham, Granta Park, or the Abingtons, at all.</p>
Strongly support	<p>Ideally, the stops in Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston would be more central - to encourage more users - but I can understand why it would not be feasible to have the new link running through the villages.</p>
Strongly support	<p>Strongly support Hinton Way</p>
Strongly support	
Strongly support	<p>Well thought out</p>
Strongly support	<p>I think it will offer commuters a safer route to travel from the nearby villages to the Biomedical Campus directly.</p>
Strongly oppose	<p>These will cause congestion and CO2 emissions for the local residents of Haverhill Road and Hinton Way as well as a significant noise impact.</p>
Support	<p>Please consider accessibility for disabled travellers living near the proposed S Cambridge Station proposed site.</p> <p>We also need to access services and are reliant on busses for access to Cambridge and to train stations.</p> <p>Current travel time from Trumpington to Cambridge is 40 minutes. Yes, really.</p>
Strongly support	<p>Sawston one is the most important for me, and that is okay so long as cycle routes join up</p>

Support	
Support	Option C would likely result in more delays and will be more expensive
Strongly support	Strongly Support
Oppose	The whole route goes through green belt and should be stopped. In particular the section in between Nine Wells and Hinton Way should not go ahead and the route should follow the existing cycle path and railway line for as far as possible.
Strongly oppose	Stops are ok.
Support	Could they be more integrated within the villages (eg within Shelford, Stapleford) to encourage use? As they are they are essentially parkway stations and difficult for most to walk to - so need bikes (up hill) with only very limited parking.
Strongly support	Good compliment to transport already available
Strongly support	They are not central to the settlements, which would be better. But given the aim, I think they can work. Good cycle parking should be provided and cycle lanes.
Support	I like the proposed stop locations.

Strongly support	
Oppose	
Strongly support	Stapleford and Sawston stops may be slightly too far outside of town for practical non-commuting use. Appreciate the desire to not impact on existing homes or businesses - perhaps there are plans to encourage growth around the new stops?
Oppose	The focussed development of Addenbrookes (Cambridge Biomedical Campus) should never of happened if there was not the infrastructure to support it. Better to have distributed sites that avoided this traffic focus. The problems we face in Abington -[road] - is the large amount of lorry traffic on the A1307 that this scheme does nothing to deal with and indeed is likely to
Strongly support	
Support	I am pleased the transport route and hub are to be built as they will speed up travel to/from common destinations and mean more people in villages can leave their car at home. I prefer Option B as it is easily accessible from A11 and A1307 but the entrance will be on a more minor road so will not add more complexity to
Strongly support	
Strongly support	Ensure ease of accessibility from / to the A11. Site B looks best in that respect.
Oppose	In my view the fundamental problem with this scheme is that it does not connect the centres of population - the line will be 3/4 mile from the centres of Shelford & Sawston yet the stops are shown without any parking. Will residents walk or cycle this distance to a bus stop on a cold wet winter morning along, in the case of Shelford, a narrow footpath & busy road?

Strongly support	
Support	Good
Support	OK - though a shame that on your map you used circles to show stops, wince qt first I assumed these were roundabouts.
Strongly support	It would be better to have the shelford stop closer to the train station rather than the proposed location. If you insist on keeping that location, we will need much better pavement/cycle connections between the shelford station and the bus stop. Right now that road is dangerous for cyclists and walkers.
Support	
Support	
Strongly support	Support
Strongly support	Support, but there appears to be no parking places.
Strongly support	

Support	Would be better to include a Granta Park stop as well
Support	
Strongly support	I think they should have much greater space for bicycles. I can envisage myself as well as many others, cycling to one of the stations, lock the bike, get the bus, and then take another bike left locked at the other station for the rest of the commute. This would happen both ways: people going into town (and using the Biomedical campus as an intermediate stop) as well as
Support	I think they will just encourage building more housing on green belt land and it's a shame they aren't more convenient for current Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston communities. However, I am sympathetic to the constraints laid out about space and cost to retro fit this route. On the whole I strongly support investment in public transport and I think this is a crucial
Strongly support	Good choice of stop locations
Strongly support	It would be better if they were closer to the centre of Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston but I can understand that this would provide some interesting challenges and raise costs.
Support	good
Support	
Strongly support	

Oppose	The problem for people travelling from Haverhill is the time it takes to get through Linton not near Four Wentways so I do not see how this will improve the time it takes to get to Cambridge and ease congestion at Linton.
Support	Numbers of colleagues living in Sawston and those who need to use the A11 and A505 deserve better transport options than they currently have. A direct and dedicated link between Sawston and the Campus would assist many residents in their daily commute.
Strongly support	look well located for access to all the villages on the way
Strongly support	
Support	How much is this going to impact on traffic through these small and already busy villages? If the bus goes through Babraham to come out onto the fast road at the top of the village, is there finally going to be something done about that junction? The new entrance to Babraham Research Campus was built to reduce the flow of traffic, will this not just increase it again?
Support	I support the idea but there should be a MUCH bigger shared use path. I would suggest a separate pedestrian/cycle route, possibly on opposite sides of the busway, AND either a barrier between buses and cyclists OR a grassy gap of a few meters (as in some parts of the north busway).
Support	Logical stop positions.
Strongly support	This is great for connecting Shelford and Sawston with central Cambridge.
Strongly support	The proposed stop locations appear to be sensible.

Oppose	Please prioritize public transport and sustainable travel instead of building more roads. We need to discourage driving by providing feasible alternatives.
Support	That junction tends to be very congested in the morning already, so the direct access to the hub right from the junction might increase the traffic jam.
Strongly support	Perfect
Strongly support	In general I find the fewer stops the better.
Strongly support	As few as possible better for quicker journey times from A11 to Biomedical Campus.
Strongly support	Support
Strongly oppose	This is a waste of valuable agricultural land and green belt land. The A1307 should be upgraded instead.
Support	It is good idea. As I am living in Haverhill if the bus from a new park and ride will be free than I will park my car on new park and ride and come to hospital so that will help with the traffic.
Strongly support	Na I commute by bike



Strongly support	The proposed stop locations look realistic as long as there is sufficient service for the anticipated number of users.
Strongly support	I think this is good to provide better links for poorly served residential and business areas.
No opinion	
Support	fine
Support	
Strongly oppose	I don't see the point of these stops. The purpose of the scheme is to create huge car parks for the highly paid employees of companies on the biomedical campus. Very few residents of Stapleford or the Shelfords work on the campus.
Strongly support	
No opinion	Too far away from the population centres. Citi bus links to the stop locations would help but that would take away travel journeys and income from Stagecoach which they would obviously not be happy with. No good at all for those with a disability or mobility problems.
Strongly support	

Strongly oppose	The proposed locations will make Abington a car park. They will increase pollution and not benefit anyone except for Addenbrooke's bio-medical campus employee's.
Strongly support	Good
Strongly support	
Strongly support	Fantastic, particularly the planned stop on Haverhill Road in Stapleford, this will make it far easier for our whole family to travel to work and school, thank you
Strongly support	Appear to be the most sensible sites given the existing built environment
Support	Good, however, I would support the restitution of the railway along this line with the easterly stop being where Pampisford station used to be
Support	The stops do not appear to be in the centre of the villages, but on the outskirts.... If you live/work in the villages, surely you will want to hop on the bus straight away, not walk for a mile to the nearest stop? Are the bus lines integrated with the existing guided bus routes?
Strongly support	
Support	No strong views; all are relatively easy to access from the villages they serve.

Strongly support	The link to the Cambridge Bio-medical Campus is critical for my use of this route. Without it, the only benefit would be the potential reduction in traffic into Cambridge, making my drive easier.
Strongly support	Site A or B look most appropriate and don't need added expense of a bridge.
Support	About the right amount
Support	All good
Oppose	They don't help or apply to me at all. The message received states that you are "improving journey times and linking communities and employment sites in the area south east of Cambridge will be of great interest to the majority of employees here at Granta Park." The majority of people I know at Granta Park, are based on the A1307 in Haverhill, Horseheath, Linton etc. I would
No opinion	More work needs to be done to include traffic from the haverhill and newmarket directions including surrounding villages as many people do not live in Cambridge as it is too expensive
Strongly support	
Strongly support	Excellent
Strongly support	

Strongly support	I hope they will be accessible to nearby residents
Strongly support	Strongly support location of Sawston hub, which would greatly increase the sustainability of the two allocated Local Plan Sites H/1b & H/1c. The hub would be some distance from the village centre however and over 800m from the nearest existing bus stops. It is therefore important that a frequent shuttle service between Sawston centre and the hub is provided, or that a
Support	Personally for us we are more interested in the cycle and walk way, rather than the use of the bus.
Strongly support	
Strongly support	Sounds good
Oppose	Pointless. None of the stops Are convenient to population locations. e.g. Sawston, you may have to walk 20mins to the location. Babraham, is nowhere near.
Strongly oppose	Stapleford is earmarked as stop. It is already unpleasant to access Gog Magog Hills to go for a walk as the traffic goes too fast down Haverhill Road. 1. I am concerned that the the proposed stop in Stapleford will be another obstacle to accessing walking into the countryside.
Strongly support	Adequate
Strongly support	

Support	Not directly affected
Support	no impact
Support	Would it be possible to also include a stop near Granta Park as this would help connect the Park to Cambridge better, especially for visitors and so reduce the number of road users/taxis.
Strongly oppose	The stop locations are not convenient for Sawston, Stapleford or Shelford
Support	There should be a cycle path all the way from Haverhill to Cambridge
Strongly support	
Support	I believe they make sense and are located close to population and employment centres.
Oppose	
Support	Its excellent

Strongly support	
Strongly support	Seems comprehensive enough
Strongly support	They are appropriate locations that are at the edges of each village avoiding congestion in the village centres. The one in sawston can also support traffic to the proposed Cambridge city football stadium.
Strongly support	Good
Support	Seem reasonable.
Support	Seem reasonable.
Support	The locations seem reasonable. It would be useful to also have a stop closer to Trumpington as under current proposals it seems to fall just slightly far from the Cambridge Biomedical stop and the Great Shelford stop for e.g. people who can't cycle, small children, etc. and there is a lot of housing here that currently isn't efficiently serviced by public transit.
Strongly support	These are fine
Strongly support	Given the proposed route the proposed stop locations seems to be optimal

Oppose	Seem fairly sensible but don't know if it matches the demand
Support	Proposed route the Sawston bypass an underused access route to the A505/A1307/A11/M11 consideration to this route for HGV traffic access from Babraham Road Sawston to be diverted through the Witch road (ie widened and improved and a connection cycle path from Babraham to the A505 cycle path built and underused since the Tour de France 2014. So my view on the
Support	Needs to explain how the buses will cope
Strongly oppose	There is more important things that need money than waste on a cycle path that would not have enough use not value for public money
Support	To have this extended to Haverhill, Suffolk, suggested hub at Haverhill Research Park.
Strongly support	Stop A is the only logical long term option as it allows future extension to Haverhill and also avoids distraction of protected trees that are alongside the A1307. Stop C appears inefficient
Support	Okay no
Oppose	It seems a real problem (and a huge shame!) that all of the stops are in the open countryside, instead of the towns they are supposed to serve. I strongly support the busway as a whole but in practice I'd need to keep driving between Trumpington, Gt Shelford and Sawston under this route option.
Support	

Support	The stop locations look fine. The connecting cycling lanes must be built early on to prevent people using cars to get to the stops.
No opinion	I am unsure how much the intermediate stops would be used as they are remote from the main population centres of each village (except perhaps Sawston).
Strongly support	I'd like to be sure there was adequate connectivity to the Babraham Research Campus
Support	The stops proposed are valuable to link local villages to the CAM service into the biomedical campus. It doesnt link the railways stations of Great Shelford and Whittlesford 'hub' at the present, or Sanger Centre at Hinxtton which perhaps would also use this route to out of Cambridge.
Strongly support	
Support	They seem too far from the housing. People would still need transport to get to the stops. Is there to be a stop at Granta Park?
Strongly support	
Strongly support	
Oppose	



Strongly support	
Support	Stops should be kept minimal such that journey time is short.
Oppose	Must regularly visit Addenbrookes.
Support	Seem reasonable to me
Strongly support	good
Strongly support	
Support	People will still drive as they are on the edge of settlements. Should be build on brownfield sites.
Strongly support	All good but is there going to be sufficient parking at the opposite end to Cambridge to allow use from people who live between Haverhill and Babraham? Alternatively can this, in the future, be extended further towards Haverhill as the road seems to have its dangers, albeit created by most of the users!

Support	I feel that the stops are very much on the outskirts of the villages (looking at the map) so would they be easily accessible to everyone? Would it be better to have them further into the villages so that people have easy access to companies in those areas?
Support	
Support	What are the results of Environmental Assessments for each of the proposed stop locations and the land between them? What is the impact for the River Granta and Bury Farm? I only support more detailed proposals if relevant reports and assessments are favourable.
Strongly oppose	The whole idea is misconceived & should not happen.
Support	
Support	They seem fine.
Support	I live in balsham so it would be good if there was a service from balsham to abington.
Strongly oppose	The stop locations seem poorly positioned from a road safety point of view, due to the risk of increasing traffic to those stops on poorly scaled roads.
Support	

Support	The Sawston stop is quite far from a lot of the village. Not sure how much use it would get by people who live far from Babraham Road.
Strongly support	Well located.
Strongly support	Great, at the moment no more stops are needed however I am sure future developments are considered and therefore more stops can be accommodated if required.
Support	
Strongly support	Extra stop in Great/Little Abington would be helpful
Strongly support	Stops are well placed
Strongly support	
Support	No provision for parking, particularly in Stapleford and Shelford. Biomedical campus only makes sense if there is a Cambridge South Train Station and link to guided bus into Cambridge.
Support	Too remote for many villagers if they have to walk. If by bicycle will Busway transport accommodate bicycles, if not what happens at destinations without a bicycle? this could be relevant for Sawston in particular as farthest from destinations.

Support	I support the location of the proposed stops.
Support	These are all a long way from the centre of each village, so cannot imagine villagers walking to these in inclement weather. Therefore, these are really suitable for people with bicycles, not pedestrians.
Strongly support	I think it is important to provide connectivity for the Babraham site as well as Granta Park, so I favour Option B. I am also glad that Sawston, Stapleford and Shelford will all get stops too.
Support	
Strongly oppose	Too far away from the village centres to be useful and too close to some people's homes.
Strongly oppose	Not needed
Support	The route need to be extend into Granta park Abington for me to use it.
Strongly support	Is there a stop in Sawston as well ? There should be, and it looks like there's one on the map. There will need to be a stop in Sawston since a lot of people live there and go to Cambridge or Granta Park every day. There will also be a large football ground in Sawston, which will intermittently have a huge number of people travelling to/from Sawston.
Oppose	Traffic exiting the A505 / A11 at the Fourwentways round about is already horrendous between 8 -9 am, with traffic queuing down the A505. It's dangerous! Cars travelling ~70mph on the A11 are having to try and join stationary traffic on the A505. Many mornings I have to travel one junction up to Fulbourn and loop back down to Granta Park as I can't physically join

Support	I've worked at Granta Park for [number] years. The suggested access to site A is ridiculous! That little bit of road is full every rush hour with cars and cyclists vying for space. Wanting to send a couple extra thousand cars or so through there is ludicrous and highly dangerous for the cyclists that commute to Granta Park
Strongly oppose	I don't think its justified with the fees, also disruption in a lot of areas.
Strongly support	Generally excellent but I have reservations about the stop in Shelford. I believe that few people in Shelford will walk to the stop because of the distance from the village centre and its peripheries. Either a regular bus link from the village (could be a problem with the railway crossing often being closed) needs to be part of the plan or more car parking is needed adjacent
	None of the stops are in particularly useful locations. Site A is in an already heavily congested junction, which some mornings queues back onto the A505; Site B is probably the least bad option; Site Chas no plausible benefits associated with it. All three sites are too far from either Granta Park or Babraham Research Campus to be of benefit without some sort of shuttle
Strongly oppose	
Strongly oppose	this would mainly benefit a relatively sample number of people who wanted to go between campuses. it does not properly address the problems of getting an and out of the City itself. I note that the later part of this consultation document doesn't include train travel! This is not righty!
Strongly oppose	These locations are simply the most ridiculous proposal for some of the most congested approaches to Cambridge and the surrounding area. A more northern approach towards Fulbourne and even north of that straight off the A11 and or A14 would be a more viable alternative.
Strongly oppose	
Oppose	None

Strongly support	
Strongly oppose	unecessary and not required but causing irreparable damage to nature
Strongly oppose	Why? No need to cut into countryside to save limited time. The extra traffic & congestion it will cause
Oppose	The proposed stops at Hinton Way, Great Shelford and at Haverhill Road, Stapleford are too remote from their village centres. They are unlikely to be used sufficiently to justify the cost of installing them. No prospective user of the busway is going to walk or cycle over a mile to get to either of these stops.
Strongly oppose	These are odd locations, right on the edge of the villages of Stapleford, Shelford and Sawston with limited obviously s benefit for many residents who will need to drive/ cycle/ walk to the stops. What are the plans for car parking? If people cycle to the stop in Stapleford/ Shelford they might as well cycle into the biomedical campus
Strongly support	Locations seem sensible. All stop locations should include properly secured bike storage. Open bike storage areas are notoriously rich pickings for bike thieves and will discourage people to use that mode of transport.
Oppose	26 buses an hour. Can't the bus system we all ready have be improved?
Support	The distance of the proposed stop locations from Shelford and Stapleford village centres make it unlikely that village residents will use the new service for local journeys. Assuming parking at these stops will not be provided they will be only lightly used and so should be designated as 'Request Stops'
No opinion	I live in Balsham and feel cut off.

Oppose	They do not take into account the bottleneck of Linton in the journey from Haverhill
Strongly oppose	The proposed stop locations are all some distance from Sawston, Stapleford and Great shelford villages so most people will have a walk or a cycle (or even drive) of 1/2 to 1 mile to get to the stop locations which will completely offset any time savings due to a shorter bus travel time and will significantly reduce the use. Disabled or the elderly will find these sites almost
Strongly oppose	The proposed stops in Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston are an the outskirts of the villages and are unlikely to be used without creating additional traffic issues with cars parking on the roads or the introduction of double yellow lines impacting the quality of life for existing residents. It is hard to imagine regardless that these stops will be well used, particularly as much of Shelford
Strongly oppose	Unnecessary.
Strongly oppose	The proposed route and stop in Hinton Way would have a massive negative impact in regards to restricted access with a second baton barrier similar to the railway crossing, increased traffic, parking along Hinton Way, disruption to natural habitats for wildlife and is strongly opposed to by many local residents with similar views. The huge costs of constructing the bus line
Support	
Strongly oppose	
Strongly oppose	Great shelford and Stapleford are already used as a rat run and congestion is high in rush hour traffics or simply when the train bollards are down. We do not need this 'service' in Stapleford or Great Shelford. I live [road] of this proposal and strongly oppose it.

Strongly oppose	Why should local residents have their surroundings ruined by months of construction, congestion, noise and pollution? We do not want this 'service' in Stapleford or Great Shelford. We have hardly any green areas left or areas to walk dogs.
	A bit far from most of the houses, which means it's quieter for the houses but means less people will find the stops convenient to use without driving to them. This would mean people parking up and down the nearby roads, on verges, and other nearby hard standing eg Stapleford Pavilion car park.
Strongly support	Appear logical
No opinion	Route/Stops should be closer to places of work e.g. Babraham research centre
Strongly support	It's a shame that the stops are not closer to the villages that the route runs through
Strongly support	
Strongly oppose	The idea of cutting across farmland and destroying a valuable green space (albeit farmland) is abhorrent. It will lead to over development and a huge loss of quality of living. There is plenty of space to build bus lanes alongside the A1307 and keep all the transport in one location rather than create more webs of roads. Why not make the footpath along haverhill road into
Oppose	Balsham We have no decent bus service We are not able to access any hub without a car How about a hub and bus in our village? All money spent on improving services that are already sufficient
Strongly support	



Strongly support	Brilliant THANKS for sharing
Oppose	Too far from Lt Shelford to benefit local residents.
Support	stop locations are fine. I am more interested in how the route links to connecting villages for cycling purposes.
Support	Abington should have a bus route that allows us to get to Sawston.
Support	
Strongly support	They seem logical to me. But will there be enough parking? Also now that I am unable to cycle or walk far, will there be a connecting bus service from Sawston? My concern would also be the effect on the current bus service which I use every week. I would be housebound without the current No7 bus.
Strongly support	No problem with them
Strongly support	They are all well placed in relation to existing villages and roads. A contentious issue is the provision of car parking at these stops. Understandably, the new transport route must be located on the edge of Sawston, Stapleford and Gt Shelford. These are all large villages and many people will find it too far to walk or cycle to these crossing stops - especially
Strongly oppose	I have no views.

Support	Good.
Strongly support	Suitable
Strongly support	
No opinion	Any proposed improvement to the transport system is pointless until the current agreement with Stagecoach has been terminated and a proper bus company has been appointed to replace it.
Strongly support	The proposed route is very convenient for both workers of Granta park and Babraham research center. It also provides much needed transport links for communities such as Sawston. The authority must ensure that the stop for Sawston is within walking distance from the village so that community members will make use of the public transport and potentially use their cars
Strongly oppose	
Support	Fine, no problem with these.
Support	
Oppose	Totally messy around Granta Park, and doesn't really support that location which would greatly benefit from being included as a stop, rather than being bypassed totally.

Oppose	Too far for easy access by walkers. My problem with the whole scheme is that it is another acreage of unnecessary infrastructure to shave minutes off journey times and is too heavily influenced by big bus franchises. Better outcome would be derived by a network of shuttle buses - fast, frequent & free - around all the villages, combined with measures to reduce car use. A
No opinion	
Strongly support	Travel on public transport from Sawston into Cambridge is not good. Even using the park & ride isn't always quick and convenient. We need the new system to stop at least once in Sawston. The Babraham Road end is good for me but a long walk for those who live at the other end of the village. Not everyone can ride a bike for various reasons and it's about time public
Strongly support	They seem well spread out, close to the village locations and the science campuses.
Oppose	problem in terms of parking at Hinton Way stop .If people cannot park at the stop in an off road car park then they will park along Hinton Way .There is already great difficulty passing parked cars along Hinton Way. This plan will purely turn Hinton way into a very long thin congested car park along its entire length for the biomedical campus which is the next stop along .Please
No opinion	This looks very sensible however I do worry about the extra congestion this would add to the A505 that regularly queues from the mcDonalds roundabout to the M11 virtually all day. IF jn 9 was made accessible from the north that may however be solved
Support	Look OK
No opinion	I am more interested in how any of these schemes might link to a currently non-existent direct service from, say, Trumpington Park and Ride, to the city centre.
Strongly support	Stop locations look good.

Support	I am retired and live in Thaxted CM6 with a need to access Adenbrookes, currently driving to Babraham Road. This proposal doesn't seem to be any help to me personally but I can see how it might be good for CBG Biometrical Campus people.
Oppose	Difficult to comment on as not knowing which hub will be adopted. They all work in their own way
Strongly oppose	Great if they were on a light railway from Haverhill via Linton
Strongly oppose	No view.
Strongly support	I am strongly for the proposed stop on Babraham Road in Sawston.
Support	Providing that there is suitable footpaths, cycle ways and access for disabled I believe they are in the correct locations.
Strongly support	It makes sense to have the stops in the locations as suggested on the proposed route.
Support	
Support	I would want to go into Sawston high street and it is not clear how good the connecting bus service would be from the Babraham stop.

Strongly oppose	We have enough stagecoach buses to get people in to Cambridge
Support	No Preference
Strongly support	Stop B looks best to me, BUT I think this proposal should be considered together with and be part of a solution to the horrendous peak time traffic problems at the BP/MacDonald roundabout on the A505, which impact so much on the M11 at J10. It is so dangerous. It is only a question of time before there is a serious accident there. In my view this problem should be
Strongly support	They all seem to be designed with the environment and local village impact carefully considered, so ideal as far as I can see.
Support	There do need to be more stops near centres of habitation to minimise travelling to the stops . Links to villages across the A11 and the proposed North Uttlesford Garden town will alter the dynamics of the whole proposal, and development east of Cambridge. For example there will be no need for further expansion of Haverhill or within villages
Support	The proposed stop locations are well placed.
Support	These look fine
Oppose	Option B seems the best option based on it having little financial impact on the residents nearby. I would imagine that there would be no need for financial recompense to the home owners directly impacted by option C
Strongly support	Excellent & well thought out

Support	
Strongly support	
Strongly support	I fully support the proposed locations.
Oppose	
Support	All makes sense
Oppose	It has come too late as I have just retired, but anyway I would be against more of the green belt being destroyed. Whenever a homeowner wants a small extension on a small house in acres of land, on the old land settlement it is rejected as being green belt, but Granta Park can put massive ugly buildings up and this hub can eat up acres of greenery. Even the Babraham
Support	Fully support the proposed route and stops as listed below.
Strongly oppose	Too far from Shelford and Stapleford to be useful. No car parking. Who will use these stops? Indeed who will use the transport at all? Cars have been counted but would the drivers and passengers use the proposed new system?
Strongly oppose	You are doing nothing to help people get from Haverhill to Abington. The A1307 needs upgrading/addressing before you spend £155m+. People have problems getting from Haverhill to Abington & you are totally ignoring this issue.

Support	They are OK but very much on the edge of the villages. I can understand why but they may not be attractive to those who currently drive!
Strongly oppose	Stops at Stapleford and Great Shelford are irrelevant. You would need to cycle to get to either stop and if you can cycle from the village to the stop (going away from Cambridge for most people) you would simply cycle into Cambridge along the existing cycle paths. You are massacring our Green Belt with no benefit to us!
Support	I think there needs to be a circular route around the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, taking in Robinson Way (For the Rosie), the Forvie Site, the stop at Outpatients, along Puddicombe Way for CRUK, and then Francis Crick Avenue. CBC is a huge site and this must be taken into consideration. The stop at the front of Outpatients is crucial.
Strongly oppose	Will be built onto Agricultural land used for producing crops for food. Service is not for benefit of local residence our village and fields are nearly in the way of the campus!
Support	Support
Strongly support	
Strongly oppose	I fail to see the benefits of the stops in Haverhill Road and Hinton Way and it would be better to make the Babraham Road stop in Sawston a mre defined stop with car parking.
Strongly oppose	It would damage the green belt around Stapleford that attracted me to the area in the first place. Other alternatives around the existing infrastructure seem to make much more sense.
Strongly oppose	I think they are a ludicrous choice of location. Given there are no parking spaces, only for bikes and 5-6 disabled slots, who on earth is going to use the stops, to get in or off at Stapleford or Great Shelford? The stops are pretty in the middle of a field. This will simply encourage me to use my car - but will go via Trumpington Road instead, as there will be traffic jams on

Support	
Strongly oppose	Dreadful- will bring more traffic and parking problems to the village whilst causing traffic chaos with constant traffic light stoppages.
Support	They appear to be a set of evenly spaced stops, with reasonable access from those 3 villages. Probably the best that can be done in the circumstances.
Oppose	Shelford and Stapleford locations are too remote from the villages to give satisfactory access to most people. If they are used extensively there will be severe parking congestion in the roads near the stops
No opinion	No strong views
Oppose	There needs to be a direct link from the new to town centre in order to be useful and reduce congestion. The current plans only seem to address the needs of a small minority of users of the A1307.
Strongly oppose	The stop on Hinton Way is irrelevant as anyone cycling from Shelfords and would simply continue along the DNA path towards Cambridge and the stop at CBC.
Oppose	Cannot support the idea of going across my favourite quiet field . Leaves the stapleford stop in a location that doesn't work for anyone
No opinion	



Strongly support	
Strongly support	<p>ensure good public transport/pedestrian/cycle links to them rather than priorities cars.</p> <p>ensure locals are consulted so that measures can be added to reduce/negate QoL impact.</p>
Support	N/A will be using as cycling route
Strongly support	They look ok
Support	
Support	Perfectly acceptable
Support	The stop locations seem to be fine.
Strongly support	Babraham road stop rather a long way from Sawston for the elderly especially, Suggest this is changed.
Support	They look fine

Support	OK, as long as there are quick and easy links to the proposed South Cambs railway station at Biomedical Campus / Addenbrooks. That won't have much parking on current proposals, so anyone wanting to use public transport from Haverhill needs to be in short walking distance of railway station for onward connections. Also of course, need to be able to link quickly to centre of
Oppose	OK
No opinion	OK
Strongly oppose	None of the village stops serve their village. They are too far out of the existing settlements and up a hill. In any event the existing railway station is nearer. Anyone from these villages wishing to travel north will use the existing no 7 bus or the railway as the busway is so inaccessible.
Support	Sensible locations
Support	
Strongly oppose	Why don't the GCP utilise the railway instead of taking fine agricultural land and invading residents back gardens
Strongly support	Good
Oppose	None

Support	Seem fine
No opinion	The Sawston stop is quite a distance from the bulk of inhabitants - If it's not possible to bring it closer, I think the greenway and bus routes need to consider the large number of houses not currently on these routes (they only take into account the top 1/4 of sawston and do not cater for people living further south in sawston or in pampisford). It is a 20 minute walk from
Strongly oppose	A great place for travellers to pitch up, an eyesore, loss of valuable green areas.
Strongly support	
	Extremely logical
Strongly support	Great.
Support	I think they are a short term stop gap, I believe the money would be better spent on the Cambridge Metro system that serves all the villages as well. If you are serious about future proofing Cambridge and surrounding villages increasing need for transport into Cambridge then implement a proper fix that does not cost more than going in your car and stops cars sitting in
Support	Seem sensible
Support	I don' have detailed views, other than a layperson's perception that in order to encourage as many people to use this as possible the stops need to be as near as possible to the origin and destination points of as many current and future travellers as possible.

Support	Further stops along the A1307 would be welcome
Oppose	Too far from the villages they are supposed to serve.
Support	
Support	
No opinion	To respond to Climate emergency and poverty/austerity this needs to offer a good transport link From/to Haverhill as part of the deal. Working people on low income cannot afford to live in Cambridge. , many live in Haverhill. They have a 50 min journey by bus to work so this needs to be considered in decision making about stops not just for the wealthy middle class to the
No opinion	
Strongly support	
Strongly support	Perfect
Strongly support	Friends living locally who will use say they are acceptable

Support	location of stops good in my view
Strongly oppose	unless you make the park and rides totally free they will never cut traffic as to many parents take there kids to school and to many people that dont have to care tools drivre in to cambridge nothing is being done to sort travel for the construction workers which cambridge needs but doesnt want to see
Strongly oppose	I strongly disagree with the whole concept and see no reason for this busway being through greenbelt land rather than next to the existing road.  I strongly disagree with the stop on Hinton Way. This doesn't really benefit the village residents as it is at the end of the village. It will increase traffic
Strongly oppose	Stops in Shelford, Stapleford and sawston are right on the edge of the villages and are not convenient for most residents. They will also lead to pressure to build housing on the greenbelt
Strongly oppose	see 5) below
Strongly support	
Strongly oppose	
Strongly oppose	I think that it is ridiculous to carve up the countryside for a scheme that I do not believe people will use enough to justify the financial and environmental cost.
Strongly oppose	This is going to wreck our village. A transport link across the fields next to Haverhill Rd will ruin the peace and serenity of that side of stapleford

Strongly oppose	The proposed stop locations are too far outside Stapleford and Shelford to have much value to the residents of these villages but will cause great disruption to both villages by making it very slow to reach the A1307
Strongly oppose	Hinton Way is already dangerous for children and this would increase traffic.
Strongly oppose	Of little use to Stapleford residents of all kinds
Strongly oppose	
Strongly oppose	Oppose strongly - will lead to extensive traffic on these roads and does not help with getting into central Cambridge.
Strongly oppose	They are not positioned well to help the majority of people, currently, unless this is a backdrop was to ruin the green fields that surround our villages, such that the developers can get rich at the misery of others building thousands of poorly made over priced homes, that swamp the already overloaded infrastructure.
Strongly oppose	Extremely concerned about: 1) Residential development in unused field areas. 2) On-road parking in the villages. 3) congestion.
	I recognise the location of the stops is a balancing act. From the plan, all three stops are beyond the perimeter of the built-up area. This is positive for properties close to the busway as there will be less noise. However, the suggested stop locations will limit the number of people who will be prepared to walk or cycle to the stops. Rather, people will be tempted to drive. Since
Strongly support	Appropriate

Support	The proposed Sawston stop is too far out of the main village. A village that size needs two stops.
Support	The current stop locations are ideally placed in my opinion. These stops are well placed to enable residents of the 3 main large residential areas of Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford to access the transport and travel into the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the proposed Cambridge South Station. The proposed stops are also a good central choice for smaller
Strongly oppose	Site A is situated off the A505 on the narrow slip road to Granta Park and Abington and will create much congestion for traffic approaching and leaving on the A505. It will also create congestion for traffic that approaches from both the north and southbound A11 traffic. At present there is a queue every morning and evening of traffic entering and leaving the Granta Park site.
Strongly oppose	At a previous presentation of these plans, I was told by a council representative that 'common sense would prevail, and in actuality, the lines of hedgerows would be followed, so the houses would not have their views blighted, and the farmland would not be carved.' Well common sense has been abandoned. Do you really think we want to
Strongly oppose	The scheme is overall badly conceived hence none of the proposed locations should be relevant !
Strongly oppose	These stop locations will cause more delays and congestion especially on Hinton Way which already has a train line taking out approximately 22 minutes of every hour causing constant traffic and delays. This potential stop will cause further stops. - the route should remain on the main A1307
Strongly oppose	The stop location in Stapleford will cause Cambridge commuters from all points south-east to south-west of Stapleford to fill the nearby streets with parked cars, making travel along Haverhill Road, Bar Lane and Mingle Lane particularly difficult, endangering children playing on the recreation ground and exacerbating the existing dangerous road hazard faced by residents
Support	These sound appropriate
Strongly support	As a resident of Great Abington/Hildersham I strongly feel that only location B is acceptable. It is close enough to the village to make it a practical and convenient option for residents travelling to Cambridge but does not impact on the village environment.

Support	A long way from village centres.
Strongly oppose	We do not see an obvious benefit to positioning a stop in Hinton Way, as those who wish to travel from Great Shelford to the Addenbrookes campus have an excellent point of access from the pre-existing Babraham Park and Ride, which I myself often use.
Strongly oppose	I believe that parking on Hinton way would increase. Once the transit is in place the farm land would become housing and we would loose our "village"
Oppose	Looks as if it destroying more valuable farm land required for food production. Have you thought about that?
Strongly oppose	Great Shelford and Stapleford stops are poorly placed at extremities of the villages. Will be of little benefit. Lack of tie-in to current Babraham Road P&R is also poor.
Support	What is really needed is an off road route all the way to Haverhill. Cosmetic 'improvements' currently underway will do little or nothing to improve traffic flow. Further housing developments in Linton and, in particular, Haverhill, coupled with the opening of the Astra Zeneca headquarters and other developments on the Addenbrookes site will make traffic problems all along
No opinion	See answer to Q10
Strongly oppose	With the buses every few minutes, the stop in Stapleford will cause a significant congestion on the Haverhill Rd, and related to that air pollution.
Strongly support	Although the stop locations are outside of the village centres, this is understandable because of the proposed route. It would be good to see if local bus operators will adjust their routes to service these proposed stop locations.



Oppose	The proposed Cambridge South Railway Station could result in the downgrading of Shelford Railway Station, with more trains stopping at the new station and less trains stopping at Shelford. Hinton Way and Haverhill Road are main roads into the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford. Crossings on these
Strongly oppose	I strongly object to the line itself that stops at Hinton way and therefore do not support the other stops.
Strongly oppose	I'm afraid there will be significant air and noise pollution increase along Haverhill Road in Stapleford due to increased traffic to proposed stop
Strongly oppose	I am opposed to the scheme altogether - I think it is a far too expensive and totally unnecessary. What you should be investing in is giving priority to the existing buses and investing in cleaner, more environmentally-friendly buses on these routes. There should be incentives for people to leave their cars at home and travel by bus. One of the worst contributors to congestion is the
No opinion	The stop on Hinton Way will encourage parking on Hinton Way, which is not suitable.
Strongly oppose	The proposed stop at Stapleford will be underused as it is too near Addenbrookes and there are already alternative ways to go there. Also it would only be useful for those employed at Addenbrookes as the proposed route stops there. Anyone using the stop will reach it by car and there is no parking provision at
Strongly oppose	They are of little use to Stapleford and Shelford residents as people will not walk to the stops if currently do not walk to buses and will certainly not want to carry purchases by foot back through the villages to their homes. The existing Park and Ride facilities are better as a result of the parking (if enough) spaces are provided.

Strongly oppose	There is no Car Park for the stop in Stapleford. Cars will block the roads. for residents
Strongly support	OK with all of these.
Strongly oppose	The stop is on the edge of Great Shelford and will therefore only serve a small proportion of our large population when our village badly needs a fast route into Cambridge (the citi 7 is excessively slow and attracts only those who don't have a car).
Oppose	If the true link went into Cambridge center I'm sure it would be used but to have the route start and stop at the two medical campus and cycle links are already in place across most of the route I see the stop locations fairly pointless. These stop locations will just become a parking point for
Strongly oppose	Please see comments in number 10 below in relation to the proposed stop on Hinton Way - CARA objects to the route of the proposed transport link in its entirety.
Strongly oppose	Please see 10 below - we strongly oppose the route in its entirety.
Strongly oppose	I don't support the route at all. This is partly to do with these stops - as you will see they are on the outskirts so they are likely to be little used by residents when the train station in shelford is much nearer for most people, and they go to the same location - the station.
Support	
Support	

Strongly support	Would be better if closer to villages, particularly Sawston, but presumably constrained by land availability.
Strongly oppose	Please route this alongside the existing A1307 Babraham Road to avoid destroying more countryside
Strongly oppose	I understand there will be around 16 buses an hour, which will potentially be very detrimental to the road crossings involved with an increase in traffic congestion and pollution etc etc.
	See 10 below
Strongly oppose	They are absurd and will cause chaos and lots of disruption in the villages of Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston (which are already busy enough as it is).
Strongly support	They would be better if they were closer to the centre of Stapleford and Shelford but I understand why they are not
Strongly oppose	I don't agree with this entire project, therefore object to them all, and also to the village bus links.
Strongly oppose	Dont see teh point of these stops

Strongly oppose	This proposed route will burden Great Shelford and Stapleford with 16 buses per hour, that is 1 bus every 4 minutes across the fields with stops and traffic lights across Hinton Way and Haverhill Road. Great Shelford already has roughly 22 minutes of every hour stopped by the railway line closure . The number of cars stopping and starting and the pollution caused from this for a
Oppose	They are both too close to residential areas while also being too far away from the majority of residents to be useful. Shelford train station is better placed for the majority of Shelford and Stapleford residents. The Babraham Road stop is way out of Sawston - a train station at the former Spicers site would make more sense. All the stops would attract additional cars and
Strongly support	Good!
Strongly oppose	Proposed transport hub on A1307 j/w Bartlow Road. I wish to very strongly oppose this proposal. 1, The site has not been properly assessed for it suitability. 2. The location is bordering on 3 counties and is an ideal location for county lines drug dealers to exchange their wares. 3. There are many escape routes once spotters identify police cars in the vicinity. 4. It is an open
Oppose	The project needs to be re-thought. A significant percentage of the rush hour traffic on the A1307 is generated by commuters to Cambridge from Haverhill. This travel demand would be best met by a metro link roughly along the line of the old Cambridge-Haverhill railway, which passes close by Granta Park and Addenbrooks.
Strongly oppose	The proposed route will massively increase congestion along Hinton Way. The railway crossing already causes significant air and noise pollution down the majority of Hinton Way, and the bus route will worsen this problem AND cause similar congestion leading up to the crossing between Hinton Way and the bus route.
Strongly oppose	Hinton Way would become a car park in between the frequent trains and the busway. This proposal would cause more traffic, rather than alleviate it.
Oppose	The locations are much too far from the village (Stapleford) for most people to use them easily ie on foot. Parking appears to be limited to spaces for disabled but there are many elderly people who could not walk so far and do not cycle who would use it for hospital visits if general parking were available. If people parked on the approach roads it would cause congestion adding to
Strongly oppose	These stop locations would only cause problems for everyone who lives nearby and help no one, because residents in the area already use other transport methods.

Strongly oppose	
Oppose	
Strongly oppose	
Strongly oppose	I strongly object to any further encroachment onto green belt and loss of wildlife habitat.
Strongly oppose	I am concerned that Hinton Way would become a car park
Strongly oppose	They are too far out of the villages to be of any use.
Strongly support	A1307 itself needs making more user friendly from Haverhill ie dualing all the way into Cambridge .Linton needs looking at as a bottle neck there is caused by the traffic lights at Linton village college . A roundabout there would ease the bottle neck and a reduction in speed limit would help the safety aspect .
Strongly oppose	See attached comments
Strongly oppose	The proposed stops will turn our lovely villages into a Cambridge suburb destroying the natural beauty of the greenbelt, causing more traffic congestion and pollution. The stop proposed in Stapleford is quite literally right next to our homes. With buses multiple times per hour and commuters parking all over the narrow roads this will create utter chaos, negatively

Strongly oppose	Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park are not well served by putting a stop equidistant between them, where it is too far from both. The villages are also not properly served by the proposed locations of the stops. Strenuous efforts must be made to enhance existing bus services serving those villages.
Strongly oppose	see attached comments
Strongly oppose	It appears that none of the villages are well served by the proposed stops. Sufficient cycle parking spaces must be incorporated into the stop locations to make them viable for village residents to use.
Strongly support	They are sensible and allow many communities to be better connected to each other and to central Cambridge. It does not make sense to include more stops as it would slow down the service
Strongly oppose	Stops *outside* Shelford and Stapleford just encourage car use for part of the journey. This isn't public transport. The proposals suggestion "potential bus connecting services" with no guarantee of their existence. The proposals create a need for buses to travel from a village to a greenfield site in order that people may connect to a arterial transport link. That is very
Strongly support	
Oppose	Please note that my opposition is to one specific part of the route, not the whole project. More details in my response to Question 5.
Strongly oppose	My great concern is that the village of Stapleford will become a carpark as the proposals only offer parking to cyclists and disabled people. Please consider how many people will walk to this proposed stop? Very few I would guess so drivers will come near the stop and park along the Haverhill Road and the recreation ground. I cannot see the point of having a
Strongly oppose	the locations should not be close to quiet villages

No opinion	They're in the middle of nowhere. Far easier to walk to Shelford station (4 mins for us) and train into Cambridge than bike/drive up to new stop (10 mins and hassle). Or, simpler still, bike along the DNA route into Cambridge whilst we are fit and able.
Strongly oppose	Stop location on the Haverhill Road would inevitably lead to congestion when the barrier is used. This would especially be severe in the morning and evening when Haverhill Road becomes a rat run for people returning from work.
Oppose	The stops are located on the edge of villages potentially making it less accessible for those with mobility problems, small children, heavy shopping etc. Not very practical if you live on the other side of the village.
Strongly oppose	
Strongly oppose	The locations proposed in Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston are so far from much of each village that they would not be used. For Great Shelford and Stapleford, the time taken to walk to each location from the centre of each village would be as long, if not longer than cycling to the biomedical campus. Much of Sawston is even further away from the proposed stop
Strongly support	
Oppose	The proposed stops on the edge of Stableford and Shelford will not encourage the majority of residents in those villages, most of whom live more than a twenty minute walk away, to use the new public transport route. Some will cycle, some will use a connecting bus service, but people generally do not like having to change to another service (cf their car which
Support	The Biomedical Campus stop will need careful siting. This is already a busy and badly designed junction for cyclists, pedestrians, cars and buses. In particular for cyclists and pedestrians. The others are fine.
Strongly oppose	I cannot see that they are any use at all. The Shelford and Stapleford stops are out of the villages and I cannot see anyone using them. You may argue that they could be used by cyclists working at the Campus. I disagree: cyclists would cycle all the way to the Campus rather than leave cycles in a theft prone area.

No opinion	
Strongly oppose	I strongly oppose the stops on the Haverhill Road and Hinton Way because all that will happen is that these will be used by commuters who will park their cars on both roads and cause congestion for local people. If yellow lines are introduced that will move the problem further into the villages. We already have a bus service for locals which should be improved. If this system is
Strongly oppose	There is absolutely no value to this locality, Stapleford & Gt Shelford.
Strongly oppose	They are completely unsuitable. The actual stops are basically in the middle of nowhere. They're outside the villages of Sawston, Stapleford, and Great Shelford, with a typical 1 mile walk, well outside the distance most would consider. There are no stops at Babraham, Granta Park, or the Abingtons at all.
Strongly oppose	
Support	Location A is my preference, followed by B. Location C will be too expensive and will require a bridge to be built and encourage more traffic in Cambridge Rd.
Support	They will be good for the residents in these areas, as long as the service is reliable, usable and frequent. The stops need to be close to people houses so that they will be more likely to use them. Then it is likely to cut down in the traffic in the area.



Strongly oppose	Great interference to village life at huge expense without benefit and with many downsides to local residents. To use routes along the 1307 would have far less negative impact on local life and presumably at far less cost
Strongly support	Great. We live in Sawston so the Sawston stop should be 5-10 minunte walk from our house
Support	None
Support	Too far from village centre, bit of a trek.
Strongly oppose	My concern is that the surrounding village roads will become car parks but if parking regulations are put in place the stops become pointless except for those in walking distance. I am also concerned about development of green belt land surrounding the stops.
Strongly oppose	There should be no stops in Stapleford or Shelford; they would only be of very limited use to a few of the village residents - wherever possible we use the Babraham and Shelford Station. Stops would increase congestion, particularly non Hinton Way; already used as a through/commuter route, and traffic flow compromised by the level crossing and traffic lights. Referring
Strongly oppose	There should be no stops in Stapleford or Shelford. They would only be of very limited use to a few. Wherever possible I use the Babraham Road PR and Shelford Station. Stops would increase congestion, particularly on Hinton Way, already used as a through and commuter route, and traffic flow is already compromised by the level crossing and traffic lights. Stops and
Strongly oppose	
Strongly support	My strong support is only in relation to proposed Site A with access from the A505. This will avoid bringing additional traffic onto the A1307, which is already congested in the morning and evenings around the A11 roundabout. Having access from he A505 also makes sense with the significant housing expansion on the South Cambs border with North Uttlesford (e.g. it was

Strongly oppose	I live on [road] and go by bike with a trailer on the back for the children or walk everywhere I can. However, HINTON WAY is already dangerous to do either. The road is fast and busy and the pavement is narrow. Traffic is already held-up by gates at the train-crossing. HINTON WAY is dangerous for walkers and cyclists and I see the new proposals as making it worse.
Support	Good that there is stop for each of the villages however they are outside/on the edge of each village which I think will make it difficult for some people to use them. Not sure how many people will take a bus to reach them. They would seem to be of main use to cyclists.
Oppose	Hinton Way stop - there are no parking restrictions on Hinton Way so what is there to prevent people parking cars all day and using the stop? The fact that there is a hill close by makes it more dangerous. Why is there no provision for car parking?
Support	Seem sensible.
Support	Not helpful for majority of traffic entering Cambridge from Haverhill.
Oppose	I believe that the stops proposed for Haverhill Road and Hinton Way should be omitted as it would attract untold parking problems along Haverhill Road, Gog Magog Way, and around the Recreation Ground. In my view it should be a fast track option from P & R sites to the east thru to Addenbrookes etc and the city.
Strongly oppose	1) Likely to cause increased traffic congestion on Hinton Way, due to the proposed Bus Stop having a barrier which will stop traffic on Hinton Way at frequent intervals (informed every 4 minutes at peak times). Traveling along Hinton Way is already slowed by the need to wait up to 10 minutes, at the level crossing at Shelford Railway Station. If traffic is also stopped on the hill
Oppose	Strongly oppose the stop in Stapleford and Hinton way. This stop would cause problems with: parking on roads near by Noise from barriers Air pollution from cars stopping at barriers
Strongly oppose	Will eat into green belt and open up the opportunity for property developers to destroy the villages. As has happened to Trumpington.

No opinion	People who commute to Cambridge from Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford by car are not likely to use your transport route. If they currently choose to drive rather than walking to their nearest bus stop and taking a bus, why would these people be willing to walk to this new transport route stops instead?
Support	Agree with all proposals.
Strongly oppose	As the stops have only drop off facilities I can imagine people thinking that they may as well drive the whole distance to work rather than expecting someone else to have to do a double journey, to and from a stop, to drop them off. With specific reference to the proposed stop on Hinton Way I can imagine this stop causing increased congestion on this already very busy
Strongly oppose	I do not favour the proposed route across Green Belt land. I favour the route following the A1307 with stops at 1. the Babraham rd Park & ride & 2. the BioMedical Campus & 3. new Cambridge South station. Residents of Grt Shelford & Stapleford could pick up the new transport at the stop at Babraham Rd Pk & Ride.
Strongly oppose	I am not happy about the proposed stop location on Hinton Way. Hinton way is a very narrow road from the Babraham roundabout to the traffic lights in Great Shelford. If the rail crossing is down the traffic can build up at peak hours a long way back from the crossing. There is likely to be an increase in traffic because of the stop location and the road will not be able to deal with
Strongly oppose	I do not agree that these stops or the greenway itself is necessary, and I do not think they will be well used. Certainly in Shelford and Stapleford we are well served already with the cycle path, railway and Park & Ride. It is unlikely that people will using multiple buses to get to a stop 3/4 way up Hinton Way rather than using the existing railway or Park and Ride.
Strongly oppose	On narrow busy roads, no parking facilities, cutting across green belt, large impact on environment.
No opinion	

Strongly oppose	<p>This proposed transport route should run adjacent to the existing road line of the A1307 with stations at the end of Hinton Way and Haverhill Road</p> <p>This proposed carving up of the local landscape is purely to allow development by the back door.</p> <p>Anyone wanting to use the transport route could either walk or cycle to the</p>
Strongly oppose	<p>an M11 Babraham Park &amp; Ride is an excellent idea. Putting stops in Sawston, Stapleford &amp; Shelford are totally redundant and not necessary at all. There will be no benefit to the local community who already have well established transport links (bus, train, cycelpaths)</p>
Strongly oppose	
Strongly oppose	<p>These proposals appear to be all about opening up the corridor of green belt land between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granta Park, for development.</p> <p>If this new transport route is built, and if this swathe of green belt land is then developed, we will be back to square one with even worse traffic congestion,</p>
Strongly oppose	<p>Stops are too far out from the centre of Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston to be accessible to pedestrians.</p> <p>Stop on Biomedical Campus is a long way from the hospital - 10-15 min walk</p> <p>Why not put a stop at site A?</p>
Strongly oppose	<p>I think all of the stops are close to preexisting public transport links. Why get rid of green belt land, to put in links that are already there</p>
Strongly oppose	
Support	<p>I don't live near the stops so don't feel I can comment.</p>
Strongly support	<p>These seem logical</p>

Strongly oppose	Disrupts traffic flow and green belt area
Support	i think they ok depending where route goes where planned
Strongly oppose	Spoils countryside. Not practical for where people live. Who needs / is going to use this?
Strongly oppose	It is unreasonable to place the stops up to 900m away from their target locations, or outside the village footprint.
Strongly oppose	They are too far away from the village centres to be useful. The time saved by the busway would be removed by the walk to the bus stops.  These stops locations will only increase the development of the green belt /farmland as developers seek to fill in the land in between. This will radically
Strongly oppose	The proposal is a poorly considered one. Anyone could draw a line through the beautiful South Cambs countryside and that's precisely what you've done. The green belt will be destroyed, and as a result opened up to further redevelopment development. Isn't it plain to see that the development should come down the existing A1301 route which would join up with the existing
Strongly oppose	I can understand a stop location near A11 to encourage people to use public transport to Addenbrooke's Hospital/Cambridge Biomedical Campus and therefore reduce congestion. However I cannot see any benefit for additional stops on Haverhill Road or Hinton Way, Great Shelford.
Strongly oppose	Little or no use to local residents as on edge of villages and there are more central buses or the railway station (for Shelford and Stapleford) for journeys to Addenbrookes or Cambridge. It does not provide connectivity for local residents except those living near the stops. nor does it connect even the campuses along the A1307 and A1301.
Support	Looking good.

Strongly oppose	They would cause traffic problems where they cross the roads. They are too far out of Shelford and Stapleford to be useful, especially to the elderly.
Strongly oppose	No need for stops at these location, just need to put more buses on route
	more buses needed at busy times using existing bus route would be a solution.
Support	Support all.
Oppose	They are much too close to the village of Stapleford. The trams are expected to run 16 per hour so every 3-4 minutes. The proposed traffic lights will inevitably be almost constantly red for traffic going in and out of that side of the village. It will be gridlocked. Terrible idea. These are busy roads as it is and needed for local people to be able to get in and out of the village. Move it
No opinion	
Support	
Strongly oppose	Major major inconvenience on Hinton Way in Great Shelford, half a mile from train station one way and park n ride other way, which not only is not needed but will increase traffic and delays immensely
No opinion	

Strongly oppose	Because there is no parking proposed at Shelford and Stapleford stops there will be increased street parking to the north east of both villages. Any attempt to restrict parking will impact unfavourably on residents. The distance of stops from the centre of the villages will inevitably lead to more car use.
Strongly support	Great
Strongly oppose	Not particularly useful for the villages. Large parking areas taking up green belt areas - bound to negatively affect the villages.
Strongly oppose	None of it should go ahead
Strongly oppose	The stops on Hinton Way and Haverhill Road are unhelpful for the majority of people living in Shelford and Stapleford (they are remote from the centres of these villages). They will cause traffic chaos (particularly on Hinton Way, where problems already arise from traffic arrested by the level crossing). This will be exacerbated by cars left on the road nearby by those using the
Strongly support	As I live in south Sawston, I have over 1.5 miles to walk to the bus stop off Babraham Road. Will there be anywhere secure for cyclists to leave their bikes to get on the buses at the stops. What are the parking plans if people want to drive to the stops or will they have to go to one of the parking sites? Pleased Multi user tracks to include EQUINES are included.
No opinion	
Support	I believe something needs to be done with regards to the safety of the A1307 but not sure this is the answer. Its already an extremely busy junction where the A11 meets the A505 and A1307, this will only add to the congestion.
Support	In principle, I support the proposal, given the congestion currently. Moving traffic out from Babraham to A11 makes sense. The support is conditional however. As a stapleford resident, I would look for appropriate safeguarding for local residents regarding parking overflow. Restrictions would need to be in place in the villages of Stapleford/Shelford and enforced. Further, I would

Oppose	Locations A & B are unsuitable and do not take into account the hugely increased traffic already imposed on the local road due to thousands of extra jobs from the expansion of Granta Park
Strongly oppose	The route is a long way from the village, along a muddy single footpath, two people have a job to past each other.
Strongly oppose	In its current form Hinton Way is not suited for purpose and suffers from too much traffic coming in. The suggested stop will completely clog the road up making it impossible to drive through. It will create a huge disruption to the residents as cars will inevitably congregate around the stops. It will also make the Babraham Park and Ride roundabout impenetrable and create
Support	As a Stapleford resident, I have a major concern about the location of the Stapleford stop and its impacts - both environmental and social - on the local area. It will fundamentally change the nature of Stapleford as a stand-alone village and it opens the door to extensive residential development around CAM stops over time, further eroding remaining green belt around
Strongly oppose	
Oppose	The 'village' stops on the edges of Sawston, Shelford and Stapleford serve the villages poorly, and will generate short distance car traffic which the stop design and the surrounding streets cannot cope with.
Support	I use the 13 bus or P&R to go to classes in Cambridge twice week. Trumpington and Babraham P&R are often full by late morning so I either have to park in a non designated area or drive to the City Centre, this defeats the object of offering P&R and it is expensive. Urgent improvements are required. The 13 bus from Little Abington is excellent but even at 5:45pm
Strongly oppose	Stops are too far from the centres of habitation to be useful to most of those living in the villages along the route. The frequency of buses crossing the existing roads in each case will cause a lot more traffic congestion on all of those roads.
Strongly oppose	Being right out on the edges of the villages, they're poor choices for residents



Strongly oppose	<p>We use the route daily a few times a day. I oppose the off road route completely as it creates more problem than it solves.</p> <p>The core issue is that the current Babraham park' n ride site is TOO CLOSE to Addenbrooke Hospital and Biomedical campus. People therefore use the</p>
Strongly oppose	<p>The map presented to public has faults in it. The cycle path by railway line between Sawston and Stapleford is incorrectly drawn.</p> <p>The stops up on hills of Haverhill Rd and hinton at are stupid locations as people can't walk easily to them and they are in middle of nowhere meaning you will also put more housing to fill in the fields.</p>
Oppose	<p>They are likely to be of limited value to those living in the villages. See my comment at 10 below.</p>
Strongly oppose	<p>Not everyone has a chauffeur to drop them off at the stop. Parking in village will cause a problem. Footpath on Haverhill Road out of village is only shingle puddly track only wide enough for one person and not safe to ride a bike on or even walk. So getting to stops not easy. inconvenience for residents who will not use this bus way.</p>
No opinion	<p>They seem to be too far from the centres of habitation to be particularly useful to the residents of Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford. They will create extra traffic on already busy rural roads.</p>
Strongly oppose	
Oppose	<p>Apart from the two ends the stops are on the periphery of the three intermediate settlements and of little value compared to the green dashed route. The route should be via Shelford Station parallel with railway until just south of Shelford Station and then take up the currently disused railway formation towards Linton and Haverhill. This route will serve the three</p>
Strongly oppose	<p>The stop locations would not be attractive to local residents. Easier to get the conventional bus or train from Shelford. Cyclists would not join the route at these points as it would be quicker to join the route elsewhere nearer to Cambridge (eg at Granham's Road).</p>

Strongly oppose	The stops are not well positioned to encourage usage or switching from other methods of travel.
Support	The Great Shelford stop is too far from the village centre. A better route would be through the village along the existing railway line.
Strongly oppose	Far from where people live, will not be used much. Not in the general interest and certainly not wise public transport option : the public lives too far from proposed stops will increase traffic and wild parking
Strongly oppose	Haverhill Road and Hinton Way: Frequent buses will paralyse the village and cut it off. On Hinton Way the railway is already a traffic issue, and this will be more than doubled. Queues mean fumes and pollution for residents and also drivers. Not everyone wants to arrive at the stop - many wish to progress through!
Strongly oppose	Not in locations that would be convenient for most village residents. Level crossings would cause severe traffic hold-ups.
Strongly oppose	Stop locations are ok, but I object to the whole idea on the grounds that it is enormously expensive, provides only marginal benefits and has serious environmental harms. Surely the A1307 route would be a much better option?
Strongly oppose	1) The stops cross roads and presumably mean a barrier would come down. If the coaches are once every ten minutes and the barriers down 1 minute that that could bring the barriers down every four minutes and back up traffic on both Mingle lane and Haverhill Road. Has loss of productivity and time increases to drivers in traffic holdups been taken into account? How many
Oppose	The locations outside these three villages would be of little benefit to local users, and threaten to undermine the viability of existing bus services through the villages - see attached response.
Strongly oppose	There is no connectivity for Shelford, Stapleford or Sawston offered by this scheme. The scheme locations are of no real practical benefit to people living in the village. They would mean a walk uphill of at least a kilometre. There is already a no. 7 bus and a railway service which are, in contrast, easily accessible. The stop locations proposed seem to be little more than

Strongly oppose	Too many
Strongly oppose	The stops are not well positioned for Shelford and Stapleford residents, who would continue using other options (rail, existing buses, cycle lanes) to get to Cambridge.
Oppose	This route does little to serve the people of Stapleford and Great Shelford, and threatens to undermine the viability of existing routes through the villages, particularly the Citi 7 service.  The proposed busway has potential to do significant and as yet unassessed
Oppose	
Strongly oppose	Stapleford and Hinton Way stops: I am concerned about the potential parking (other than disabled) on Haverhill Road and Hinton Way and the surrounding roads. Both stops are on the fringe of the villages which is good for minimising disruption within villages but likely to increase potential parking 'demand'. Also disruption to traffic flow at the 2 road crossings. How many a Strategy one offers no connectivity for Shelford, Stapleford or Sawston. The route is too remote to be of any practical benefit to people living in the village of Stapleford or Shelford and involves an uphill walk of a kilometre or so: the existing no. 7 bus and railway service provides easy accessibility in contrast. The GCPs presentation of the benefits are not real and do not take into
Strongly oppose	
Oppose	Personally none would be useful to me.
No opinion	I'm concerned about the effect it will have on the road traffic - there are already long queues along Hinton Way and Granhams Road due to the railway stations/crossings/rush hours, etc - how will the new 'lights' where this proposed line will cross add to the problems? Also, however much you might not want to encourage it, I would anticipate that there will be people
Strongly support	P1 Very good. Close to each village without going into them (so speedier journeys); and a good direct (almost straight) route.

Strongly oppose	P2 They use greenbelt land That we can't get back again. I am very concerned that the one in Stapleford will cause traffic problems, unwanted car parking on streets and spoil the rural feel of the village
Oppose	P3 not a good idea crossing Hinton Way at just below the Hill! This project will also hold up the flow of traffic on Hinton Way
Strongly oppose	P4
Support	P5 Wonder if it needs to stop in Shelford as already well served
Strongly oppose	P6 MUST HAVE PARKING AT ALL STOPS
Oppose	P7
	P8 no issue with stop locations
Oppose	P9 rubbish. no point in having a stop in Hinton Way
Strongly oppose	P10 not needed

Strongly oppose	P11 There are no parking facilities so Stapleford village will become a giant car park
Strongly oppose	P12 cover agricultural land with concrete. shared space does not work - walk slower than bike - pram + wheelchair mixed with horses??! Does not go where we wish to go. Waste of money. stop building.
Strongly oppose	P13 Of no benefit to Stapleford or Sawston residents. Impact of parking in Stapleford + Shelford has not been factored in - or the inconvenience caused to local residents
Strongly oppose	P14 suitable but will require yellow lines where parking not permitted
Strongly oppose	P15 They will attract further parking into Sawston. Stapleford and Shelford or will require parking restrictions to the disadvantage of the villagers
Strongly oppose	P17 The route should stay on the main route & not be destroying fields & the environment
Strongly support	P18
Oppose	P19 As I am a resident in Haverhill Road, Stapleford, I am concerned about the impact/positioning of stop here and the effect that it will have on volume of traffic and parking of cars (by users of the proposed transport)
	P16 I am rather baffled by the 3 strategies/options, as a daily bus commuter on the A1307 from Haverhill to Biomedical Campus. Is the plan to put in hubs A, B or C in order to build houses/industry around them?

Strongly oppose	P20 I feel the stop locations in Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston would be extremely disruptive to all the villages due to increased traffic & parking around the stops. the flow of traffic on the roads leading tot he stops would be disrupted and the congestion around the stops would affect the feel of the
Support	P21 worried about using 'greenfield sites' worried about extra traffic along Bourne Bridge Road and old A11 (Newmarket Road)
Strongly oppose	in a recent survey half of traffic from Haverhill to Four Went Ways goes to A11 (London) + 1/2 to Cambridge
No opinion	P23
Support	P24 Some distance from the villages
Strongly oppose	P25 Of little use for residents of Stapleford
Strongly support	
Support	P27
Strongly support	P28 support route. (option) A and stop locations serve local populations in sufficient number.

Strongly oppose	P29 the intention may be to provide a benefit, but will lead to unintentional consequences. take the stop on Hinton way: - was the stop based on survey information?
Support	P30 Good
Strongly oppose	P31 The crossings in Granhams Road & stops in Haverhill Road would be less disruptive than Hinton Way but would increase the difficulty of finding an alternative route to using Hinton Way.
No opinion	While I understand the villages are to be catered for, the disruption caused by the main route (orange) is of great concern (environmentally). Alongside A1307 was my favourite option
Strongly oppose	P33 These locations will suit employees of Granta Park, Babraham Institute and Addenbrooke's, but completely irrelevant to Abington residents.
No opinion	P34 OK
Strongly support	P35 They seem suitable but could be changed if it seemed useful
Support	P36 No strong views
Support	P37 Broadly support, subject to seeing detailed designs

Support	P38 OK
	P39 I cannot comment on the details as I do not support the position of any of the hubs. See further comments
Strongly oppose	P40 The proposed stop locations serving Stapleford and Great Shelford are on the edge of these villages and offer little improvement to the availability of bus services. The new bus service
No opinion	



**5) Please comment if you feel any of the proposals would positively or negatively impact on the environment.**

Negatively, development of land compared with the Carbon Offset for project use (if any) net neutral if any

Positive. More cycling/walking/public transport use = less cars = less congestion and pollution.

I do not see an impact

Of course it will impact on the environment but I am confident that everything is being done to lessen that impact. I also think that this will lower congestion and that will help the environment in central Cambridge

View from Gog Magog Down and from Whitehill Farm would be impaired. The Babraham to Abingdon cycle route at present is nice and rural but a better surface would compensate for reduced peace. There must be some wildlife there that would be disturbed.

They all just move the problems to different locations still promoting car journey to these locations, which will only work if you run the services at hours suitable for the users and at nominal charges.

This development includes Green Belt, which should be avoided.

Positive: reduction of the travel time into Cambridge - who wouldn't want one of these schemes? The Biomedical Campus is expanding exponentially and it is vital that infrastructure is in place to support this. Maybe there would be a negative impact on the environment but it would surely be netted off by the reduction of traffic on the roads.

The Bury farm route is a favourite walking and cycling path across beautiful countryside. Why destroy the green belt when there is already a road from Babraham to Addenbookes. Why not widen the existing road with a dedicated guided bus at the side?

Given somewhere to park a sufficient number of cars near the stops, the environmental impact would be very good because it would reduce the car travel distance of those who must commute some of the way by car.

Overall positive impact in providing improved public transport

neutral on environment - improvements made with scheme would offset land used judging by existing guided bus route

That is not my concern. Please consult an environmental and conservation expert for advice on this issue.

These proposals have the possibility to greatly improve air quality, health and wellbeing of local residents. As long as the project is properly managed during construction then impacts to habits and wildlife will be minimal.

This would be devastating to the environment. I fail to see how a strip of hardcore ranging from 16-37 meters running across the rural landscape can be anything other than negative.

Positive

positive

Positively, as would encourage the use of public transport and cycling.

I am totally opposed to this scheme as the route is almost exclusively in the green belt and will ruin prime agricultural land, rural views and will impact negatively on existing houses. It will also inevitably attract development along the route, as usually happens when a new transport corridor is developed. It would be much better to modify existing transport corridors at much lower cost and entailing far less environmental impact. My

The route needs to be converted for electric vehicles as soon as possible. The health and environmental impact of oil-based fuels, especially Diesel, are being found to be far worse than previously thought. Thought needs to be given to how the vehicles will be fed with electricity or recharged. Having rubber tyres makes this problem more difficult to solve. If the vehicles are only recharged when they are not in use, they will

Negatively - the green belt is rapidly disappearing - and cost is cited as the issue for not reusing existing traffic lines or disused rail routes.

slow down cars with extra lights increase fuel consumption

No opinion

There will be a loss of some countryside balanced by a reduction in traffic. Whether this is good or not is unclear, although I suspect some benefit.  
They should of course much improve traffic flow around Cambridge.

All developments impact the environment badly but the current transport situation needs to be improved.

Valuable agricultural land to go under tarmac for ever plus acres and acres of trees and bushes to waste more land called greening

Any changes must avoid additional off street parking around hubs or new bus stops

Green belt should be respected and preserved not concreted over!

If transport is green, ie electric or hydrogen or allows more cycling then great. We do not need more polluting diesel buses which are already horrific. Any future plans should not permit any more diesel buses. Electric buses now available.

positive feed back as it would save emissions as well

positive

I am very surprised that the choices all involve a green field route.

Unfortunately anything of this nature is going to impact the environment and there is nothing that can be done about that.

The impact of the park and ride site is surely negative in an attractive area of countryside. But if it lays the grounds for future connectivity out to Abington, Linton, and Haverhill I would support it.

Environmentally, anything that reduces car use in favour of cycling, walking and public transport is an overall positive.

I think it would benefit the environment as less traffic would travel into City Centre.

So long as efforts are put in to replace any lost trees, the benefits of people using public transport vs. their cars would have a greater positive impact in my opinion.

Positively, it should reduce traffic on existing roads.

Inevitable impact on natural environment during construction, but looks like mitigation has been factored in

Deforestation would be a worry, however urban greening could occur at the travel hubs

Clearly negatively for the countryside and the overall feel of this being a rural region. I would like to see plans for how to remove visibility and noise.

Severe impact on open views from Shelford and Stapleford and severe danger of planning creep out to the busway

Including "Horse Riding" is totally absurd and not environmentally positive. Horse have a significant carbon footprint, are anti-social, leave manure which cyclists will have to splatter through and are a hazard to walkers and cyclists. It is hard to see why this anti-social special interest group is being pandered to. Where are they going to park their horse whilst they are at work? They are not commuters.

Concerned about impact on Ninewells Reserve

Looking at the integration of, for example, the Busway around the Biomedical Campus and Trumpington Meadows, I feel the advantages outweigh the relatively small impact on existing green belt space.

Going off-road is going to have a major impact on the environment (compared to going alongside existing roads). Is it really not avoidable?

I think it will improve access by bike which is good for the environment and with the bus improving travel times this will encourage more people to use public transport rather than cars

Positive impact. It should result in fewer cars traveling long(er) duration at slow (crawling) speeds.

No impact is impossible. Positive impact is possible, especially overall. Reducing the need to travel and reducing the need to use private motor transport will help. Allowing people to avoid pressured routes, and reduce pressure, is a good idea.

There is no assessment of the pollution around the Park and Ride sites. Site C is on undeveloped land and will be a visual and traffic eyesore.

Very negatively - the new busway is cutting directly across beautiful unspoilt landscape. Walkers will be discouraged from using the route.

The route may impact on the visual landscape and break up the countryside. The route would go through existing fields and the nature reserve so care would need to be taken not to disrupt any endangered wildlife



I think that in the short term these proposals will negatively impact on the environment as the building process will disturb many wildlife habitats. Even "Brownfield" sites have value as they are important habitats for rare plants and insects. I would hope that these impacts will be thoroughly investigated prior to any work commencing.

I guess this would impact positively the environment, since it would reduce carbon footprint in other congestionated routes.

N/a

More pollution due to more traffic jams

Negatively. It is basically a scheme that encourages people to arrive by car at the terminus.

I am concerned about building on greenbelt land. I think that any way to encourage use of cycling/public transport is a good idea. However I wouldn't like it if fossil fuel powered buses are used.

While the short term implications will be negative we need to be considering longer term methods to reduce the number of polluting cars congesting the roads. Offering world class public transport makes it easy for people to decide "I don't need to drive today" and hopefully even "I don't need to own a car".

Positively impact the environment. I feel fewer people will travel by car.

I think it would positively impact the environment by decreasing road traffic and making alternatives enjoyable and safe.

Positive by taking more cars off the road.

No positive effect. Some green fields will be under tarmac, so some negative effect.

Negative I suppose. But you can't make an omlette etc

I imagine any negative effects on green spaces will be more than outweighed by the potential reduction in traffic along the route.

Negatively impact the outlook from several residences in Cambridge Road Abington.

I think 2000 car parking spaces is very excessive. This plan should be made to cater for future needs, and, as the planet is on fire, we should work to reduce car park spaces as much as possible. I suggest increasing the number of disabled parking spots and cycle lockers and cutting the number of parking spaces. People will only use buses if they are cheaper and more convenient than using their cars.

Clearly, any major new roadway will have a net negative environmental impact, particularly during construction and the early years of operation, when planting is still maturing. Over the longer term, the net effect will depend on the effectiveness of mitigation measures and the amount of motorised traffic taken off the roads. It would have been useful for flow projections to have been included in the leaflet.

Negative

Massive negative impact - this seems intended to expand the areas for housing development - rather than providing effective public transport - if it was - it would serve the current communities.

Positive benefit, because anything that keeps cars off the road is a good idea

It would improve the environment with fewer cars and a modern transport system. It could be far superior and more effective if extended to Linton or Haverhill.

Can't see any negative impact

Neutral

The route across green belt will have a very negative effect on the environment, both in the short term and in the longer term, if it becomes a boundary for development.

Good

Positively by reducing the number of cars driving into the CBC and city

The proposal that takes the most people off the A11 and A1307 into Cambridge will have the biggest impact on the environment. I do not have any specific concerns about the proposed locations per se. However, I think site A is less likely to appeal to commuters along the A1307 due to the additional transfer onto the A11 and A505, and therefore I would discount this as an option. Getting traffic off the A1307 is crucial.

Any development of a greenfield site will cause concerns. I do not see a problem, although the use of the old railway track bed would have been a better choice

I think the arable land in this area is largely monoculture and of no particular benefit to the environment, and alleviating traffic through the increased use of buses and bicycles would be beneficial overall. The river Granta is important for wildlife and should be protected.

Option A & C would impact negatively on the environment

When there are already considerable road and rail links running in the South East quadrant of the Cambridge (A1307, A1301, Rail) creating a brand new route through pristine countryside is highly questionable from an environmental point of view.

B & A are limited in size by the high pressure gas main which may preclude future expansion

Positive and can provide more access to open space

Site C is outside the Green Belt but the actual location is less spoiled than Site B at present. If Site C location has to be used it would be environmentally better to move it along the A1307 close to the A11. This could also enable users from the A11 West Bound to enter the Park and Ride from the existing slip road.

It will negatively the green belt around the villages and will impact on Gog Magog Hills. It will open the floodgates for infill development

None

The whole project will have a Negative impact

The proposals are all reasonable and proper care to environmental considerations is being given

If there is a reduced amount of cars on the road then there will be less congestion and definite benefits to the environment. I'm sure the layout of any Hub would be considered but it would also need to not be too much of an "eye sore".

I am strongly opposed to the proposed site C. As a resident of Abington and [road], I have significant concerns about the traffic and pollution this site would cause. Not to mention the destruction of the village character. I would urge you to reconsider this site as an option. You only have to look at the mess and environmental impact of the fourwentways garage site to see the impact a larger site wold have on the village.

negative, as additional roads and parking are on green belt..

Increased traffic on the A1307 will be counterproductive & there will be an overall negative impact on the environment. By slowing the route without improving the link along this road will not alleviate use but clog it for longer than it is already. Idling engines will increase emissions and it is a heavy transit route for large vehicles with predominately diesel engines.

No particular concerns

Some impact inevitably but overall should improve air and noise quality

Obviously putting a new park and ride outside Cambridge does encourage the people coming from surrounding towns and villages who would use it from seeking other transport solutions for their whole route (e.g. local bus or train service). This has to be weighed against the fact that they will keep traffic and associated pollution out of central Cambridge. If the electric bus (CAM) option is pursued then this will further

I strongly feel that the proposed route would damage the environment and not improve congestion in Great Shelford.

Building a new road that goes right past the nine wells nature reserve and right through the surrounding countryside would be quite disruptive and noisy - especially during the building process - and I feel that it would ruin the peacefulness of the area.

Positively as it would encourage modal shift.



Provided pathways have wild and tree planted verges should be good for the wildlife.
Clearly there is some impact on existing undeveloped land, however I feel this is far outdated by the potential for reducing traffic pollution.
Negative - they will encourage development on green land
Decent uptake of either the public transport or the shared-use path would mean less vehicle emissions - a good thing for us all. New hedging would improve the habitat for wildlife; the new hedging along the Babraham cycle path is now full of life.
Not sure, but long term, getting people to use the bus, cycle or walk will hopefully overcome any short term impact?

The whole proposal is clearly negative on the environment. It encourages people to use cars, makes them travel further than necessary, and builds on undeveloped land.

Use of electric vehicles with rubber wheels will minimise noise.

The proposals would be a significant negative impact on the environment. The strategy 1 route is shown as going on a route between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way high up on the Gog Magog Hills as opposed to following an alternative route skirting the higher ground. It is imperative to change this route to take it off the skyline.

I think it is much better to fund public transport than motorways for individual cars.

Option C will most likely negatively impact the area

I support the proposals, even though some might negatively impact the environment in the short term but would limit congestion and automobile traffic, which would have positive effects on the environment for the long term.

The whole route goes through green belt and should be stopped. In particular the section in between Nine Wells and Hinton Way should not go ahead and the route should follow the existing cycle path and railway line for as far as possible.

Will not reduce car use.  
By splitting up agricultural land it will increase risk of development which would be detrimental to the villages.

N/A

Reduction of congestion and air pollution due to better public transport times and links as well as safe convenient cycle routes

Improving public transport has the ability to persuade more people out of their cars lowering emissions.

I think Site B would encourage more use of public transport due to its location and in the long run this is better for the environment. I glad the existing nature reserves will be protected.

Impact should be outweighed by removal of cars from Cambridge's roads.
I run across the paths to Babraham every day and enjoy the country side - these schemes are adding development around our village and ultimately result in further development infill.
It will have a negative environmental impact as it will increase road traffic and create a large car park but should hopefully improve the environment along the route by developing rail-side natural habitats.
Could help air pollution in Cambridge. Would require large car park and building so impact of building / concrete. Consider visual impact would need to be hidden by trees so land aspect / height important.
Negatively impact existing open countryside and create a potential future development corridor especially around the stops.

Not known

When route passes 9 Wells, how near to railway does it go? It needs to be right next to railway, so any encroachment on 9 Wells is kept to the minimum..  
Reference to Green Belt and your proposals about this would be welcome. I think it is particularly important thqt loss of undeveloped land is kept to the minimum needed.

Positive impact - make it happen fast.

Seems well thought out and I agree

I feel the need to build on green belt needs to be looked at, why cant it be built underground with an auto shuttle tram/tube network that will not blight the surroundings and release CO2, an approach to plan for this service being future proof instead of being in a budget that will help rural growth, it will need to be adapted to modern needs and using space on the surface will take up space.

I think that, overall, the proposal would benefit the environment by reducing need of car ownership and usage, reducing congestion and encouraging more sustainable transports and cycling

There will inevitably be some loss of greenbelt, however if native hedgerows/trees etc are properly established and we reduce car use dramatically in the area, then this seems to me an ok compromise. I do believe that you should incorporate much more cycle parking at each stop than shown in your mock-up image. We must encourage people to cycle rather than be dropped-off as much as possible.

It would positively impact the environment as it would encourage people to use an alternative to the car

Any change will inevitably impact the environment, but public transport is preferable to queues of slow-moving cars.

I think in the long term it will positively impact on the environment as more people will have better cycle and public transport access to Cambridge

Would rather not build on greenbelt

Positively, fewer cars.

All have a negative impact, but Cambridge has decided to build transport links on green belt instead of houses, forcing people to travel further with the obvious environmental damage this causes. Houses within cycling/walking distance of workplaces would be inherently less damaging. Reopening railways would also be less damaging (consider vehicle exhaust pollution).

Positive. Less traffic on A1301, so would reduce emissions and noise disturbance.

There would be some negative impact during construction, but overall I feel that the benefits of making public transport more appealing would be positive. Wildlife crossing points/ tunnels along the route would reduce any long term negative impact.

Presumably the area around the hub will be impacted negatively, while the routes between the hub and the campus should experience a smaller traffic load.

Neutral impact

Any building work/additional roads will destroy environment, but balance of fewer cars on that stretch of road would reduce pollution.

The proposals do have the potential to impact positively on the environment should the aims and commitments set out in the public consultation leaflet be met. I would urge GCP to commit to meeting the 20% net gain target. Please ensure the impact of increased disturbance on the Nine Wells Site is taken into account, and that the proposed purchase of adjacent land and restoration to semi-natural habitat is

It will have a very negative impact on environment

If people will park their cars on the new park and ride as long will be free the car park and the bus that will reduce traffic a lot I would say.



While there will be an environmental impact in these locations, this has to be far outweighed by the environmental benefits of taking cars and also highly polluting diesel buses off the roads.

I think there would be a positive effect if were removing slow moving cars from Cambridge roads

Extremely negative

The scheme is aimed to make the Babraham and/or Abington villages into mega car parks with all of the resulting pollution from car fumes and other environmental impact from mass car transport

As most of the route is in the green belt then it would inevitably have a negative impact on the environment, nature , wildlife and the general rural scenery.

Neutral
Positive - we will cycle far more often and will also use the busway on rainy days when we'd currently drive. We will be able to walk to the bus stop on Haverhill Road, so we anticipate that we will be able to go down to one car and stop driving into Cambridge at all.
I don't feel the need to pander to horse riders, as they only use routes as recreational and horses are skittish so would not react well with other traffic. I would prefer solar powered trains running on a gravel bed that lets water soak away rather than tarmac everywhere.
I feel this gives great potential for improvement of environmental impact.
Agricultural land is important and so as long as this land is not isolated then I have no objections regarding this. i do have strong views on the green belt and consider enough of it has been eroded already. i would NOT like to see any more removed for transport use.

I feel the benefits provided by a mass transit system outweigh the negatives.

It will have a negative impact in the Nine Wells area

Small negative impact

I am concerned the proposed hubs may actually complicate driving and increase traffic pressure around A11 and A505 junction, which gets congested very often, particularly in the mornings. A junction for southbound A11 heavy traffic to join M11 northbound and vice-versa would partly alleviate the traffic through A505.

I am also concerned about the impact the new transport routes through what is now

Seems like a definite positive impact. So many people drive to Granta Park - I'm sure it's the majority at my office.

There would be a moderate environmental effect caused by creating a new route across the open fields between Sawston and Babraham. Historically, however, a steam railway followed much of this route, which would have had a far greater impact than the current proposal. There would be significant landscape impact along the route between Stapleford and the Biomedical Campus, but this could be mitigated by

We hope whichever one is used will have the least negative impact on the environment.

Negative because of cut off to countryside walking and increase in number of cars parking around the the stop

Bridge cost and Traffic implications for Abington - 1307 traffic using the village as a rat run to avoid queues

Hub C would impact Abington village with an new expensive bridge and extra traffic - some using the Village roads to avoid A1307 roundabouts

Any effort to take cars off the road is a plus for the environment.

Bury farm and the green belt would be negatively impacted.

Positively: But please put a cycle path All the way from Haverhill to Cambridge

If more cars are removed from the road, then it would benefit. Opportunities should be sought to work with landowners to further enhance the busway with planting, and potentially new country parks to open up access to the green belt.

impinges on the green space north of Stapleford  
This is probably going to result in backfill housing development that will adversely affect our environment

No impact

Improve air quality by hopefully fewer individual vehicles on road
Good
I live in [village] looking over the line [ house]. We would want trees to hide the line as we directly overlook it
Overall I consider the impact on the environment will be strongly positive as it will reduce road traffic and congestion on existing roads, make public transport a more attractive option and provide additional off road cycling options. This is at the cost of some development on farmland which is a negative feature, but I consider the net gain strongly outweighs this issue.

No construction is environmentally neutral

Negatively impact on the environment on green belt land in private farming economy. Disturbance of the natural wildlife and ecology which is a corridor between the A1307 and A1301 already in situ and requires little more than adding a bus lane for autonomous vehicles.

Would not get enough people out of there cars

If done right, I think this would grealy rduce pollution generated by vehicles.

Stop C would damage protected trees and appears inefficient use of reassures and a short term option compared with option A that appears to allow easy extension to Haverhill.

No view

It's really good to see net gain and carbon commitments in the proposals. It feels as though these locations will only work if there is major new housing development around each of the proposed stop locations (as there's been at Clay Farm in Trumpington), which should be considered at this point as well.

Building inside the green belt would affect the environment.

The section nearby to the Nine Wells nature reserve would negatively impact upon the nature reserve, surrounding paths and the BRCA2 cycle path.

Although this is a green belt land proposal I see value in improving access to facilitate growth on the Cambridge biomedical campus and other business/science parks in the area.

The landscape in this area would be affected, bringing more urbanisation into a greenfield area. Sensitive landscaping is required to make this acceptable.

Generally positive P & R must accommodate EV charging for cars and electric bikes plus infrastructure for EV Buses. Buses must be zero emission to ensure improved carbon and polluting emissions. Should have solar pv canopy.

less traffic = positive impact



Renewable power generation (e.g. wind turbines) should be incorporated into plans. The flat, sparse terrain surrounding this area has a particularly high potential for wind energy.

Continuing to add jobs to Cambridge whilst building thousands of houses in places like Haverhill without re-instating the full railway is just short sighted.

I think they would have a positive impact, particularly if it got cars off the road

Site A and B will have a negative impact on the environment and landscape.

There used to be a train line from Haverhill to Cambridge anyway and I can see this being preferable to using the road thereby cutting emissions and actually helping the environment!

Any changes will impact on the environment during the construction phase but that has to be weighed up against the impact of the volume of traffic that goes along the A1307 on a daily basis and sits in queues at Linton and from the Gog hills. The more people that use the proposed facility, the less cars on the road and, therefore, less pollution.

Negative Impact at Nine Wells Nature reserve. Have there been thorough Environmental Impact surveys made over a number of YEARS to follow the fresh water SPRINGS, NINE WELLS, from which Hobson's Conduit emerges? What is the impact of the new housing in Trumpington? The proposed route goes too near Nine Wells nature reserve

Of course this will negatively impact on the environment. Wake up! This will destroy the habitat, character & positive features of the area. It intrudes where it is not wanted.

The proposals for the travel hub all appear to avoid the obvious brown field sites and instead rely on destroying fields in the green belt. The brown field areas around the service station and the former roundabout are currently underutilised and appear to be ruled out because they would be a more costly. It is almost always cheaper to rip up a green field than to re-use a brown field site but that's exactly how we damage our

Can't help but feel these would negatively impact on the environment. Moving vehicles on new roads cutting through a mature environment will either kill more mammals, or force them to move and avoid the new tracks

There would be a positive impact if it encourages people to use public transport or cycle on the shared use path rather than driving.

Positive impact through lower carbon modes.

Cannot say at the moment. Definitely while it is under construction it will be a huge problem for wildlife and environment but then it might be beneficial especially if people start using the system.

Proposals will have a positive effect on the environment. The Babraham road into Cambridge each morning has 35-45 minute long ques of traffic this is very polluting. In the eveing this swaps to Hills Road

Would lose fields between Sawston and Stapleford, fear it may then allow the remainder of those fields to be used for housing without proper infrastructure.

Potentially negatively for the entire cross country route unless very carefully designed and landscaped

I feel that Site C would have a very negative impact on the environment as this is currently farmland and no other development is located to the north of A1307. It is also on hill and would therefore be more visible. There would also be a significant impact regarding light pollution to residents of Little Abington in general but particularly residents of Cambridge Road, Bourn Bridge Road and West Field. The other two sites

While it comes in close to some environmentally very sensitive sites, I think this is the best option for bringing the heavy A 1307 traffic into Cambridge in the most sensitive way.

All development impacts negatively on the environment!

The impact on the environment (by shortening the distance existing commuters travel by car) is outweighed by the devastation of important agricultural land, open countryside, wildlife etc and the - how many TONS of concrete and tar? it will take to build. It will also cause hold-ups and congestion on FOUR main village roads in to Cambridge which will ADD to air pollution. So overall the impact on the environment is

Of course it will impact on the environment, you are destroying masses of land when they are viable options for people to get from a to b already

Site A would heavily negatively impact the environment by causing awful congestion on a little bit of road that struggles in rush hour as it is.

Positive impact overall. Short term negative impact because of landscaping.

negatively disrupt habitats existing and ruin the general view of nature

negative. it is unnecessary. it would damage environment, remove farmland, cut up green belt.

There can be no positive impact on the local environment bar reducing traffic slightly (if at all). All the impacts are negative.

Clearly this proposal would harm the ecology of the area

Untouched countryside then ripped into for no real reason

The route will cut across agricultural holdings in a way which could make some land uneconomic to farm and leave pieces of land attractive to speculative development in the green belt. It is not possible to judge the effect of the route on the environment until there are firm landscaping proposals. Lining the route with trees as suggested by the artist's impression would be inappropriate for wide open land. Fencing? Farm

Unequivocally negative. The fields between Stapleford and Sawston are full of birds, deer and other wildlife. This would all be disturbed. It is also a prime dog walking/running/walking area, which would be ruined by frequent buses.

If the proposals increase the usage of public transport and reduce car journeys to South Cambs and the CBC any negative impacts of the new route through open countryside are likely justified. The use of electric vehicles would also greatly help.

This goes through open countryside and green belt along by the Gogs. There would then be the threat of further development alongside the route.

The plans seem to be sensitive to environmental concerns but hopefully there may be additional tree planting along the route.

They will not take the huge volume of traffic off the road before Abingdon, on the way to Cambridge

The area out between Bury Road and Babraham is full of a surprising amount of wildlife which would be disrupted by this development. The area is also used extensively by walkers, and dogs, runners and cyclists and the value of the area would be substantially diminished as a result of this development. I would add that there is relatively little provision for walkers in this area, there are almost no connected walking routes. A hugely negative impact, cutting through existing green belt land popular with walkers and cutting the villages off from the Gog Magog Down and Babraham. The character of the villages will be destroyed.

One can only imagine that further development will follow once this precedent is set. The proposal will have a huge negative impact on the environment. The changes around Cambridge in recent years have been horrific. Cambridge is beautiful, because of the close, surrounding countryside. You cannot start carving up more beautiful fields and countryside. It is not necessary and its impact on wildlife will be catastrophic.

I feel that the proposals would negatively impact upon the environment and local wildlife.

Negatively impact- across green belt and will likely mean increased building and changes to the whole landscape

Of course it will negatively impact the environment. We will have more congestion in the area which will mean more car and bus fumes as well as running what little green areas we have left thanks to constant development

The whole process is negative. There will be an increase in fumes/pollution/noise/congestion

1. There will be triangles of land in Stapleford that could well get pressure from developers to build houses on. There is an opportunity for GCP to create green space for trees and wildlife here if the farmer can't/won't farm there.
2. There needs to be lots of trees planted, to screen the stops, fences etc, and to help with carbon capture.

I assume the CAM would be electric and thus be considered a sustainable initiative.

Cutting through the farmland between sawston and stapleford will lead to more development and these future slums that are found in areas like the CB1 estate. How will the footpath across the fields towards Babraham be affected? Will we still be able to cross this horrible busway? How will wildlife be protected from being struck down? The scar on the landscape will never heal if this goes ahead, and it will be the



Reduced car journeys & congestion & provide a sustainable infrastructure

Negative - Damage to Green Belt environment.

Site A would absolutely negatively impact on the environment of Pampisford Road. This is a country road and traffic is already seriously out of hand at the busiest times. There are no pavements and you walk along that road at your peril.

The only negative I can see is that people would park their cars in residential streets if there isn't enough parking.

There is bound to be a negative impact on the environment from the Travel Hub and the busway itself and all efforts seem to have been made to minimise these.

A huge negative impact on the environment and the green belt. This should be built along side the A1307 to minimise loss of the green belt. It appears to be a back door route into development of land between Shelford and Stapleford.

Positively - Cambridge is far too congested with traffic.

No impact

Any new development will impact on our environment, so long as you don't destroy any historical or nature reserves.

It can only be negative. Too easy to cry 'but it's public transport' so cannot be argued against. All the language is about mitigation, environmental screening etc and all the environmental aspirations, while laudable, do not counter the negative impact of more ground under concrete.

Given the amount of building that is planned for the area and has already happened, the increasing amount of traffic in Cambridge has to be halted. Although this may not be great for the environment in one way it should reduce car use and will therefore be beneficial. An imaginative scheme could & should provide enhancements to the environment.

Positively. I would be more inclined to use my car less.

More cars along Hinton Way more parked cars along Hinton Way more congestion locally and a lot of concrete roadway across a pristine field

Negatively

I do about the extra congestion this would add to the A505 that regularly queues from the mcDonalds roundabout to the M11 virtually all day. IF jn 9 was made accessible from the north that may however be solved

Use of farm bridge over M11 would impact badly on the local environment.

It will have a very positive impact. , workers based in Haverhill, Saffron Walden and all surrounding villages will greatly increase public transport use by driving, cycling or taking bus to these hubs.

It seems that more green fields will be acquired when surely the A 1307 which exists should be upgraded

as they follow the old railway line it shouldn't be an issue

I feel that they have a strong negative impact because they do not reduce car use or reduce traffic and congestion on the A1307 from Haverhill to Four Went Ways.

Site C is outside of the Green belt so would naturally be my first choice.

negatively

Not in possession of enough information to make an informed comment

Can only have a negative impact.

Seemingly designed to make either low or positive impact.

There will be an impact on the environment due to increased traffic flow, but this is inevitable due to an increasing population in South East Cambridgeshire, and the impact would be worse without this scheme.

C might be negative as the Haverhill road is already busy

Option C would be a real eyesore for residents where as option B is on ground which is largely hidden from view

This will benefit the environment if carried out as planned - especially because the present situation is overcrowded & overpoluted with road traffic & is dangerous for pedestrians & cyclists - & this scheme is sensitively & carefully planned.

Short term negative impact, long term gain.
If an off road route is preferred then this limits the impact on the environment both visually and actually
More loss of greenbelt - more rubbish government being shortsighted - who closed down the Haverhill to Cambridge railway? Would take most of the traffic off the road - should be re-opened. We own part of the old line and would happily see it working again even though it is at the end of our garden. Only option B looks to destroy less greenery and would at least mean that area would not be covered in housing
The proposed route is positive as it is going close too the main residential, business areas from the suggested travel hubs.
Negative cutting through a swathe of Green belt land.

All sites will generate traffic and therefore noise and air pollution around Little Abington. Ideally the hubs would be further out to reduce traffic on the most congested part of the A1307.

I am concerned about the river, which might be somewhat impacted, notably by 'hub' sites B & C. It's not very clearly shown on the map but a bridge will also be required

Our local plan highlights the environmental value of the land north of Stapleford, values the views from the village to the only hill in south Cambridge and from the Gog Magog hills back down the valley. Your plan simply ignores this and cuts straight across with a concrete strip. Putting it in a cutting still does not diminish its impact!

Bad as currently I cycle to Addenbokes if needed or use DNA way cycle route to go into Cambridge. Also this pathway will need to be light at night to make it safe for cyclists or pedestrians which will cause light pollution. As shown by not lighting DNA way properly there has been muggings and incidents in the dark.

They will undoubtedly affect the existing countryside; I am not at all sure that the proposals for mitigating the environmental consequences as stated here will actually be carried through, as they are simply stated effectively as qualified intentions, and I am sorry to say I don't always trust such assurances from public bodies. However, I believe that the scheme can potentially reduce the effects of traffic and pollution on the

The route will be unsightly and you are simply opening up the green belt to property developers. As this is a vanity project, why not go the whole way and put it underground?

I think they would negatively impact the environment. The green belt would be irreparably damaged.

They will have a negative effect on the environment - with 16 vehicles every hour there will be cars queuing up, pumping out fumes while they idle at the crossings.

The proposed route will damage green belt, cutting up beautiful countryside forever . More cars and parking will happen in the village bringing more pollution.

If the route is sympathetically planted with trees and other screening then I think the impact on the environment will be reasonable.

The route around Shelford and Stapleford badly spoils the open green belt and there is a danger of the town development creeping out to the edge of the route. Proposed tree planting could well aggravate the situation by spoiling open views from nearby properties.

Since the route does not have useful stop locations, there will be little impact on the environment.

Idling traffic will drastically increase pollution, proven scientifically, which will harm residents who cycle to work and our children who cycle to school.

Definitely would affect the noise. And would be such an invitation to speculative builders who would eventually wear down the legal capacity of the authority to defend. Visually it should be in a ditch. Even though I will cycle it more than walk it I want the minimum width not a great swathe (put the one horse per week somewhere else)



Reduce traffic so positive effect

Positively

site C would negatively impact the environment for the residents of Little Abington with houses near the site and the road crossings, also the route across the fields goign to the west of the A11.

Public transport is a positive move for the environment only when adequately used.

OK

Not happy about any incursions into green belt.

Clearly cutting the Gog Magog Downs from the Hills with this road is damaging environmentally and is a barrier to wildlife in an area rich in habitat and diversity.

This is all Greenbelt and should be treated as never to be developed. Given planning trends it creates a developer's charter to build houses on the land out to the busway

The GCP new route will have a negative impact of the environment, wildlife and existing residents this cross field route should not be allowed

Negative - creation of new infrastructure, concrete, lighting etc across current green land. This project needs to have a net positive impact and to create more good habitat for wildlife than it destroys, including trees, hedges, areas of scrub and wetland

My main concern is environmental, and minimising loss of green belt, wild place and biodiversity.

I don't like the idea of building (especially transport) on the green belt.

very negative, there is a need for being able to see unspoiled green areas, be it farmers fields, scrub or woodland. The carving up of the area would decimate this, make it an ugly eyesore and impact on small animals and birds that currently move across these areas. Deer would be hit by buses. No no no.

negative as it will be on greenbelt. Therefore, everything needs to be done to protect wildlife and nurture nature - too many animals are being killed on the road for instance.

Clearly it would be detrimental- loss of green belt, visual impact, noise.

Positively - I know many people who drive from these villages and the surrounding area to get to both the biomedical campus and hospitals. It should reduce the amount of cars being used if used well.

Not having cars sitting in q's from Addenbrookes to Linton school for up to an hour can only be good for air quality.

Should lessen traffic which is an improvement

No particular views

Locations of the proposed stops will lead to development of land either between them and out towards Babraham Road

I am extremely concerned about the environmental impact on the green belt. I would prefer to see a tram or train line to Haverhill. Rail lines tend to have greater benefit to biodiversity. I would use a rail line to get out to the country with my bike on regular basis if it was available.

However what you are offering is the worst of both worlds, is disruptive to the green

The scheme MUST protect environmentally and historically important sites and ensure routes for wildlife are open in a linear way to ensure they can travel safely from one place to another. Tree and green planting is vital to combat CO2 pollution

Definitely will impact on the environment on a positive way as the reduction in cars will be considerably reduce.

<p>This will definitely negatively impact the environment. It cuts through greenbelt land when it could be positioned next to an existing roadway.</p>
<p>Significantly negatively impact the rural nature of the villages</p>
<p>There is no doubt that putting the proposed transport routes - and all the associated stop locations/parking etc - across this precious piece of agricultural greenbelt land would have a markedly negative impact on the environment, in the following ways: a) it would destroy the nature of that land itself - and all the wildlife that depends on it, severing pathways that foxes, muntjacs, badgers etc need to roam freely.</p>
<p>100% agree it will</p>
<p>It would destroy farmland and habitats in the open spaces of the village.</p>
<p>Obviously any such intrusion into unspoilt countryside will have negative environmental implications</p>

Much agricultural land will be lost and beautiful vistas ruined. Once the transport link is built there will be infilling with houses so concreting over the countryside.

Increased traffic and congestion

Totally negative - inconveniencing and using primary farmland and causing traffic problems around the local stop

Will destroy the countryside around the proposed area.

Without doubt it would have a huge negative impact.  
Expand the existing road to allow a busway - it was managed for a cycleway that one bike per year uses to get to Babraham.

1. There are areas of land in Stapleford between the village boundary and the busway that are likely be targeted by developers for housing, despite not being part of the current Local Plan (approved to 2030). There is an opportunity for GCP to purchase these tracts of land and create green space for trees and wildlife here, assuming that the current landowner considers this land is no longer viable for agricultural purposes

The proposed travel hub site B would be sited on an existing protected road verge area where chalk grassland flora are currently protected. There is no mention of this being retained.

To build a transport hub to accommodate over 2000 vehicles at site A would negatively impact on the residents of both Little and Great Abington. This proposed site is very close to residential property and would significantly increase both noise and air pollution. Site B and site C are more favourable because they would not have the same negative impact on people's residential environment and health.

This will have a detrimental affect upon the environment of a small rural village with regard to both pollution and the built environment.

At a previous consultation/meeting, a group of us pointed out that there is a herony adjacent to the route in Stapleford. This time around, no one seemed to know about this! Its so important that this is conserved, so that this nesting place is not destroyed, or the herons frightened away by the works/busway. Also at at previous consultation a neighbour who had concerns about the ground nesting birds on the farmland, was told

The impact of the schemes would negatively impact in the environment but the only scheme with the least impact is the one that runs along existing roads

Most definitely this proposal will have a negative impact on the environment. The proposal will go through land in which bars, newts , herons, skylarks, foxes and much more habitat and will obviously be destroyed. Pollution from traffic stops is inevitable

Stapleford residents truly love the village atmosphere and its countryside setting, and only ever move away reluctantly. That 'country feel' to the village would be lost if the proposed busway went ahead since it would cut the village off from the only adjacent accessible countryside.

Travel hub A and B would be on green belt which will negatively affect the environment.

Improved public transport should improve air quality and reduce the number of accidents on the A1307.

For the reasons stated above, Location C would negatively impact the village environment. It would be the most visible location from a residential area and its elevated position would likely contribute to an increase in noise pollution for greater/little Abington.

As long as mitigation measures are fulfilled as described, the impact should be positive/neutral.

We live on [road], close to the proposed stop on the border of [village]. We are particularly concerned about two environmental aspects of the stop. Firstly, it is likely that queues of road traffic will form outside our home as the "tram" crosses [road]. As parents of a young child, we are very concerned about the air pollution resulting from such queues and feel that it is imperative that strong measures be put in place to

The transit goes across green belt land so of course it would negatively impact the environment. Animals will be displaced and less green space is never a good thing

What does your plans include for vehicles who pass around the city and what are the plans for HGV passing through the area. HGV emit so much pollution, more than cars.

I have a real concern that the proposed route will lead to development on current green belt and farmland.  
Therefore, very bad for the environment.

Only one not in an existing green belt area which is an advantage as the green belt is under threat.

'-

The proposed route is damaging for the natural environment. It cuts through a large part of green arable land, and destroys local countryside.

There would be some negative impact on the environment but hopefully this would be offset by the reduction of cars used when people would use this new transport service. I am, however, concerned about how close the route comes to the Nine Wells Nature Reserve and any possible damage that might be caused in this very sensitive area.



This busway should follow the A1007 and not negatively impact on Great Shelford and Stapleford by cutting through village roads and green spaces. There will likely be an increase in busway passengers parking their cars along village roads near to the stops, plus an increase in pollution caused by idling traffic at the two busway crossings in Hinton Way and Haverhill Road.

Running a mass rapid transit route which is over-bearing through existing peaceful and agricultural land can only have a negative impact on the environment and am surprised you are asking for positive comments. If you want to reduce traffic into Cambridge then run the transit route parallel with the main road into Cambridge.

I'm afraid this will irreversibly destroy countryside of great value for community

These proposals would negatively impact on the environment in terms of the infrastructure and parking needed at the hubs. I really do think that more investment should go into developing the park and ride sites that we already have and improving the links with these and public transport. Cars should be penalised for driving into the city, which would allow free passage for the buses and bicycles.

I live in Stapleford and my view is of that part of the proposal. It will impact negatively on the village, crossing straight through Green Belt land for no good reason (see above). People will need to drive to the stop and will park in the nearby roads causing congestion and hazardous conditions for all in the village. The land enclosed inside the route will inevitably be built on, eroding the character of the village.

The loss of productive agricultural land for both the route and the significant area of affected land left as impractical to farm with modern machinery will be taken out of production. A significant acreage will be lost from food production. The area between the villages and the transport link will become expansion development land for dwellings.

There is no Car Park for the stop in Stapleford. Cars will block the roads. for residents

Positive (better public transport) outweighs negative effects of new structures.

I am deeply unhappy about the incursion into open fields through all the parishes the route crosses. It will negatively impact their rural quality. By dividing the arable fields it will reduce their ease of cultivation, and also render them more likely to be developed. It will negatively impact wildlife. Although the buses will be electric, they will still cause disturbance in their passage, especially with the degree of frequency.

My comments above highlight the use of the link as being a commuter driving hub rather than a local use inter-city connection. So at the moment I see the effect as Negative and will bring more vehicles into the area.

A positive environment proposal has been made on this suggested area.

Please see comments in number 10 below in relation to the significant negative impact on the environment - in particular it is noted that the proposed route is close to a Conservation Area and will have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as well as threatening local wildlife including bats and newts; the established trees are generally subject to Tree Preservation Orders and may also

Please see 10 below - we feel the route will have a profoundly negative impact on the environment.

These will negatively impact on the environment for no real purpose as another route is available (the one that could go along the A1307). There are already waits at the train station on both routes, and with busses expected every 4 mins it will just cause more congestion on these roads. Also it cuts through the countryside. This would all be ok if there was not another more suitable route but there is.

1. Positive to the extent that they reduce the number of cars entering Cambridge.
2. Negative insofar as existing footpaths are encroached upon by buses and parked cars, more inroads are made on the green belt.
3. Positive insofar as a larger footpath network is created.

Negatively, more countryside ripped up and will lead to more development
Large negative impact. Why does there need to be a separate route when an upgrade to the existing A1307 would be cheaper, easier and have less environmental impact?
See 10 below
The proposed route will undoubtedly have a huge negative impact on the environment, tearing up the areas of green/countryside between villages.
I think the effects will be broadly neutral
There would most certainly be a negative impact on the environment, with buses travelling through our already highly congested small villages of Stapleford and Great Shelford. We are fairly close to the M11, which is bad enough, but we certainly don't need buses, and delayed cars, travelling through any part of the villages and stopping/starting, causing additional pollution.
Massively damaging to the environment -green fields for very little benefit

This proposed route will burden Great Shelford and Stapleford with 16 buses per hour, that is 1 bus every 4 minutes across the fields with stops and traffic lights across Hinton Way and Haverhill Road. Great Shelford already has roughly 22 minutes of every hour stopped by the railway line closure . The number of cars stopping and starting and the pollution caused from this for a route from Babraham Institute to

Of course it would have a negative impact on the environment! It would cut right across the greenbelt! Apart from increased noise and pollution, it would be an absolute blot on the landscape.

Public transport development would definitely have a positive impact on the environment. I'm very happy about the scale of the project, we need a dramatic positive change.

I am of the opinion the proposed transport hub will be a constant source of annoyance to the village. I also believe it will be a burden on the limited police resources.

The proposals occupy prime agricultural land, which is undesirable.

The fields beside Hinton Way will be unnecessarily damaged by the congestion caused by the bus route crossing Hinton Way.

There would be a negative impact on the environment as the bisected fields would become ripe for ribbon development when the infrastructure is not there to support such a development. The impact on Hinton Way to existing road and cycle users would be detrimental as the stretch of road between the railway station and proposed busway would become a car park - it's already bad enough when the barriers are down

Views from Magog Down would be adversely affected. There are already very few open view left rear Cambridge and increased traffic, lighting and activity in the area may well deter birds and other wild life.

The pollution and traffic caused by building works will negatively effect the environment, particularly harmful to Great Shelford which is renowned for its green spaces, and once the buses are rolling, it will cause further damage due to more traffic and pollution.

This route would impact on the green belt and in particular would bring noise and (possibly) light pollution to near neighbours, of which I am one.

One of the joys of cycling to work along the cycle path to Addenbrooke's is being close to nature and the wildlife in the fields around Nine Wells (I refer to the natural spring and not the new housing estate). Any bus route development across this green belt area will steal habitat away from what little wildlife is left,, cutting across farming land and creating more money making housing development opportunities WHICH WE DO

I feel these proposals will negatively impact on the environment.

The effect on the air quality would be detrimental as cars queue each time the lights are on red to allow a bus past. The view over green fields would be spoilt and animals' habitats lost.

Totally negatively. In particular huge damage to Nine Wells

Positive to the environment .

This proposal will negatively impact our lovely small village. Our small village is surrounded by a greenbelt. Beautiful chalk downs and agricultural fields. The destruction of our village for this proposed stop is totally unjustifiable. It is a gateway to further development on precious greenspace for developers turning these villages into characterless congested polluting suburbs. The tranquillity and natural beauty of

I support the proposed efforts to protect Nine Wells Nature Reserve by planting on the remaining strip of land. The doubling of the railway line must happen on the western side of the existing track.

I strongly support the proposed enhancement of Nine Wells Nature Reserve by planting on the remaining strip of land. There must be no suggestion of the additional rail tracks being built on the eastern side of the existing railway line.

It will disturb some hedgerow and farmland but with tree and hedge planting along the route probably the overall impact would be limited.

There may be some light and noise pollution but again with careful management this can be minimised

Cutting across farmland north of Shelford and Stapleford when there is a reusable trackbed for the old Haverhill railway, is an environmental travesty. The railway should be reopened all the way to Haverhill with a stop at Granta Park too. Public transport should not \*bypass\* villages in the manner of the proposed route - it should serve them directly. As for a "travel hub" near the A1307/A11/A505 junction, in reality this a car

The inhabitants of Cambridge and surrounding towns and villages face real problems with travel into and away from the city. Any proposal that will offer affordable and reliable public transport is to be welcomed. However, such proposals must be designed to ensure minimal impact on the green belt and environment. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the

Cutting across the fields would impact negatively on the environment. It will have a huge impact on the environment of the precious Magog Down.

the transport system will have a strongly negative effect on the environment

Sorry to see more agricultural land and open breathing spaces being concreted over. Seems something of a gravy train for contractors without much benefit for local residents

The proposed route could easily be raised i.e more easterly, so that the buses would not be travelling so close to residents on Haverhill Road. The area is also used by many birds which would be deterred by the buses.

The whole concept will have a negative impact as it will increase congestion and therefore pollution around four ways, will destroy countryside along the route and passes close to the nature reserve at Nine Wells.

The bus route runs through green belt land, which will cause massive disruption.

Stops are proposed for both Great Shelford and Stapleford. The second stop in Stapleford will serve a very limited number of residents. Much of Stapleford is equidistant from both stops. All of Stapleford is significantly closer to the Great

By promoting public transport and cycling, and giving people a credible alternative to private cars, this will have a positive impact on the environment.

I am generally supportive of the way the proposals try to minimise the impact on the environment and the proposed mitigation.

I notice that in the consultation leaflet, the plans to illustrate Sites B and C both refer to "upgraded shared use paths to Abingtons" along Bourn Bridge Rd. I know there are protected verges along that road and wonder whether those verges will be protected.

They're all negative - it's building an entirely new bus way through countryside and creating a very large car park.

Negative. I voted for a route closer to the A1307 and still feel that is a more friendly option rather than cutting through fresh land.

<p>Stapleford is renowned for having a rolling hills environment which will be devastated by this project. Who will benefit, certainly not the villages, it is purely for the commuters and the way to solve this problem is to alleviate the Central Cambridge problem and distribute traffic more quickly once it enters the city. This idea will not ease that and will decimate the villages and surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Totally negative. The result would be disruption to local traffic and massive increase in passing traffic.</p> <p>It would result in a continual construction development to fill the gaps!</p> <p>It will create longer journeys in to Cambridge.</p> <p>Greater pollution</p>
<p>The whole proposal is significantly environmentally negative. It forces people to own and use cars, and fails to provide any useful public transport whatsoever either to the villages or workplaces in the area.</p>
<p>All proposals will have a negative effect on the environment. This is the unfortunate effect of development work.</p>



There would be massive increase in road traffic accessing and trying to park at these stops, entailing the obvious increase in pollution for local residents, let alone inconvenience and loss of quality of village life. This is apart from the multiple buses passing by each hour. There is no need for these multiple stops - all traffic for the Biomed Campus could access transport at the A11 and use the 1307 and save money

Positive impact

Traffic waiting to cross the junctions will negatively impact on the environment as well as the access in and out of the villages. If the majority could be persuaded to leave their cars behind them great but that is unlikely due to the limited destination of the CAM.

I understand that a potential net improvement in air quality in the "wider area" (Cambridge City South East?) may (or may not) balance any decrease in air quality along the route/hub/stops.

In these times of urgent need of bold, brave environmental projects this project I understand the concept of trade off of air quality, between the wider area (Cambridge. South?) and the area around the route/hub/stops. However, in these times of urgent need for bold, brave environmental projects this transport project represents a very poor return on a huge amount of public money.

A massive, irreversible impact on the environment and the green belt.

Site B and particularly Site C are much closer to the Abingtons and Abraham and therefore more vehicles on the A1307 accessing both of these sites will mean more air and noise pollution for these villages.

The fields would be used for car parks and building. It is obvious that wild-life would have less space.

A new P&R will negatively affect the environment by covering the area with tarmac. Hopefully it will be well used and take cars off the road. I hope that it will have fewer negative effects if the new roads associated with it are kept as close to existing roads as possible, such as the purple route rather than through the middle of rural areas, such as the proposed blue and black routes.

Will have a negative effect on noise and air pollution in abingtons

Would be a terrible negative impact on the environment especially where it deviates off the old railway line to cross Haverhill Road and Hinton Way. This will be a developers land windfall for infilling the green belt.

I believe the sensible option would have been to keep to the old railway route to Shelford station and fit it in alongside the existing cycle path running adjacent to the bus stop and in particular the frequency of the barrier coming down across Hinton Way, stopping traffic, will cause increased air pollution from vehicles, especially those with idling engines. Residents who live on Hinton Way, or on roads leading off Hinton Way, will be exposed to these increased exhaust fumes and the subsequent health risks associated

Proposed stop in Haverhill rd Stapleford, would impact biodiversity, changing existing habitats and altering the landscape.

Negative. Will cut up green belt and for the villages affected very little benefit.

Encourages people from Haverhill/Linton area to drive to the hub site and bus, rather than taking the number 13 bus directly, i.e. there will be more cars on the road. The increased traffic may affect muntjacs and badgers. Lighting of the car park at night will negatively impact on bat populations. The green belt should be protected and not dug up to build a huge car park for thousands of cars!

All the chosen proposals would negatively impact on the green belt and already endangered wildlife and indigenous plant species, and increase congestion and pollution at a time when we should be striving to reduce our carbon footprint.

1. The proposed route & various stops will devastate the environment around the 3 villages. 2 It will also ruin good farmland. 3. Both Wandlebury & Magog Downland - wonderful resources for Cambridge & local residents- will also be impacted negatively. 4. The current well used roads Hinton way, Haverhill Rd & presumably Granhams Rd will be

There will be considerable noise pollution from the transport link and I believe there are some rare species that will be affected by the development.

These proposals will have a massive negative impact on the local environment. Further development around the important heritage and nature reserve at Ninewells can only be to its detriment. The proposed route cuts through miles of currently unspoilt countryside, opening up the possibility of ribbon development all along it. The council say that it will remain green belt; but if that is the case surely it should be

Countryside up the sides of Hinton Way and Haverhill Road would be affected. Farmland at present. Birds already on the decline. More cars, more pollution, more noise, more road traffic.

Travel Hub C would involve bridge over Newmarket Road and through the current Comfort Cafe site. A decision is required urgently otherwise this site will be left undeveloped and will be an eyesore and a health and safety issue. Also increase in queueing traffic and so fumes.

Travel Hub B - would cause delays to existing public transport in queues - queues

These proposals would have a hugely negative impact on the environment. Swathes of agricultural land would be carved up. Development to fill in the remaining gaps would be swift increasing traffic volume and putting more pressure on local services where infrastructure is already insufficient. Negative impact also on wildlife in the fields

The proposal would have massive negative impact on the environment. Putting a new road in through fields can only have a negative impact on the local wildlife (deer, hares, birds) and

The land between Stapleford & Sawston is prime Skylark territory, and development of this land would have an advise effect on the population.

Highly destructive to the environment around Stapleford, Shelford and beyond.

Lots of detrimental effects e.g. parking on green belt or arable fields, minimal proposed woodland planting e.g. vicinity of site B is mostly proposed to be grass (green desert). May interfere with the river as well.

I think they would negatively impact the environment. Improve the current transport links. If the trains and busses were better then less people would drive and there would be less congestion. New roads are not the answer they just negatively impact the wild fauna and Flora of an area. The soil will be negatively impacted because of the reduced drainage availability from all the tarmac. The lighting will negatively impact the

If this can cut traffic on the A1307 and replace it with low imission transport it has to be a positive. I would hope that sympathetic planting and consideration of wildlife routes would be put in place.

An environmental impact is inevitable, but justifiable for the greater benefits of the scheme.

Negatively - disgraceful cutting through protected green belt area. Excuse after excuse made to destroy nature and ruin views from people houses of nature.

all developments will have an effect on environment wherever it may be but progress needs to complement this.

Negatively - it is going to ruin countryside for no justifiable reason

Earlier discussion of this project repeatedly included the phrase 'linear park'. This is not what is now proposed, just small patches of greenwashing. For a project of this size, ploughing through the Green Belt, that's not ok.

Negatively as 7m wide concrete slabs are placed through green belt farmland. And it depends how much the 10% increase in biodiversity is actually held to account rather than running out of budget when it comes to this last item.

The environment impact on the green belt is unforgiving, irreversible and developed by planners who have no appreciation for the environment. Yes, there needs to be development to cater for the increase in footfall to Cambridge but adapt what is currently in place. E.g. Connect the new hubs with the A1301. Widen the road and introduce the electrical buses to join up Babraham Park & Ride.

I strongly oppose the route through the green belt - it will destroy the countryside and am concerned about increase in congestion on Hinton Way.

I STRONGLY agree with the need to vastly reduce congestion on A1307 especially and on all routes into and within Cambridge and to reduce car use and increase eco buses and cycling. Once the cycle path was opened I cycled to work in Cambridge everyday. Now retired, I cycle into Cambridge, or use bike and train or the park and Ride if lots to carry or small children with me. BUT

For me, it would ruin my village, my view and everything I love about living where I live!

more congestion on the A1307, creating a negative impact on the environment.

more traffic on the A1307 creating a negative impact, using farmland, greenbelt both negative.

Yes. Land will be disturbed and built on. The surroundings of the village of Stapleford will be ruined. It is proposed to be right on the boundary of the village which will ruin it. It needs to be further away nearer to the Babraham road A1307, if at all.

Negative impact on environment obviously as goes right through the heart of greenbelt

The proposed route would have a negative impact on the present green belt. It would cut the parish of Stapleford in two, separating us from the open fields and Magog Down. Inevitably there would be an excuse for development infilling to the north of Stapleford up to the route, and to the east in the triangle between Haverhill Road and the route.

Highly negative impact on the environment - taking up green belt area and bound to negatively affect the invaluable nearby Wandlebury and Gog Magog Hills open spaces

Totally negative impact on the environment, the ecological balance, and waste of £155m that could improve what is there already.

The busway will be carved through the chalk downland that forms the beautiful backdrop to Stapleford and Magog Down. This is part of the Green Belt that encircles Cambridge and is crucial for maintaining its character. Because the busway will split the hill to the north of the village, the farmed area will be constrained and unprofitable, making it at high risk of infill development.

Hub A - The 'County Wildlife Site' I was not able to ascertain at the session I attended if this was going to be anything more than the rabbit home along the old railway bank. Tongue in cheek I was told at the session rabbits were wildlife! If you are calling it a Wildlife site I feel it should be a managed one.

Response from Hobson's Conduit Trust

Hobson's Conduit Trust has, since 1631, been responsible for the care of Hobson's Brook which rises from the springs at Nine Wells and flows into Cambridge. This rare chalk stream habitat running into the heart of Cambridge is a significant ecological

I believe if this has to go ahead then Site C give the least impact to Abington village and the surrounding greenbelt land.

Negative impact due to loss of greenbelt land and marginally fewer cars only. Main benefit is congestion reduction

I think the proposals would have a negative impact on the local environment as Site A and B on greenbelt

it is all built on green belt land, and disturbing the wild life

Construction on the green belt will negatively impact on the environment. Due to the increased traffic flow to the stops and resulting congestion the air quality will decrease. This is not a sustainable proposal.

No consideration is given to the preservation of views. Since S Cambs enjoys some of the local high points, we currently have extensive uninterrupted views across green belt (arable land and woodland). This will be substantially eroded by the extension of CAM and its stops across the area.

The cost, impact on environment, traffic (improvement) in Cambridge and citizens near by are in no relation in my opinion.

Negative local impacts. Congested local vehicle traffic and parking pressure around the 'village' stops will generate air pollution and noise issues. Planning 'capture' of arable land on to the north of these villages is also a concern. The new transport route will encourage infill development of the fields bounded by Hinton way, Haverhill road and the new route. Site C would increase traffic on Cambridge Rd in Little Abington which is a residential area with consequent impact on noise, light and air pollution levels. It is on a hill so difficult to landscape effectively.

Site C has no environments benefits. Its impact is more noise, air and light pollution in Putting bus stops where they are will create a huge volume of extra traffic with people being dropped off to the bus (since they will consider it too far to walk), plus the extra queues of traffic waiting along the existing roads will create extra air pollution. The bus route across what's currently quiet countryside will negatively impact on the current peace and quiet of this countryside. And the environmental impact of the construction Cutting through the green belt with a great swathe of tarmac and concrete has to be a negative for the environment.

It's clear that Cambridge is going to have to drastically reduce the number of private cars being used for commuting due to the climate emergency (even if they all went



The proposal will severely impact the green belt, that is chipping away established habitat. This off road option is totally not necessary.

Negatively. Going through nature areas and making noise from top of hill where it's running.

This would severely damage the green belt environment. See my detailed comments at 10 below.

Loss of open space. Agricultural land for growing food lost. Habitat for wild life destroyed. At present deer, badgers, foxes as well as small mammals. Birds on fields - disturb the heronry. Numerous insects. General peaceful mindfulness of our home environment gone for ever.

It would seem that this will create a lot of extra car traffic in the three intervening villages, both people dropping off passengers, and car drivers queuing at the crossing points. Lots of extra emissions!

In order to link the Addenbrooke's site to Babraham, the proposed route will cut through green belt land. How many passengers per day - at such a high environmental and financial cost? At a cost of £155 million and to save a few minutes for a few specified people, this scheme is being pushed through despite the rational and many objections of the Parish Councils. Once the green belt has been divided,

The red route is carved across a landscape close to one of the most pristine, iconic even, landscapes in and around Cambridge, the Gog Magog Hills. It will create movement where there is none at present. The route parallel with railway should be used as the additional movement will be "lost" alongside the very busy railway line, soon to become busier with East West Rail. Very much against the red route. It must

A new busway/cycle track across the fields would inevitably adversely impact the environment, crossing existing footpaths.

I am against creating a new busway across the green belt/farmland. It will affect agriculture and disrupt footpaths.

The proposals are bound to adversely impact on the environment. I'm afraid that is the price for coping with the increased population. However, more thought could be given to costing the impact on the green belt which seems to have been overlooked in the existing preferred route.

destruction of greenbelt and biodiversity  
open to more developments on greenbelt  
more pollution and traffic at new lights

Fumes from stationary cars waiting at crossings will increase - the problem at Shelford station (and the knock-on effect along Mingle Lane) is a case in point.  
Wildlife habitats will be destroyed both by fumes and by planned building (land capture!)  
Parking problems close to hubs will make turning out of drives much more dangerous

Valuable open countryside would be destroyed.  
I fully endorse the views expressed by Cambridge PPF and by Stapleford Parish Council.

Serious impact on the environment. The proposals would involve destruction of green belt land and of the rural character of Stapleford and Great Shelford, all for marginal benefits in terms of improved transport. Why don;t developers realise that residents value the green belt, attractive landscapes and keeping the villages separate from Cambridge? A key issue is that development leads to more development. As soon as

- 1) The CO2 of building an unnecessary cycle way between stapleford and the biomedical campus does not seem justified on any grounds.
- 2) Until there is a published justification of the need for stops, the building of the stops would seem to have an unnecessary environmental impact for no gain.

Negatively - see response attached

This proposal for a 14- metre wide road gouged through the Gog Magog hills would bring environmental degradation in terms of fossil fuel use ( it is a road with buses, trechnology environmentally outdated long ago), noise and light pollution. It would affect the valuable wildlife often Gogs through its effect on wildlife land use of then areas known as Hill Farm and of Fox Hill. Also, the porposal takes absolutely no notice

Traffic on Cambridge RD Little Abington would increase pollution above legal limits

A new busway over agricultural land is unnecessary and destructive of the landscape and crop growing resources.

The proposed busway would cause significant damage to the landscape, particularly at the Magog Down. At the very least, the busway should be put in a cutting for part of its length and wildlife corridors including tree planting should be placed on either side of it.

The proposed route would cut across green belt land and spoil the landscape. I think the route along the A1307 was a much better proposal and had much less environmental impact.

Cutting through the green belt with this route will be another step towards urbanisation of this area. South Cambridgeshire has one of the worst records for development on

negatively because currently area of peace, farming and footpaths, .bridle way. Potential for infill building a real possibility.

This is environmentally and historically destructive. The GCP should take people into account, their real working practices and their health. The process used has not done this and therefore is fundamentally biased. You are destroying the wildlife of the Gogs and the historic heritage of fox hill.

Negative

Habitat loss/agricultural land from the construction will not be entirely replaced by wildlife areas.

Mixed hedges + some trees, preferably bot sides of the route, would be very good. Encourage wildlife + experience of route users.

I think that carving up the green belt is insane for the environment, for wildlife, and for growing crops on this prime arable land.

Cutting across field is not my idea of good planning! we need fields for growing food!!

Negatively. You are bringing even more tarmac on this poor planet, cutting through fields, damaging wildlife such as skylarks, badgers, hedgehogs, great crested newts, sparrowhawk etc.

may have a negative impact on environment

VERY NEGATIVE

Negative impact on village

Haverhill Road stop to crossing of Black Barn lane: leaving a potentially unusable triangle of arable field - currently green belt, which will potentially lead to development in the future. A negative impact on the environment/wildlife/access to countryside for cyclists + walkers plus impinging on historical sites such as Magog Down + Wandlebury.

destroy perfectly good arable land

Negative as so much wildlife deer, foxes etc will be slayed if more buses car etc used in this area.

This will have a huge effect on the environment. our green land will disappear + there will then be infill. more houses etc.

greatly - loss of open space.  
water run off. parking problems.  
noise - light pollution

negative impact on green belt areas + local wildlife

will spoil it

negatively. this is the imposition of the least green form of construction across the green belt

this route will destroy heron life & nestin, a skylark habitat & much more - the traffic created will impact on air pollution already suffered from the station on Hinton Way

good fior cycling - positive

Negative impact on an area of significant importance locally (the Magog Down) and on the productive farmland all around the possible route, between Babraham + Stapleford.

to me they all look negative. Cambridge South Station needed. current buses 7 etc linking to it.  
otherwise main things for Haverhill are  
1) more frequent commuter buses for workers + 6th form students (overcrowded now)  
2) re-open rail line!! Quickly

negatively impact on village life around the stops - people will inevitably park around the roads close to the stops.

The countryside that the route cuts through will be lost prefer as beautiful landscape on the edge of Cambridge

'- vely

I would expect much of the land to be green belt?

The new Public transport route plan goes very close to Nine Wells - may have an impact on wild life

There are several mature trees along the Babraham-Abington cycle track - will they be protected?

disrupt farming in the area

option A has least impact on open countryside, and car park is on least visible land away from residential properties. Good walking access (best of all options) to Granta Park.

option B too visible as is C.

net negative, including that from idling + slow traffic on Hinton Way caused by traffic backing up from a bus stop, particularly when already delayed by London Road junction lights, railway crossing & other bus stops + parking obstructions.

None

It would spoil the outlook on each side of Hinton Way.  
It would cause unhealthy fumes for nearby residences.

The proposed main route which has been chosen (orange route) was NOT my favourite. I feel it encroaches upon GREEN BELT and disrupts natural habitats. Furthermore Nine Wells Nature Reserve is compromised.

traffic queues will be enormous causing even more pollution. None of the environmental proposals will overcome the damage caused.

I strongly support more tree planting (not sycamores!). maybe drivers would resent paying for petrol from Haverhill + bus fares?

Transport problems too severe for local government to deliver solutions. National plan and money unavoidable.

n/a

'Negatively:

- loss of agricultural land
- Increase light pollution from car park
- Increase traffic congestion in vicinity of car park

'Negative impact:

- the loss of grade 1 agricultural land cannot be supported. The need to feed the growing population is becoming more urgent.

it will also cause more pollution by encouraging more traffic to pass through Linton & Abington to reach the hubs

The consultation document states, "There would be an impact on the Green Belt." In fact, the proposed busway is wholly within the Green Belt for most of its length until it reaches the A505 This is somewhat more than an impact! The landscape that it runs through is open fields which tend to slope down towards the villages along the A1301 so that there will be a major visual impact along the edge of these villages .



**6) How far do you support each site proposed in the leaflet?**

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support
Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion
Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion
Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support
Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion
Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose



Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose
Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion
Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support
Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose



Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site B: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support



Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site C: Support

Site B: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site B: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose



Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support



Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion



Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site B: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site B: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support



Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose
Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose
Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion
Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support



Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Support, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose



Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: Strongly support, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Support

Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Support
Site A: Strongly oppose, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose
Site C: Support
Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose
Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion
Site A: Strongly support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion
Site A: Oppose, Site B: Support, Site C: Oppose
Site A: Strongly support, Site B: Strongly oppose, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site C: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: No opinion, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: Oppose, Site B: Oppose, Site C: Strongly support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site B: Support

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Support

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: Support, Site B: Support, Site C: Strongly oppose

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion

Site A: No opinion, Site B: No opinion, Site C: No opinion



**7) How far do you support each public transport route accessing the proposed travel hub sites?**

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site  
C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown  
route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue  
route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly  
Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Support



Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue  
route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support,  
Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue  
route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown  
route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route  
(site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route  
(site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support,  
Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support



Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly  
Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route  
(site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route  
(site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly  
Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Brown route (site B): Strongly Support

Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support



Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site  
C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly  
Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Brown route (site B): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose



Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown  
route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route  
(site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue  
route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue  
route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site  
C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support



Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly  
Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown  
route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site  
C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown  
route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route  
(site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue  
route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route  
(site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support,  
Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Support,  
Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue  
route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose,  
Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route  
(site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown  
route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route  
(site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown  
route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route  
(site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion



Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose,  
Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route  
(site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route  
(site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown  
route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site  
C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown  
route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route  
(site C): No opinion

Brown route (site B): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue  
route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No  
opinion, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose,  
Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly  
Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Oppose, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown  
route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site  
C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown  
route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose



Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly  
Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Support, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown  
route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site  
C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Support,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose,  
Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown  
route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route  
(site C): Support



Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Support,  
Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route  
(site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly  
Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C):  
Oppose, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose



Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Strongly Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Support

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Oppose, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Black route (site C): Support, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose
Purple route (site A): Strongly Oppose, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose
Black route (site C): Support
Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion
Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose
Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion
Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Support
Purple route (site A): Strongly Support, Pink route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Brown route (site B): Strongly Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Blue route (site C): Support

Purple route (site A): Support, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): Strongly Oppose, Blue route (site C): Strongly Oppose

Purple route (site A): Oppose, Pink route (site B): Oppose, Brown route (site B): Oppose, Black route (site C): Strongly Support, Blue route (site C): Oppose

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Pink route (site B): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion, Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue route (site C): No opinion

Pink route (site B): Support, Brown route (site B): Support

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion

Purple route (site A): No opinion, Pink route (site B): No opinion,  
Brown route (site B): No opinion, Black route (site C): No opinion, Blue  
route (site C): No opinion



**8) Would you like to provide any further comments on the route and travel hub options?**

Waste of £150M, won't achieve any improvements above what is currently on offer other than those limited persons that live in Haverhill and work at either the Babraham Science Park and/or Grant Park

Would improve cycling/walking options between these villages. Currently the distance is not an issue, but safety is a concern. A separate off road walking/cycling path would solve this

The hub sites really affect residents near there and people who would use the hub (which I won't).

The aim for all of your projects seems to be use concrete or tarmac, not use existing infrastructure and maintain it with subsidies to increase usage.

The on going problem of traffic jams at the McDonalds roundabout A505 and A1307 junction will get worse with the added traffic. I suggest this problem should be considered as part of the proposals, ideally with an east west flyover at this junction. Thank you.

What is needed is an efficient route easily accessible by car with adequate (like a park and ride) free car parking. This would be easier for some routes and hubs than others. However, subject to adequate car parking I would support all the options except Blue route site C.

Travel Hub B would make access between the 2 science parks much easier, which would probably encourage more people to use it.

Cycleway/footpath of 3.5 m is too narrow. The existing route along the southern busway is already dangerously crowded during rush hour and carries far more people than the buses! - pedestrians and cyclists need to be segregated if this is to be a realistic commuting route as cyclists from Sawton or further out to Cambridge need uninterrupted cycling route. Also needs to be protected from buses.

It would be better if the proposed public transport route extended further away from Cambridge than the A11/A505 junction. If the route went as far as Haverhill, then it would be far more useful.

None of these proposals always help relieve the traffic on the A1307, they all seem to favour the biomedical campus. How much are they funding this project? They're workers will benefit

What use will this route be should the various research campus' shrink owing to the economic climate. They may even relocate to a place which is more attractive than the Cambridgeshire area as it is being urbanized at an alarming rate. It no longer has the beautiful countryside that encouraged businesses to locate here.

Prefer location B, primarily because it will allow good access to both Science Parks at Babraham and Granta Park. Furthermore, one stop would be in the car park, reducing the number of stops relative to the other sites.

Site A would be on an extended route towards Linton and Haverhill. The stop should be built in-line to the old railway, so that CAM trams can stop there on the way to more distant destinations. If it is built in any other location it will need to be moved later, adding unnecessary expense to a future project, or there would have to be some kind of complicated diversion from the main route slowing down journeys

The above question 7 does not have a strongly oppose, but has two strongly supports!! I strongly oppose on environmental grounds because of the impact to green field sites.

A-road connections to hub A are poor, for example for traffic coming from south on A11. Hub A also does not connect to the greenway under construction now. Hub B needs more than a T-junction onto the semi-dual A1307.

No

Why can I not mark Strongly Oppose? There are two columns marked Strongly Support!

Site C: Putting traffic lights on the A1307? You must be kidding. Have you seen the jams in St Ives? The A1307 is already bad.

Site B: It appears that all traffic leaving the site and travelling away from Cambridge

Waste of money unless the buses will be free to travel on as the campus that you feel these sights will be used by people working at them all have good car parking unless it's your plan to ban car parks at these places of work

Additional support to make cycle routes safer - lighting is needed Addenbrookes through to Shelford

I think these plans are long needed but disappointed they don't address beyond Abington to the villages along the A1307 and Haverhill. Also interested to understand the plans for the No13 bus route...

Looks like a scheme to help non-residents only - why should we support this?

criteria to use - not at all clear. There is also no clear option of bike use to and from the travel hub. This healthy alternative may well be preferred by many commuters. "shared use" facilities is not sufficient

No strong preference.

Your diagrams don't really help me in seeing where the public transport routes are coming from so I feel that I am unable to form an opinion about this. That means that if I was to use these hubs, I will be driving.

I think the key is that this is built in a way that can enable the CAM system to extend out via Abington and Linton to Haverhill. This would then be able to serve a substantial number of travellers and reduce congestion on the A1307. In the current version, I do not see a good value for money because there is not significant congestion at most times leading up to the Babraham Road Park & Ride, so little

I love the link ups with the Sawston greenway project and the increasing amount of South Cambs that is accessible via off-road cycle paths.

The new round about for option C would be welcome, as it can be difficult to get in and out of the existing road that leads to the Shell garage.

I think site C is best as it is furthest to the east, is on the A1307 (the majority of the users will come from Haverhill), and allows easy access in all directions to the A11 and A505.

The Hub option B and Brown route is the preferred option for bringing public transport as close to Babraham as possible. However, if an additional stop on the route brought Babraham into play then the hub location could be option C. Site A provides neither a termination point close enough to Babraham nor the potential for an additional stop location.

I believe sawston should be connected to Cambridge through the new transport scheme

the map is not at a resolution to allow comment. There are no images of the existing sites.

Severe impact on traffic already in Shelford and Stapleford from badly managed level crossings, it would add insult to injury to then add traffic light junctions for the busway

Including "Horse Riding" is totally absurd. Horse are anti-social, leave manure which cyclists will have to splatter through and are a hazard to walkers and cyclists. It is hard to see why this anti-social special interest group is being pandered to. Where are they going to park their horse whilst they are at work? They are not commuters.

I support both routes on site B as this seems to be a much better choice for the hub location.

I think a transport hub is a great idea, but I'm concerned about the vehicle access for sites B and C. A queue for either could result in increased queues for and on the Four Went Ways roundabout. The proposed new roundabout on the A1307 (for site C) may also increase queuing at peak periods. For site C, construction of a bridge and a roundabout is likely to be very disruptive.

They all seem logical

Barring factors that I do not know about, short and direct is better.

Develop the brownfield site at Fourwentways instead of taking more land and covering it with tarmac.

Once again, these do nothing to alleviate the real travel issues in this area of Cambridgeshire.

Please reconsider the bus route. It's a lovely farm track where many people walk daily and can enjoy completely safe environment to walk dogs, run, and cycle.

Whatever route is chosen, maintenance of footpaths/cycleways to enable access to Babraham/Granta Park should be paramount - good quality pathways that allow users to leave the main routes to head towards Babraham/Granta Park for non-bus or car users.



I support the construction of this route. It needs to be well lit if it is going to be used by pedestrians and cyclists along side the bus route. Otherwise there is a chance that it could turn into an area targeted by muggers such as parts of the guided busway.

As above I believe this route C that I prefer ought to extend to Linton

No hubs would benefit me working in duxford it will just delay the 16 miles journey to take even longer..

Multi user path 2 meters away from a busy road on horse? No thanks that's really not safe for horses. It's not mutli use is cyclists path

Non of the above helps the 1307 beyond Granta Park... you need to reach further. Haverhill is growing year by year with more and more communters working in the City... PLEASE PLEASE Consider reinstating a rail link instead!?

I would prefer the see a scheme that would not need people to have a car in the first place. This means a higher capacity/frequency scheme that stops in walking distance of destinations: Granta Park, Sawston, etc. Light rail to Haverhill would do this and also serve the large village if Linton, which is not catered for in this scheme (except by car).

Most of my trips by car are to/from Babraham Rd Park and Ride, so will be unaffected by this proposed route, except to hopefully take some of the traffic off the route.

Please ensure that the path has lights for cyclists (e.g. like the LED ones on the Cambridgeshire Busway routes). Please also ensure good cycle connections and safe pedestrian walkways between the research parks and the hub.

Great idea and hope it goes ahead!
Put route through middle of villages. Expand existing parking at park and ride. Build Cambridge South railway station. Save the money on this plan.
Far too expensive. Money could be better spent elsewhere. The volume of traffic will only increase with your proposals and are detrimental to other road uses particularly given that buses only pass thorough hourly!
N/A

Option C - what analysis and allowances have been made to ascertain the negative impact on local property values in the direct area. Many will have mortgages etc which could be jeopardised, what compensation will be given to residents if option c is voted in?

As above:

I think 2000 car parking spaces is very excessive. This plan should be made to cater for future needs, and, as the planet is on fire, we should work to reduce car park spaces as much as possible. I suggest increasing the number of disabled parking spots and cycle lockers and cutting the number of parking spaces. People

Site B provides the best access to Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park, which is likely to increase usage, and reduce road congestion more than the other site options. It also offers easier access to more users. The brown route provides the most direct route from the best site, so would offer some cost savings, and involve less farmland/landscape being destroyed.

We should do more to protect pedestrians from speeding cyclists on the walkways, and to protect either cyclists and pedestrians who may use the bus routes. More should also be done to protect wildlife and wild flowers.

Scrap this daft scheme - concentrate on improving the existing infrastructure rather than building a white elephant that serves the interests of house builders rather than residents.

Needs to be as straight and direct as possible, why include a curved section?

NA

Please budget for maintenance of any routes. We keep seeing new additions, but then basic maintenance is ignored (e.g. hedge cutting next to cycle paths)

If it is to be potentially extended beyond to Haverhill, bridge over A11 to consider this in design.

Is this project really worth up to £155m?

Good

Prioritize bicycle routes.

Site A, Poor connection to A11

Site C, Should also include improvements to the public footpaths to the East of the proposed location into Little Abington and a new route Northwards to the Roman Road.

To ensure that the new hubs are used adequately, they must ensure both good transport to the CBMC and into the centre of Cambridge. It is also crucial that improved cycle routes between the route and neighbouring villages are improved. The increased cycle traffic along the new path between Sawston and Stapleford demonstrates that improving the route and making it safe does increase the number

I prefer Site B as it will be closest to the cycle route I use on a weekly basis into Cambridge. The upgrading of the footbridge and cycle path into Babraham are a big plus

I think that having the public transport routes crossing the A11 will be expensive and create more traffic problems at the Fourwentways roundabout. Since all the routes go north, I see no point in building any part of the hub to the south of the A11, except to allow cyclists to reach it safely from Hildersham and the Abingtons. As long as travel hub B is easily accessible by bike, its location should be ideal.

More trees any hedging needed to provide screening along route and stops

The route does not make sense. There are existing roads to the North (A1307), which could be widened, and South (Whittlesford-Shelford) which is never at capacity.

A better solution would be putting in a Cambridge South rail station so that the

Site A may lose much of the traffic from Haverhill.

Site B: This would encourage use by A11 traffic, especially if a dedicated exit road were used to by-pass the Fourwentways roundabout onto site B. To exit towards Haverhill the traffic would need to cross one carriageway of the A1307 and compete with traffic leaving Cambridge. A dedicated lane on to the east-bound A1307 almost

I do not like Site C and much prefer Site B. C is harder to access for most potential users, will cause increased traffic queues on the A1307 (which is already a high accident and congested route) because of the new roundabout and the traffic lights. C will also be much more expensive because of the required new bridge across the A11 and will also have an adverse effect on the residents of Little Abington

Cannot see logic - far better to improve current public transport than waste money on what looks like a vanity project and seems likely to have a negative impact on surrounding areas

The hub must be outside of the A11 and the four wentways roundabout to allow for expansion in the future and to avoid traffic issues that plague this area currently. Choosing a site inside this area means either adding to roundabout issues coming from A11 onto A1307 or adding to A1307 heading to Abington. Please think carefully about this.

Strongly oppose this illconceived, unsustainable & environmentally destructive project.

No comments

I am strongly opposed to the proposed site C. As a resident of Abington and Cambridge road, I have significant concerns about the traffic and pollution this site would cause. Not to mention the destruction of the village character. I would urge you to reconsider this site as an option.

As a resident of Abington, I feel options B and C would have a large detrimental effect on day-to-day life with significant impact on traffic accessibility to homes, and off-site parking by users of the proposed sites at B and C

It should not be needed if decent public transport routes existed from towns like Haverhill and Newmarket

The issues are not just confined to congestion through Cambridge. By providing a travel hub at a large and growing town like Haverhill, that has heavy commuting into Cambridge, you could have more direct shuttle runs during rush hour. This will be the only genuine way to reduce traffic congestion through Cambridge; by stopping the commuter cars needing to get to Cambridge.

Site B appears to involve far less expenditure, disturbance and is by far the better option for both Granta Park and Babraham

Site B is closely aligned with the existing A11 and would require less upheaval.

I am of the opinion that this corridor should be served by a railway, and that the CAM metro is a horrific idea. The solution is not big flashy projects but actual improvements to existing bus services.



<p>In my opinion site C is too far away from the research campus. In this scheme the signalised crossing across the A1307 and new roundabout are likely to move congestion and pollution back towards the houses along the A1307.</p>
<p>I vote for Site B (with the pink route, not the brown route) because this looks like the one which is most likely to give decent access to Granta Park for people coming from anywhere between Cambridge and Sawston by foot or cycle, as well as being in the most sensible place for surrounding large roads.</p> <p>For the above reasons, I support the purple route and strongly support the pink Site B is the best location for both the Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park.</p> <p>If the other sites are chosen, this will inevitably put people of using the bus to get to Babraham.</p>

First - it's not a travel hub, it's a Park and Ride.

Second, all you have is a car park in the middle of nowhere. You're forcing people to drive, encouraging car use and requiring car ownership.

The concern about Site C is if it is further away from Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park, commuters might not be so interested in using the site

Just that public transport is more environmentally friendly and I believe that is a good thing.

The whole route goes through green belt and should be stopped. In particular the section in between Nine Wells and Hinton Way should not go ahead and the route should follow the existing cycle path and railway line for as far as possible.

I do not see any requirement for the travel hubs. If you work at Granta park you will park there. Similarly for Babraham. Why would you choose a longer walk from your car?

As a bus route to Cambridge it would be very useful from all the villages but a bus stop must be provided in Granta park and Abington. Ideally travel from Linton as

Lack of parking at stops seems a missed opportunity to create mini P&Rs and reduce traffic through Trumpington into Cambridge. Also distance from village populations makes use less likely.

A site off the 505 would be more difficult and cause more congestion to access than those from 1307. Due to high traffic levels heading between the A11 and Cambridge site C would by far have the largest positive impact to traffic flow in the area.

I marginally prefer B, but any of them seems good.

Would the shared-use pathway be well lit for pedestrian use at night?

I am looking forward to the results of this project and the Cambridge South Station project too. Thank for the detailed information brochure through our door.

I would really like to see Cambridge South Train station developed with a fast train to London .

The priority should be on removing or significantly reducing the HGV lorry use on the A1307. The GCP should contact the business owners who have a responsibility for ensuring their drivers obey the speed limits (which they do not at the moment). If the congestion and road noise of the A1307 was dealt with then as local residents we would be more amenable to supporting a scheme which helps out the residents

I'm in favour of the more direct routes to the travel hub sites.

Ensure ease of transport into Cambridge or make the existing roads dual carriageway.

Connect Saffron Walden as much as you can despite being in Essex!

I think the buses used must be designed to carry multiple bicycles eg a bike carriage so multiple bikes can be easily transported otherwise there will still be transport issues with links to places of work and homes

can we please have it done quickly? Let's try and get this going in a year.

I cycle from Cambridge to Granta Park daily. The part of my route from Babraham Institute to Granta is a nightmare at the moment and I strongly support all solutions that will make it more bearable and safer for cyclists!

Build it underground and run autonomous, solar fields could be built above ground running the system.

As I said earlier, more support for bikes. More bike parking, make sure all sort of bikes can go through bridges and paths (trailers, tandems, dutch bikes, cargo bikes, ...)

the cycle path from the A505 to Granta park need to be secured as very dangerous when having to cross the road with high speed cars coming and no light at all in the winter along this road

Something desperately needs to be done regarding the A11 and A505 problems - too many accidents and dangerous situations occurring daily, plus inadequate public transport options as things stand.

Will there be a consultation on price? With Stagecoach having a monopoly on transportation in the city and surrounding areas, THAT is the main reason a lot of people drive into the city. We don't want to, but when the buses are cancelled/delayed/overpriced, what do they expect?

Please consider bikes as a top priority, not an afterthought.

No option is as good as a railway/tram to Haverhill via Linton, Abington and Babraham.

Please prioritize public transport and sustainable travel instead of building more roads. We need to discourage driving by providing feasible alternatives.

Although I support the site C solution, the building of the new roundabout would have very serious consequences on the already busy traffic on the A1307.

I think the route is excellent, and providing parking possibilities at the southern end is extremely positive

Thinking of experience on the guided bus way, I am sure you will already consider the following:  
please ensure the routes are well lit and there is good and safe separation of any fast moving buses from cyclists and pedestrians.

N/a

Travel hubs only encourage car use to the hubs from villages, what we need is a public transport (bus) system that takes people from near their homes where they can walk to bus stops



<p>Option C appears most expensive as well as disruptive to villagers in Little (and Great) Abington. It also does not appear to have as straightforward a route in and out for buses/shuttles.</p> <p>Option A &amp; B provide a much better access route for those wanting to access Granta Park or Babraham (option B covers both well) which is surely the point of</p>
<p>Need to minimise green belt land take.</p> <p>Cycleway should be on the southern side of the route to be closest to housing centres.</p> <p>Route goes right beside H1b housing development site off Babraham Road - noise, security, accident issues?</p>
<p>Site A would have the largest catchment area as currently no public transport in that area and surrounds... It would get a lot if commuters travelling in Cambridge off the A505, easing the congestion over the M11 at Duxford</p>

Needs to serve babraham research campus and grants park with cycle routes to the stops or hubs
Please provide a link to the Genome campus - preferably a link between Genome and Babraham.
I am very excited about having a stop in Stapleford, and better bike lanes.
Best option is to reinstate the railway, allowing extension to Haverhill in the future.
No

I would like to see this link extended to reach Haverhill, which is a major commuter town for Cambridge, but has appalling links to Cambridge via the A1307 only.

Good idea but it still doesn't solve the problem of increasing traffic and especially lorries from Haverhill to Fourwentways along A1307!

does not improve traffic for the A1307

It's excellent to see these plans for more public transport options in this area. Thank you.

Site C would appear to be the most logical site for the hub. It provides direct access from the A1307, but appears to be less constrained than Site B and therefore offers better potential for future expansion, It also avoids the need for a right turn onto the A1307 when leaving the site towards Haverhill. Traffic would presumably Note the additional need for a bridge over the A11. This work would be needed, however, if

Whichever option is chosen, this will need to be maintained after completion, unlike some routes in Cambridge.

Why do you not have the route going closer to e.g. Babraham, one of the larger and expanding research hubs?

Does this scheme mean an end to any possibility of the Haverhill-Cambridge railway reopening?

'Either A or B make sense

Site C has many adverse implications

- Traffic congestion at Fourwentways
- Traffic using Abington village as a rat run to avoid 1307 junctions
- Further from and difficult access to Abraham and Granta Park

Site C is a bad choice - A or B are OK

C would increase traffic congestion around and in Abington village and need a costly bridge over the A11 and still not provide good access for the Granta park and Babraham people

Any option would need to consider the impact on the already very busy Four Wentways roundabout and not make it any busier, hence my preference for A

Why cut across beautiful green countryside?

CYCLE PATH FROM HAVERHILL TO CAMBRIDGE

Welcome to get traffic of the road. The A1307 is very congested particularly near Addenbrookes so hopefully should reduce congestion

The line needs to be camouflaged by trees to help Local resident.

I think the use of electric vehicles is extremely important to be able to justify the scheme on the grounds of minimising air and noise pollution. To be effective it would be necessary to have a high frequency of operation in order to reduce the waiting component of the travel time and to encourage its use compared to cars. It would also help if the operating hours were to run from early morning to late

PLEASE ensure all routes are horse and rider friendly

Travel hub C is the only option I support for a Park & Ride site. The reason I support this is that motorists travelling to the Research Campus and Granta Park already say they have excellent facilities due to their location South of Cambridge. Travel hub C would take pressure off the A1307 from the M11/A11/A1307 Linton/Haverhill routes to the Babraham Park & Ride which has traffic congestion along the A1307

Don't waste public money

To have this extended to Haverhill, Suffolk, suggested hub at Haverhill Research Park.

Firstly this is a matter of being eco-friendly as it would reduce pollution for it would reduce the number of vehicles on our roads.

It would reduce the numbers of cars traveling the A1307 which is often congested

I work at Addenbrookes and live in Linton, I want to see expansion to Haverhill so I can access cycle route or bus/tram route from linton. I would prefer a long term view that allows expansion.

Avoid site C at all costs. There is enough congestion on A1307 without adding thousands more cars.

The number of bicycle spaces seems too few. Cambridge station already has about 3K bike places, 200 makes little sense. Shared bike and pedestrian path looks too narrow and this seems to be creating conflict between the 2 groups again!

Location and through routes via proposed Cambridge South station needs further clarification.  
Further detail required on how the shared use path would connect to Francis Crick Avenue.

Routes accessing the proposed travel hub sites should have no option for it to be used as a short cut, for example accessing site C from the A505 would be a shortcut to A1307 to Haverhill. Unless the road was designed to pickup traffic 'Haverhill A1307 bound' from A505 removing their need to take a right on the Four Wentways roundabout

The effect of the travel hubs needs to be evaluated for the residents of Abington - all could have a negative impact upon them without giving the benefit of a stop for the village.



I support improvements to cycle infrastructure

It is vital to minimize changes so the new transport must go all the way into the city centre. Good passenger facilities, toilets and dry waiting areas must be provided.

The route needs to have hedges and trees planted along it to screen the visual impact and mitigate environmental impact

I feel the scheme needs to be extended out towards Haverhill as the amount of traffic that travels towards Cambridge each week day is huge. Extending it would remove the bottleneck that is Linton and reduce pollution. By starting the scheme at Little Abingdon (site C,), people would still have to travel quite a way to get to the travel hub so the pollution in the environment would not be reduced as much.

Site A would be more convenient for the large number of houses proposed for the Chesterford / Saffron Walde area

What happens to the River Granta at the proposed travel hubs? Are there flood risks?

Stop. This is completely wrong.

I support site C as it would be a direct bus route on the A1307 into Cambridge. I also believe having an entrance off the A11 (either north or south carriageways - depending on the eventual site of the hub) to prevent congestion at the Four Went Ways roundabout. It would make sense if you are investing heavily in this.

See (5) above.

Desperately need links to Hub from Balsham we really only have one bus a day and it is affecting the village for youngsters being able to get jobs in Cambridge.

Difficult to comment as I am not sure which project will be followed
Site B is best, site C is ok, site A too far from Abington/Granta/Babraham
Not close enough to villages, so I can't see many people using the travel hubs who don't have cars. Means it doesn't work for those who don't have a car.
Site B probably preferred particularly as vehicle access straight off A1307 is the best.

I strongly oppose Site C entirely. It is located very close to the entrance to Little Abington, alongside an already congested route (A1307). It also lies on a hillside so would be very visible from a great distance around, and would be an eyesore.

Both blue and black routes need to cross the A1307 with a signalised crossing. This would create long tailbacks in traffic in the direction of Linton with car engines running outside the homes in Cambridge Road. This is very similar to the guided bus scheme in St Ives, where long tailbacks occur at the signalised crossing. Both routes involve building road bridges, more expense.

I oppose any route or hub that would increase the traffic on Pampisford Road, Great Abington on the basis this is a country lane without pavements and is already unsafe for pedestrians having to use the road. Pampisford Road is used as an alternative route by vehicles avoiding the A1307.

Get rid of the plan to build a new busway, build a new park & ride/travel hub as planned, make some new cycle/pedestrian routes by all means and provide frequent bus services on repaired, existing roads to link villages to other travel hubs and businesses.

As previously stated there is already adequate routes to each of these places. The cost both environmentally and financially are huge and the money could be better spent repairing roads and pavements already in disgusting state of repair in many places.

Need to come into Granta Park. No consideration given to those coming out of Cambridge.

This is a great idea but needs thinking through better. None of the sites are that convenient for Granta Park, but transport options to get here with the shuttle buses from Cambridge and Whittlesford train stations work well. Although it's further away, Site C is the best option in my opinion and a further shuttle bus from Granta Park could be run from there to here rather than worry about picking a site that

Sooner the better

The simplest, most environmentally friendly route would be a rail or light-rail bases system to Haverhill, loosely following the course of the old railway line. This would solve the problem of getting into Cambridge as it could join the existing railway line at Stapleford. Further more, this could be integrated with a reliable bus service to link the areas between stations to the train/tram.

please rethink it - why not use the train or if you have to do this use the space by the train line. have you though of moving Shefford station to the other side of the level crossing?

This area is running at or over capacity as it stands. This is based on observation at commuter time. No figures are available to me.

Have you any idea how congested it is in the morning with people just trying to get to Granta Park? Placing more stress on the system by locating a travel hub here as well is not a great idea.

Sensible alternatives would be Duxford / Hinxton / Fulbourn.

<p>The choice of travel hub depends upon the traffic which it intends to intercept. Site A would seem to be the best to intercept traffic coming from Haverhill and from the NE using the A11 which would otherwise use the A1307. None of these proposed hubs is likely to intercept traffic coming from Saffron Walden and the villages north of Bishops Stortford because of the limitations of Junction 9 on the M11</p>
<p>Where the route crosses public roads there must be very clear and effective signage to prevent accidental intrusion of traffic onto the route or physical barriers. This seems to happen regularly on the Busway at present and is very disruptive. Consider lit hazard warnings to vehicles as well as standard signage (could be mains + solar powered to reduce energy usage). Perhaps a radio transmitter system</p>

There should be a travel hub in Haverhill and Linton linked to the travel hub site.

This is a waste of money and will damage the countryside and quality of life of Stapleford and Sawston residents. I strongly oppose and urge a rethink to look at other routes alongside the A-1307 or rail lines.

The blue cycle route implies access to the Babraham Research Campus however these are not open routes for non employees. Access to BRC for visitors would still require access from A1307 unless an arrangement is made with the BRC. The cycle route from the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to the BRC would remain the A1307 which is not attractive.

Each option proposed significantly fails to answer the fundamental question as to who will use these routes. Villagers en route have more convenient options into Cambridge (not necessitating two stops) and the ROI for the Babraham "hub" is unproven.

The Hinton Way travel hub and route will be a total waste of money and the scheme should be dropped

Re hub: I don't really have the knowledge of traffic or journey patterns and needs around this area to pick one as a favourite. I do however believe we need a hub, whether we have a new route or simply a good bus service from the hub.

See below for comments on the route scheme.

I hope that every new route will have a cyclist path. This it will significantly increase the number of cyclists, help cyclist to feel safer, reduce number of cars and eventually positively impact the environment.

No. Just that the proposed route is an absolute disgrace. And that the local community have been ignored.

It is not that I appose routes  
Would just like access from Balsham



Increased frequency of the X13; 13 & 13A would be a great help

My feeling is that traffic should be kept away from the Abingtons as much as possible. I moved to a village location, not a town location.

The target users are presumably those on the 1307. So Site A would be more difficult for them to access.  
The access route should take in consideration of the possibility of future extension of the route towards Haverhill.

Wherever the travel hub is located, it must be possible to enlarge this as demand for more parking increases with the expansion of Cambridge and the demand for labour. Each of the three hub locations seem to be "expandable". I favour Site B and It seems that this could be expanded within the constraints of the gas pipe, the A11 and R Granta.

This is a done deal and I doubt any notice will be taken of anyone's opinion. Only a few thousand completed the initial survey about the potential route and of those just over half wanted a route across the green belt and yet you are going ahead destroying our countryside. You have also rejected without what appears to be any real investigation of opening up, the old railway line.

No.

Hub should be close to A 11 and A 1307 to make access from these roads by cars easy. This rules out A. B is good but access to Southbound A 1307 would be very difficult especially at busy times. I find hub C not so good because the roundabout road access and the signalled crossing for CAM would cause snarl-ups being so close to Fourwentways which is extremely busy at rush hour and the traffic going to

What the hell happened to Granta Park, which has a substandard bus service already, but which is private, inflexible, expensive and not joined up to the rest of the transport infrastructure.

I admit I like the idea of a metro (sustainable, long-term vision) and understand the aim of connecting to it. But these busways are just overkill. Like HS2, we'll get half way through their very damaging construction and realise they were a mistake. They will also spawn insistent development alongside, whatever the current protections. Speculative secret consultation on acquisition is happening already!

As I am retired I no longer have to get to Cambridge for work. I rarely shop there as it is such a pain to get in and out. Consequently the travel hub sites are not such an issue for me and I'd be happy as long as there is a stop in Sawston within walking distance.

These hubs may help A11 / A505 traffic but does not alleviate the issues on A1307. A hub should be further back to support users from Haverhill/ Linton etc then expand Brabraham to support those living in between

Hub C seems counter intuitive if coming off A11 as turning away from desired route

Yes introduce a light railway between Haverhill and Cambridge.

Black and blue incur a huge additional cost of crossing the A11.

As I travel to and from Haverhill regularly Site A would improve the junction from 1307 to Newmarket Road , Abington where they have been several accidents. I It will also reduce Haverhill to Cambridge traffic on the A11 Roundabout.

Site C looks like there are more options for future expansion as it's not constrained by the river and the gas works.I also believe it is in a better location for the more frequent users along the A1307 and is still easily accessible for commuters coming from the A11.

I strongly oppose Hub A) on the basis that:-

1. The obvious road vehicle access from and to the Haverhill direction would be along Pampisford Road. Pampisford Road is a country lane which is unsuitable for any increase in traffic, particularly during rush hour.
2. There is no access from the A11 north bound

Do not see the point in travel hub on A1307 due to all the traffic from Haverhill will still be on the roads and made worse in the area. I also feel you haven't considered any homeowners views and the impact on the villages

As a resident I Haverhill the Site C hub would be the most sensible position to be of the greatest convenience for the many Haverhill residents who would use this new transport system.

Positions A & B still require crossing of the A11 before able to park their cars and that is often slow and delays their journeys more.

This proposal should not be started until the A505 traffic problem is sorted out, and that includes what infra structure is needed when Marshall's move to Duxford airfield. The A505 as it is now cannot cope with the future traffic.

All of the hubs are to help traffic going into Cambridge. It is counter intuitive for drivers to divert away from their route to access a park and ride, especially as there is one at Babraham. That is why I think Site B is the perfect option. You can access it easily from whatever direction you are coming from, it's equi-distant for Granta and Babraham Research Campus, and it is on your way to Cambridge. Site A will We need a hub near/at Haverhill to take commuters to Addenbrookes and Science Parks. This will releibve pressure on the A1307 and the villages on that road. A new route is needed from Haverhill, running south of Saffron Walden to the M11 to take HGVs and other traffic to the main route - paid for by Suffolk: Cambridgeshire should not have to take the pain of Haverhill's un- sustainable expansion.

Site C would have a very bad impact on traffic passing along the A1307, which is already very overcrowded and subject to holdups at various times of the day. More traffic will then do the "rat run" through other parts of Abington to avoid this traffic. It would also seriously affect Little Abington village residents who live on or near the A1307.

See previous thoughts re blot on the landscape for local immediate residents

Travel hub B is more obviously useful. All suggestions are a great improvement on anything we have now & are desperately needed. Especially like the Sawston Greenway.

Shared use paths work well in daylight. However, at night, cyclists are well lit and can only see within the small circle of light in front of them. Meanwhile, pedestrians don't generally carry a light and thus their eyes are accustomed to the darkness. They may also wear dark clothing. The resulting meeting of the two user types is potentially lethal. Lighting would solve the problem, but is expensive. Maybe

Looking forward to it!

The A505 cannot be used as access to this travel hub. It is heavily congested at peak times and offering 2000 car spaces would increase the congestion. It would be used by commuters to London for free parking rather than the station car park which is costly. Improvements need to be made to the a505 NOT adding to the traffic. Have you not considered opening s junction at J9 on the M11 so the A505

need to minimise greenbelt destruction.

Travel Hub site A is my preference as it is on the prosed route Cambridge South station going close to Sawston, Stapleford & Gt Shelford. It would be on the western side of the A11 thus avoiding a fly over and all the accompanying expense & disruption.  
It is close to the Business/Research sites on both Granta Park & Babraham.

Hub C would take most land and also add complexity to the A11 / old A11 road corridor.

The old Four Went Ways roundabout is already an extremely unsightly and hazardous mess due to unregulated lorry parking which often spreads, dangerously, along the Newmarket Road Abington. Littering from the fast food outlets is rampant

I believe the problem is west of your routes in question 7. Using the disused railway would solve all the environmental issues. There is space, especially if you have a single track with passing spaces. You also alleviate the need for extra crossings on three main routes into Cambridge.

Not needed for the villagers of Stapleford. As if need to get to Addenbokes cycle or use taxi if unwell.

Ill thought out. Simply going to encourage more traffic jams. Thus proposal offers no advantage whatsoever for the villages of Stapleford and Great Shelford. At the very least, if you are going to put in drop off zones for cars, why can't you provide parking for all cars. Otherwise I may as well continue using my own car.

A disaster for the countryside and villages

Site A is best unless Site C is an integral part of a long term plan to extend the route to Linton. Site B is a bad location, especially as it introduces a further junction on the A 1307 in a bad location.

Travel hub site B will increase congestion on A1307. Sites A & C segregate travel hub and city centre traffic and have the potential to work better.



<p>Site C - public transport route would have to cross 3 roads: A1307, Newmarket Road and A11 (new bridge needed, very expensive). Crossing the A1307 even with lights 16 times per hour (8 each way) would cause build ups of traffic on this very busy road, especially with the new roundabout beyond. Crossing the Newmarket Road would cause inconvenience to local village traffic. Longer route for the public I cannot believe Site 'C' is a realistic consideration-the density of traffic(increasing daily) on A1307 must surely be recipe for accidents/further congestion if a 'signalised' crossing were to be introduced. Furthermore traffic accessing site C would increase congestion on A11 sliproad which already backs up onto A11 on busy periods-I know as I return home some mornings 0730 and it is already quite</p>
<p>Please present the options for secure bike parking at the various locations. The use of motorised private transport is not environmentally-friendly.</p>

Hub B is least attractive owing to need for new access from A1307
Use the existing railway with a hub located near to the station
I am a resident of Great Abington and am concerned about the impact of hub C on the village community, both during and after construction. I therefore oppose that option. I believe option B for the travel hub will have the lowest impact on the community and also the environment. It is closest to both science campuses and near both the A11 and A1307 where there is already a high degree of infrastructure

I am concerned about the surfacing - the 'red roads' used for bus and cycle lanes in Cambridge seems not to be hard-wearing enough. As a cyclist, I know this well: so many potholes!!

Please make cycle lanes wide enough for baby carriers.

Just use a lot less money buying electric buses and provide a highly subsidised public transport on existing roads. Having talked to many residents in Shelford, stapleford, Sawston that is the general preferred option as any of these routes we would be unlikely to use. I and they would use Reliable green buses that travelled existing roafs(which the money could be used to repair and improve). Improve cycle

My understanding of the original aspirations of the City Deal were that not only was the intention to connect homes with places of work, but also to ensure and enhance strong connectivity between the places of research, innovation and employment themselves. To that end, I would imagine you will want to design a route and stop locations that enable and enhance that connectivity and networking between the

No

You continue to ignore the needs of cyclists between Linton and Haverhill for a safe, dedicated bike path.

I support option A) but only if access to the A505 in both directions is available and if the A11 southbound can be accessed without going to Fourwentways. If access to A11 Southbound is via Granta Park roundabout it will need substantial improvement. Option B) would be my preference but it would be essential for vehicles leaving the site to be able to avoid travelling West along the A1307 before

I and choosing the route and hub that appears to have least damage to the env and also closest to main road. I think the local people who have knowledge and understanding of the area from biodiversity and access should be given priority in their thinking as i would expect in my own area.

Site C is a little too far out.

My main thought about these proposals is that the cycleway should not be available to horses - this is a real problem on the busway to St Ives - horses do not mix well with cyclists as they get spooked by fast cyclists and also their droppings ( which are extensive) have nowhere to go as they are deposited onto a hard surface. The busway has proven to be a real boon to cycle commuters and there are lots of them

As stated already I strongly disagree with the proposed busway. I do not see why there should be a busway cutting through greenbelt land, which is negative to the environment and is at a significantly higher cost. I agree traffic issues need to be addressed but the busway should be next to the existing road.

The fact the route does not properly link with the existing park & ride seems daft. This will lead to additional buses to serve both park & rides. If the babraham P&R was on route (so the route was along the A1307) then this would be much more efficient.

Also if the babraham buses were to use the busway then this will mean more traffic

it is the duty of local government to serve its residents, as well as its commuters and businesses - and that means working to preserve the character of the county.

A ruination of farmland and other resources
Does not need to go through Stapleford and Great Shelford in the way proposed.
I do not have sufficient local knowledge to comment on the Travel Hub locations in depth. Site C seems to be best in terms of traffic arriving from the A11 and A1307 east. in addition, Site C does not impinge on the green belt and is not affected by the HP gas main and the River Granta.
For site B, better access in/out A1307 than in proposed plan. New roundabout?

Without finer detail on the access routes I am unable to make a choice. My concerns are that the proposals fail to address the problem of existing bottlenecks on the A505 and the very dangerous junction heading north from the A505 just beyond Pampisford where traffic turns off to Granta Park.

Site A is in a good location. It is close to business research sites of both Granta Park and Babraham . It is also on the correct side of the A11 and would therefore avoid the unnecessary cost and disruption of building a flyover. Site A is also ideally placed to continue the public transport link to Haverhill in the future. This site is also in the correct location for the proposed Cambridge South Station.

This idea of travel, in essence, could be good. But NOT if its a blight on our beautiful countryside, having a negative impact on the countryside.  
Talking to friends concurred that we do not lead linear lives that revolve around getting to the Science parks and central Cambridge. People, Im afraid will continue to use vehicles (hopefully electric soon) to do their day to day business. People

This £155 million route is a complete waste of money compared to the much cheaper £50 million and more appropriate route along the A1307. This route and hub cannot be viable with enough travellers for the cost providing a route simply from Babraham to Addenbrookes. The present cycle and walk route through Shelford and Stapleford provides this service and the proposed route would make 1

The 'travel hubs' are no such thing, they are merely car parks and bus stops!

Overall, I am supportive of the scheme as a practical and forward-looking project. However this will have a major impact on local residents and I strongly feel these views must be given appropriate weight in the site and route selection process.

put new routes alongside existing roads/rail links
The proposed route into Cambridge Biomedical Campus is not appropriate. It should be along the existing A1307 corridor or via reopening of the Shelford to Haverhill railway line.
Whichever option is selected, the potential for linkages with the proposed North Uttlesford Garden Community should be maximised.
While the Council does not have a preferred option for the route and travel hub, it supports the overall project due to its potential to improve sustainable transport
Sites A & C provide the most opportunity for expansion in the future, if needed. Site B would have restricted expansion opportunities.



A Park and Ride site in Babraham would be beneficial in cutting traffic, especially along the main roads into Cambridge. The Busway should be built alongside the A1307. Not sure that a Busway carving through villages and green belt land is justified in terms of the vast costs involved, the environmental impact, or the damage to the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford.

I think the route that destroys the country side is the least favourable and is destroying the environment.

I'm disappointed to see how a shortsighted vision distroing countryside is proposed instead of investing more and reusing existing roads /railways and have more balanced development

I think you are wasting a lot of public money on this scheme. The biggest problem is single-occupancy car use into Cambridge. Improve the present rail network and connections to park and ride car parks with public transport. It would also encourage people to use public transport if it was less expensive than driving the car to work - ie less than the cost of buying fuel for a week's journeys.

We should be looking at more rail routes, rather than schemes like this. For this cost the old line from Shelford to Haverhill could be re-opened which would provide a much better transport link.

It is important to reconsider bringing this route in to Cambridge beside the A1307. The road already exists, and the disruption to the surrounding area would be minimised. It would be cheaper and would be more logical.

NA

I believe the provision of a fast public transport route from Babraham to Cambridge would be a very positive step. However I am deeply unhappy about its route through the green belt east of Stapleford and Great Shelford. I would like to see it routed either alongside the very edge of the A1307, or hugging the main conurbations and roads within Stapleford and Great Shelford. The open fields should be left open and The travel hub at either end of the routes especially near the A11 will be used for further afield commuting.

I believe it would be wrong to add in car parking options along the route which will bring more vehicles into the villages.

Please see comments set out at 10 in their entirety; CARA strongly opposes the proposed route.

Please see 10 below - we strongly oppose the route in its entirety.

Please see below for my views on the scheme.

The proposals do not show the existing footpath network which must be preserved during any development. Future proposals should identify all existing rights of way. In particular: DNA path, bridleway Stapleford 2, byway Babraham 10, footpath Pampisford 1, footpath Babraham 4. Explanation should be provided on how shared bus routes would protect

It is unclear how local buses go to the proposed transport route stops.

<p>I am not convinced that the separate travel route was the best choice and am surprised that it was selected. I do not think the end result will justify the expense and likely congestion and pollution it will cause.</p>
<p>See 10 below</p>
<p>There's little advantage to having these routes pass through/next to small villages but HUGE disadvantages. Why can't the route run next to/alongside Babraham Road - this would surely be way less destructive and disruptive.</p>
<p>Villagers neither want nor need this kind of development. Are our views to be ignored, the box alongside 'public consultation' ticked, and the project then proceeds? That's rather the impression I am getting at the moment. I use Hinton Way and Granhams Way frequently in order to access the north side of Cambridge and this fairly attractive journey would be interrupted by this development for (in my</p>
<p>All destroy teh countryside and wil be used as an excuse to justify further growth</p>

<p>Support plan B as direct acces from A1307 and A11, good access to Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park.</p> <p>Support Brown route as it seems to be the quickest. Not aware of differential environmental impacts of the various routes which could influence my choice.</p> <p>Oppose plan A as traffic from A1307 would have to divert onto A11/A505 and not as</p>
<p>The travel hub options will, in reality, serve little purpose because they are too remote from the campuses they are intended to serve. What is needed is a metro connecting Haverhill to Cambridge to relieve traffic on the A1307.</p>
<p>The surrounding fields (and gardens &amp; homes) will be polluted by the increased congestion that the route will cause.</p>
<p>This seems to be unnecessary expenditure when the villages are all crying out for money to be spent on existing infrastructure.</p>

I would like to see the travel hub built closer to Haverhill as these proposals will not alleviate the major traffic issue that is generated by the amount of vehicles that use the A1307 and this is only going to get worse as houses continue to be built in Haverhill and surrounding villages.

I object to the loss or proposed encroachment onto green belt around Shelford and Stapleford.

There must be a way of providing improved transport using existing roads and/or raillinks without churning up large parts of the countryside.

see attached.

A tram stop is an unnecessary blight in our village, adversely impacting our green belt, our natural beauty and chalk downs, the residents closest to the proposed stop would be disturbed day and night by buses and commuters, Commuters cars will be parked wherever they can find space causing congestion and pollution. This is a destructive unwanted expensive folly

None of the three travel hub options, with their proposed stops, fully address access to the two campuses. If routes cannot be altered to include closer stops, then much greater cycle parking provision must be made.

see comments

None of the three hub options serves the two campuses well. Additional thought must be given to how workers on these two sites are going to use the hubs. And more cycle storage space will be required.

It is important to make sure the routes connect to other paths and are accessible to all communities easily, especially Babraham and the Abingdons

I'm not interested in any travel hub which is simply a car park for out-of-area users to have subsidised parking land made available for them but which doesn't provide a fast and direct link to Cambridge and biomedical campus for people in the centre of Shelford and Stapleford.

It seems that there is a hidden agenda and that, once all the new transport system is built, then all surrounding green areas will be built over to justify the cost

The proposed route to the travel hubs could easily be "raised" and then allowed to go "down" to Sawston again protecting the environment.

Anything which adds an extra leg onto a journey is not going to encourage more people to use public transport. Creating a travel hub just makes using public transport more cumbersome and will penalize those bus users who use the bus for the whole journey and not just as a park and ride. Any gains in journey time will be lost with time taken changing from bus to rapid transport link. Village bus services

Its not apparent why the existence of the park and ride at Babraham is not being incorporated into the proposals. Why not expand, or at least link with, the infrastructure that already exists?

Crossing the A11 is difficult for cyclists: there is the choice of a very busy roundabout or a very steep and high footbridge accessed along a track. This makes it difficult to reach Granta Park, or indeed nearby villages such as Abington and Hildersham. If the new route is to serve Granta Park properly, this needs to be solved, either by continuing the route to the east side of the A11 (i.e. site C) or if the Travel Hub A: The Consultation leaflet highlights there will be new shared use paths to Granta Park. I support this, but I hope this is part of a bridge over the A505, to allow westbound traffic to leave the A505 via an improved slip road off the A505, and then via the new roundabout, access the travel hub. If this is in place, this site has the significant advantage that traffic travelling south on the A11 can reach the There need to be high quality foot and pedestrian links to Linton, Abington and Balsham etc. Not the usual badly thought out inadequate provision. Where the bus/cycle/footway crosses roads, there should be automatic detection of cycles and the default being green. No stopping to push buttons please. Would car drivers expect to have to do this?

I strongly object to the whole scheme offered in this option

The routes fail to go where people need to travel, and all the travel hub options fail to serve any useful need by being so far away from anywhere that you need a secondary transport system to use them.
It would be good if the local buses on the A1307 route could call in the hub so passages could change if they needed to. Also the National Express coaches could call into the hub as well instead of the City centre.



A travel hub near the A11 junction with 505 makes much more sense, with bus routes from there to the Biomedical Campus. Useful and scenic farmland would be destroyed -

the crossing of the proposed metro over Hinton Way and Haverhill Road would create impossible log jams of local road traffic in an area which already has quite

I'm very much in favour of the shared use path alongside the new transport route BUT this must be a safe distance from the public transport route

The multi use path ways must be wide enough to support foot and cycle traffic on both directions at the same time. DNA way along is an example of something too narrow, and hence dangerous - especially in the dark. The route out to the West of Cambridge is done well with a small kerb to demarcate the traffic.

I am not qualified to comment on a preference for a particular option, but the concept of a hub anywhere off this A11 junction is fundamentally flawed. The roundabout A11 slip roads are already very fast, busy and hazardous, with a number of poor visibility locations. There is no visible provision in the scheme to improve this junction, which would become even busier and more e hazardous.

I am not qualified to select a preferred site but the concept of a hub situated at this junction with the A11 is fundamentally flawed. The roundabout and A11 slip roads are already very fast, busy and hazardous. There does not seem to be any provision for improving visibility and a reduced level of hazard at this roundabout/junction.

This route should be abandoned and a route parallel to the A1307 developed. There is space here to do this and it will minimise the impact on the green belt. This appears to be leading to an excuse and back door route into developing further green belt land around the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford.

I fully support low emissions public transport into Cambridge and new cycle paths alongside.

I am not an expert in this area. Cutting down traffic into Cambridge, and access for walking, bikes and wildlife are my main concern.

I support a new scheme that will reduce commuting traffic on the A1307 into Cambridge. It is a shame that it doesn't begin in Haverhill. I drive on the A1307 to the existing Babraham Park and Ride and from here ride my bike into Cambridge to get to work. All three of the proposed sites are too far for me to cycle to work and I will continue to use the existing P&R. Of the three locations, I support site A for the

Remove vague red dotted line possible future extension to new public transport route along Pampisford road. This is a rural road where people have bought rural properties completely unaware of planners intentions. The best solution to link Haverhill to Cambridge is to build a guided bus route along old railway line between the two. This would remove traffic on A1307 and become a commuter

Should seek to develop A1307 to prevent damage to green belt and local villages.

A is the least worst option as it is not so close to any villages. B is the worst as it is too close to the village of Babraham and will degrade the village amenity. I am also worried about increased traffic and pollution through the village. Also I know the Babraham road park and ride has attracted travellers who illegally set up camp in the car park, and would be concerned about the possibility of this happening near

Brown route Site B is (from a positive and potentially negative aspect) accessed by the three arterial roads - A505/A11 and A1307.

When we were first consulted, one option, and the most logical option, was to construct a dedicated extra bus lane running alongside the A1307. This would be the cheapest to construct, would minimise any effect on the green belt and residential areas, and would be the fastest to complete. I am astounded that this option is reported as not the most popular and tend to think that the public's views

- 1-Green Belt considerations should form criterion for decision making.
- 2-Main users of proposed route will be from Linton, Haverhill area & beyond.
- 3- Hub C is best suited option for fulfilling 1,& 2

this is the most expensive option out of the number that were originally proposed. Is it really value for money. How much will it be used, especially out of peak times. Will it really cut out traffic etc. I have yet to be persuaded.

I agree that a large travel hub near the A11 would be a sensible addition to our traffic infrastructure. A sensibly priced Park and Ride would reduce traffic travelling in to Cambridge along the A1307 and the associated pollution and congestion. Electric buses would be even better. People seeking to access the Biomedical Centre etc more locally to Cambridge would then have more spaces etc available at No, the whole project would impact badly on the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford. The cost is enormous. The whole of south Cambs is already becoming a conurbation with huge amounts of new building.. A travel route with stops and hubs would bring more building and more traffic into the area and should be stopped at all costs.

Very concerned as no thought has been given to existing road users, especially existing bus users as all proposals will cause a delay for current public transport. Lower paid jobs both in the City and surrounding business centres mean that many cannot afford house prices in Cambridge so buy in cheaper areas eg Haverhill and travel. We need to encourage people to be on public transport from the start of their

This transport route should be run adjacent to the existing road A1307  
It would make the project far cheaper (currently absurdly expensive for what it provides) and would avoid carving up the countryside  
Traffic lights particularly on Hinton Way in Great Shelford would cause traffic congestion as buses will be passing every four minutes.

Great idea to have a new Park & Ride at A1307/A11 junction  
But please don't put a new road through the fields - the existing A1307 is perfect, just needs widening / bus lanes ?

'- Proposed park and ride site is exceedingly large; it is stated to accommodate over 2000 cars and would be considerably larger when compared to other local park and ride sites  
- Such a large car park will have a negative impact on the Abingtons and will be built either on good quality arable land or on green belt; neither is a good outcome

They all cut across land that will be home to many species we should be improving the green belt for.

Hub B would seem the most sensible as it has the possibility of being a local hub as well as a transport hub. It would serve two communities with good access by road, cycle and foot. It could serve both Babraham Institute and Granta Park. It already has natural screening round part of the site.  
Hub C would cause more congestion to the A1307 and to the village of Lt Abington.

Site B: although I see the logic in the positioning of this site, the proposed road vehicle access from/to the A1307 seems poorly developed.

Scrap it.

that it link to haverhill via old railwayline through great abington then onto new path to haverhill.

How much is this actually going to be used, and who is it targeting?  
The majority of traffic to the CBC comes from outside these villages, which is unlikely to be altered by this route. This route carves up the countryside with little to no benefit to those most affected by these changes.

As already stated in Q4 & 5

While a non green belt option C might seem preferable, its being further from the 2 campuses and nearer to Lt Abington and the need for a large intersection count against it.

Why do the Granta Park buses run empty one way morning and evening? Surely they could take people both ways now.... an easy win. Sometimes the easy solutions should be considered first, before spending all this money and ruining my village. How will this scheme help with the massive development planned on the genome campus and the 1000 jobs on the Sawston bypass development.

We already have Babraham Park and ride 6 miles away which is expanding its capacity, i feel this is to close to all the proposed sites. The A1307 will be grid locked peak times.

Site A seems a lot more expensive because of new bridge over A11 . New roundabout will be costly and interrupt the flow of traffic on A1307. Brown route to site B gives most direct access and less length of new road building compared with the pink route and is therefore preferable. Site B provides good access for both Granta Park and Babraham research and that is desirable.

The maps don't show things properly so I have no idea where all the different routes are. I therefore can't answer the questions. You need to give a lot more information for something so major. You need to use much larger maps.

The proposed costs of this project versus its impact on the environment and all local residents plus the fact that it just will not be used by commuters is simply preposterous. Personally it will also have an impact on the location and the value of our home. We simply wouldn't use the route as we would choose the train directly into town. The money should be spent improving and adding to cycle path routes

I'm not convinced it's going to provide much incentive for Shelford/Stapleford residents to use. It's too far to the northeast. The obvious route to benefit residents would be to continue along the disused railway, to the main line as argued by our Parish Councils. There is still space along the main line where another track originally ran.

Site b option is too close to Babraham village and will be detrimental to the village

I think there are far better options to spend the money on, without ruining more countryside

I agree that the A1307 is excessively congested and I support mass transport from hubs outside the city. The road already exists and is wide enough to accommodate bus lanes.

By driving a route parallel to the A1307, cutting through beautiful countryside and crossing several roads the plan simply spreads the ugliness, destruction and traffic  
Hub B - How do cars go back south down the A1307 towards Four Went Ways?  
Doesn't there need to be traffic lights or a roundabout to ease traffic flow? Because of the parking layout (presumably because of the gas-pipeline restriction) will car drivers have to walk further to get on the bus.

Hub C - Is that the most expensive with the bridge over the A1307?

Local road infrastructure and travel would not be able to cope with the additional traffic movements in location A & B.

update existing roads

I have no opinion on the travel hub and its location and local route options. I have strong negative opinions of the local stop location and design on Hinton Way, Great Shelford, which I believe also applies to the Haverhill Road Stapleford and Sawston proposals. See below

\* Solutions need to be found to reduce HGV traffic from Haverhill to Fourwentways.

\* Solutions needed to reduce the number of car journeys starting from Haverhill and Linton and hence demand for parking. Site C simply shifts the problem away from Cambridge to a residential area in Little Abington.

"Travel hub" in this instance is just a fancy name for "Car park". We need to genuinely move away from car travel, and to do that you have to come up with solutions that do not keep people dependent on using their cars for some section of their journey. A true Travel Hub would be an interchange between, say, buses coming from many different, rural locations, and then taking those passengers on



We should move Babraham Park n Ride further down A1307, the current site is TOO CLOSE to the bottleneck already, and it is walking distance to Addenbrooke and Biomedical Campus. People come here to park car and cycle or walk, so not really functioning as a Park n Ride. Before we destroy the green belt, and put further strain on nearby villages that already share a disproportionate amount of stress.

The A 1307 should be used with wider lanes.

The bus route proposed will be dangerous and more people will get killed like the father from Sawston who was killed when his bike fell into the path of the bus near Cambridge assessment. These guessed bus routes are stupidly designed. You need to separate all bikes and all pedestrians from all traffic !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I have added my comments at 10 below.

Shared space does not work. Walkers too slow for cyclists. Pram & wheelchairs pushed through the deposits of dogs and horses. At present on roads traffic slows for horses, what will happen on these routes? Light pollution. New station will require changes to main line train services & traffic hold ups at railway crossings.

Our main concern as the Bridleways Group is that, should this go ahead and whichever option is chosen, there is a continuous route option available to all non-motorised users - \*including horse-riders\* - that enhances and improves the existing, fragmented RoW network.

The route should LRT and run via the railway formations. By going through Shelford the level crossings will have to be suppressed with Granhams Level Crossing being bridged and Hinton Way/Station Road crossing closed to vehicles and a pedestrian subway installed instead. The GCP bus road proposal is a wasted opportunity to really provide a stage one LRT that is supported by many in the area,

Any hub should be south of the A11, e.g. site c, as this would be better suited to future expansion. Bus route (or busway/cycleway) into Cambridge should then be alongside A1307, passing through Wandlebury by using existing dual carriageway section which is unnecessary for ordinary vehicular traffic.

I believe any hub should be located south of the A11, to minimise disruption and allow space for expansion if needed. The busway should be alongside the A1307.

Option B is the one that offers best access to both campuses.

Very surprised that the route avoids populated areas which would benefit from a decent public transport system

Additional parking should remain close to the major road intersections and roundabouts, to minimise impact on greenbelt and local housing.

There should be no new road/bus/tram route across greenbelt. This merely facilitates land capture in areas which would not be possible under greenbelt rules.

I fully endorse the views expressed by Cambridge PPF and by Stapleford Parish Council.

As stated above, I don't believe the proposals provide significant benefits when weighed against the damage to the rural environment and character of Stapleford and Great Shelford. We would prefer to live with the existing transport system rather than sacrifice the character of our villages.

See attached response.

Until this scheme addresses a forward-looking route that uses the existing railway line/cutting - then it is difficult to find any sense in anything outlined in your questions 6 and 7.

Look to the future and build a dual carriage way from Haverhill to the A11 with fast slip road to the A 11

I think any hub should be located south/east of A11. Any busway into Cambridge should then track route of A1307.

I think it would be worth having a temporary travel hub and a park and ride bus service along the A1307 as an initial trial to see what sort of take-up there is before committing to a scheme that has such a big and detrimental impact to the Green Belt

At least 2000 car parking spaces proposed for proposed travel hub sites. What are projections for number of passengers daily on proposed tram way to biomedical campus? Main use presumably at commuter times. What size and number of trams would accommodate proposed numbers at peak times?

Stapleford Parish is the most affected by these proposals. The GCP presentation gives only a partial assessment. Important issues are minimised and excessive weight given invented benefits that have no secure empirical base in real people or real lives.

I fully support the Response by Cambridge Past Present & Future and summarise

If they use the a1307 or 505 this will be terrible fir the already terrible traffic

Concerned about yet more encroachment on the green belt - think it will be a green light for further expansion of the Addenbrooke's site and also more buildings in general. Realistically, how much benefit will it be to Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston?

Hub A is preferable to keep costs down, and help towards speedy completion. it also gives the most direct route for possible future extension eastwards + extension of car park facilities if needed.



It appears to me that this will only benefit Babraham Research Institute. Why can't the Babraham Rd P&R be enlarged?

use old Haverhill to Cambridge railway route as far as possible

an outrageous waste of public money creating a scar on the countryside

These questions are worded to suit the plans already it seems decided -

Site B - need to ensure safe cycling route through the car aprk - cyclists use this route to go onward.

see previous comments.  
Haverhill and other towns are growing quickly.  
These travel hubs are over-complicated  
1) re-open local rail lines  
2) re-site P&R further out of city

I do not understand why the alternative route following the old railway route of Stapleford has not been considered in more detail - there are disadvantages to both routes but the disruption during construction + expense would be offset by the advantages to village life and the surrounding countryside once established - and a price cannot be put on these

far too much cost for far too little use expected !!

disrupts farming

Re Q 6&7: do not know enough about traffic flows to give an objective view . view based on being outside green belt+ less? use of already hazardous 4wentways roundabout

No traffic noise in villages so no environmental health problems

my concern is mainly on the route between Cambridge & Sawston

a good deal of infrastructure is already at or near Site C. i.e. petrol station, motel, place to eat. All the above could be of use to travellers.

Site B would allow drivers from A1307, A11 N + S to enter the Hub from the Four Went Ways existing roundabout  
There are existing well established trees beside it.

No

the route takes into account local plan housing allocations but makes no mention of whether potential future expansion of these conurbations has been considered.  
Detailed design should make passive allowance for future development and not be a physical or legal barrier to such.  
The route as currently indicated will result in part of our land being sterilised from

Site C will badly affect Little Abington residents living on the A1307 opposite the proposed car park.

Site C will increase congestion on A1307 which is already a dangerous road.

Site B is more accessible to prospective users of the park and ride service.

Site C requires expensive bridge across the A11

see question 10)

I have little knowledge of the area where the main travel hub is to be sited and so do not wish to comment. I do however, feel that the proposed route offers little benefit to the villages of Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford

8. Whichever option is selected, the potential for linkages with the proposed North Uttlesford Garden Community (NUGC) should be maximised. This should include consideration of an extended route, which would connect directly to homes and employment sites including at NUGC.



**9) We have a duty to ensure that our work promotes equality and does not discriminate or disproportionately affect or impact people or groups with protected**

No opinion

Without adequate car parking, this would surely discriminate low income people who commute to living wage jobs in Cambridge.
Not my concern.



as above your picking on the motorist that has to use their car as public transport is no good

Would you like a park and ride in your back yard?  
No I don't think so so why ruin villages just because you lot work in Cambridge

Nope
Please include horses/bridlepaths on your plans as none of the section plans appear to show them although they are mentioned in the narrative. There may be issues with sharing of same routes with bikes etc but we shouldn't leave them out.
cyclists



none
A fear that the proposed stop locations are too far from built-up areas. This may make it harder for those with reduced mobility (e.g. the elderly and/or disabled) to get to them.

With each stop effectively set outside of the villages, there is little chance that disabled people will be able to access them. It amounts to a form of discrimination.

None I can think of

Not to my knowledge.

As someone with a hidden disability I feel I would be negatively impacted by these schemes as I have to travel by car and this will only increase traffic in the area.

N/A





<p>This scheme impacts negatively on women who are proportionally less likely to have access to a private car, as it is a car-centric scheme, embedding car-reliance.</p>



See previous comments

Installing gender-neutral toilets at the chosen hub and ensuring that there are more than adequate disabled parking bays would be incredibly helpful.

Yes- as indicated above - by putting stops outside current communities and at the top of a hill, individuals with mobility problems will be very poorly served. The provision of disabled parking bays at stops is premised on individuals using a car which is a poor means of supporting independent living.

I think it would positively impact residents along the A1307 IF the traffic could be removed efficiently and into a properly laid out parking area.

NA
Good



None
No comments
n/a





Sooner the better.  
I hope there will be through access to central Cambridge.  
Is there not some way to prohibit/discourage traffic to private schools in Cambridge. It is noticeable how traffic worsens once the school term starts and I feel the private schools, mostly in central Cambridge

No comment.

In South Cambs (outside of Cambridge), we know that there is a massive imbalance in the ratio of males:females riding cycles. People who want to travel by cycle are already doing it. Decent infrastructure will positively affect those who are currently under-represented in active travel; women, people with limited mobility, people of black and

No




These proposals would positively impact several groups: less confident cyclists as it offers safer easier routes than cycling on the roads or current options. Less mobile people would have easier access the transport options and hence be able to travel more easily.

Better bus routes and cycle routes can help disabled people access employment and leisure

I think it needs to better lit than the guided busway is to encourage safer use at night. From cats eyes along the public transport section to eco-friendly street lights at regular intervals. It could help reduce potential for crime, such as seen when the guided busway was implemented in Trumpington.







N/A
An accessible railway or tram is better for physically disabled persons.
No
Any impact on groups / individuals with protected characteristics is likely to be positive, as they are more highly represented among people reliant on affordable and reliable public transport.

No
N/a



<p>It appears from the plans that if people are getting off a bus at option C to walk to Granta Park there is very little provision for disabled people to get across the roads/along pathways.</p>
<p>Not easy for disabled or physically impaired persons to access the scheme.</p>

No problem









Waste of time and money
To have this extended to Haverhill, Suffolk, suggested hub at Haverhill Research Park.
Option C would damage the environment of abington

N/A







<p>The proposal for the shared cycle/pedestrian path would negatively impact on the following people with protected characteristics: old, disabled and pregnancy and maternity. Shared paths are NOT SAFE. Please segregate them completely.</p>
<p>Nine Wells nature reserve must be carefully protected.</p>





The stops in sawston, Shelford and Stapleford are too far out of the villages to be of use to most disabled people who cannot drive but who need to access Addenbrooke's.

I think that people with disability and the elderly are going to struggle to access any of the stops on the proposed route.
No comment

Being able to walk into the countryside away from roads and transport is very important to mental health. And this proposal is creating less spaces for people in the community to have some peace and quiet. It is destroying a landscape that helps ease the burden of mental health issues.
As above



N.a.

None

I don't know sufficiently about the legislation to comment.



Their impact on the environment will affect general wellbeing and mental health.

Concerned that Nine Wells will inevitably be adversely affected and efforts to lessen the impact will not be in keeping with it's historic importance and natural beauty.

Can't come soon enough.



N/a

Option C would impact negatively and massively on local residents and cause hardship for many with mortgages and property values slumping; I would imagine private legal proceedings would follow immediately.









No comment





Shared use paths may discriminate against some pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrians with impaired vision may not see cyclists coming towards them, or those with hearing difficulties may not be alert to riders coming up behind them. Similarly, disabled cyclists using adapted bikes, often 3-wheelers, may have less ability to steer round

I think bus is less useful to people with disabilities than a train. I have a condition that means walking any distance is less easy but cycling ok as it does not require weight bearing. My bike is the equivalent of wheelchair and I am fully mobile as result but it needs to be my bike as set up for me. I can't take my bike on the bus unless you set up

No comments

your just knacker the roads even more for the people that have to use their own cars/vans eg builders electricians

this is already happening on what you are doing to a1307 at linton





Cycle paths seem to be a waste of money and time. The amount used between Babraham park and ride and towards Haverhill seems to be very low.
No comments
'



I am not clear how this would serve disabled or elderly people. I do fear that this scheme would undermine the current public transport services, which would inevitably lead to fewer buses and a worst service for those people who cannot drive or choose not to own a car.

The proposals positively discriminate against able bodied people by not providing parking at the public transport stops for the residents of Stapleford and Shelford. The proposals therefore positively impact against the able bodied residents of Stapleford and Shelford.

NA
N/A
N/A

See 10 below
Simply put, the environment and lifestyle enjoyed by villagers here, including my daughter (who is disabled), would be negatively impacted by these development plans. We have lovely villages here and do not wish to be stamped on by people manning glossy development clipboards!


The proposals would negatively impact the elderly community and those with young children. These two groups will suffer disproportionately more than the rest of the populous from the increased car emissions caused by congestion brought about by the bus route crossing Hinton Way. Similarly, there is evidence

--

As I stated above I think that lack of parking at stops discriminates against older people who are not sufficiently disabled to have a blue badge (the criteria for these being quite severe) but have some mobility problems which restrict distances which can be walked and cycling abilities. As this group do need good access to the hospital it

When it comes to groups with protected characteristics, my fear is the works will have a negative impact on the large elderly population of the villages, their mental health suffering due to the stress of works on their back-doors.


The proposal as it stands would not benefit the people of Haverhill a lot of whom work in Cambridge particularly Addenbrookes either in the hospital or on the site it self .They still have to travel on the A1307 to get to work .




No view

The proposals will make it more difficult for those with mobility problems to use public transport due to having to swap onto a different service. Also the potential that one could be hanging around a remote dark site in the evenings waiting for a connection could pose issues of perceived personal safety for many users.

The existence of a further, but extremely limited bus route, will be to the detriment of existing bus routes linking Sawston, Great Shelford and Stapleford with other parts of Cambridgeshire. This will impact on people who are dependent on busses for transport, many of whom likely have no interest in going to the biomedical campus only.

Nothing specific occurs.

Q12 discriminates against park and ride users. The absence of a question about park and ride/cycle/walk means the consultation is flawed. The same mistake is made in almost all of these surveys.






I do not represent any business; I am a local resident, who has read the published information and asked questions at a public exhibition in order to gain an oversight and appreciation of the benefits and disbenefits to the wider community. As an individual it is my right and expectation that my concerns and needs have validity.

I cannot be sure of the scope of the Equality Act 2010, therefore I am including my thoughts in box 10. Please refer to those thoughts in relation to this invitation to comment.


Driving to school. When schools are closed the traffic is much reduced.

Do these plans address these issues specific to this area? Recently a great deal of public money has gone into the regeneration of a large train station, with a small chaotic car park. Taxis and parking all

--

--

--

--

--

--

We have a member of our family that has Autism. Construction and subsequent operation of the stop in [village] will affect us on a daily basis. We are hugely affected by noise and disruption and this will certainly affect our child's mental health. It will certainly result in us being required to make alterations to our house to protect us from the

--



I think that children will be disproportionately affected - from vehicle fumes from cars waiting at the proposed stop locations at Shelford and Stapleford, and the destruction of green spaces

How would children and elderly access the travel hubs when located outside the vilage of Shelford. Just not properly thought through.

'- Pedestrian access to several of the stops is poor, roads have narrow or even lack pavements; this would affect disabled people

No comment

Negatively impact all residents of villages near-by.

People with a disability would only be able to access the hubs or stops by car. May suit folk from farther out; not much help to those in villages where the buses are nearer to housing.

The elderly and disabled could not easily get to the stops, they are too far out of the villages

Site B is good for both cyclists and pedestrians as well as catering for motor vehicle owners' park and ride needs.



It would upset the wild life
There need to be adequate provision for people who are unable to use public transport
Nice to see that you have now changed this question to refer to all protected characteristics, not just to disabled people!



People can fall into the path of the buses as there are no barriers between the path and route of the buses. Dangerous to pedestrians young and old and cyclists. Risk of death. As has already happened. Disabled and pedestrians cannot reach these bus stops easily at all. They are in the middle of fields.

Less active people in villages would be disadvantaged as explained in my comments at 10 below.

Elderly living with open space for many years now having this removed. Disabled access on plans not enough parking. An elderly person was killed on guided bus way when normal stop was out of action and it was dark. Can confirmation be made that this will not happen. Silent buses rush by a danger to hard of hearing & partially Horse-riders are about 90% women, while cyclists are over 75% male. Use of the National Cycle Network is nearly half for leisure use rather than commuting (Sustrans' own report shows). Thus, any development of routes available for leisure use that exclude horse-riders but allow cyclists would in our opinion constitute discrimination

The settlement edge stops are not pedestrian friendly or much use to those any sort of mobility issue and independent living.

No

Tram stops a mile outside a village do NOT serve the residents of that village in an eco-friendly way. People will use cars. Some folk NEED to use cars - if you are travelling with a number of small children, are disabled or of limited mobility etc.

We have disabled family whose well-being depends on the relative lack of pollutions in the historic Gog Magog Hills. You would be taking well-being and lungs away from all those who have deliberately migrated to the Gogs - or who escape there regularly for leisure well-being restoration - away from city pollutions . The villagers of

Why must I spend one hour to reach the BR Station??

Disabled and less able passengers may be disadvantaged if bus services through the villages (particularly Citi7) are made unviable, for they would have some way to walk to access the stops on Hinton Way and Haverhill Road, Stapleford.

it would negatively impact the small percentage of the population who are actually bothered to USE THEIR LEGS!
NEGATIVE TO THE COUNTRYSIDE
Leave green belt alone we will soon be part of Cambridge not a village

rest of the family  
age range 92-26 - all will not benefit from this scheme apart from loss  
of outlook + open space! (disagree)

This proposal will create more traffic throughout the village which will  
undoubtedly affect & discriminate upon all the villagers especially old  
& young.

None

environment & air quality will be negatively affected so bad for  
asthmatics. So much building works going on. A14 area dusty all the  
time.

What about the lorries at Fourwentways roundabout? What about using the Comfort Café site?
n/a
Stapleford does not provide car parking except for disabled this is discrimination in reverse

negative impact on pedestrians, and further encourages the hazards presented by shared use paths. Please, please separate

Site A could be completed by users without any disruption to villages or science + bio chemical plants

Site C would destroy a large area of valuable crop growing land when we need to grow more of our own food.  
It would be NO advantage to those driving to work from Abington as in rush hours it is hardly possible to join the 1307

'-

n/a

Site C will have a negative impact on the rural residents of the Abingtons and on Grange farm

no comment



**10) We welcome your views. If you have any comments on the project or particular options, please add them in the space available below.**

Does anyone who designs these proposals actual drive these routes regularly ?, or even drive a car at all ? - consult as much as you like but take the time (and a fraction of the proposed sum) and drive the route from a week or two, then perhaps you'll actually appreciate what chaos these schemes create

It would be good to have information about continuing travel into Cambridge (from the Addenbrookes site) - will the bus originating at Abingdon terminate at Addenbrookes or continue into Cambridge?

There is no indicator of costs to use this or of stops/routes after the biomedical campus.

Granapark currently £3 per day to use the bus to/from cambridge, Stagecoach are £7 even if bought for 5 days it's still £10 more expensive

It's so good to see this being taken seriously. Thank you for your hard work on this - it is (or will be!) much appreciated.

Only to repeat the point I made above.

As with all the current proposals, it is the links between modes of transport that are vital. If one seriously wants to reduce car use it is essential to recognise that Cambridge serves a rural area and the provision of car parks at travel hubs is vital to achieving that aim. It is also clear that this may not happen - for example the fact Universal does not service the Babraham park and ride strongly implies that

It would be better if the proposed public transport route extended further away from Cambridge than the A11/A505 junction. If the route went as far as Haverhill, then it would be far more useful.

Doesn't help the problem of traffic from Haverhill going past Linton

The cycle way alongside the bus route would need to have some sort of lighting as cyclists cannot be trusted to use proper lighting on their bikes and this has led to serious accidents between cyclists on unlit off-road cycle routes in and around Cambridge.

I am concerned with the quality of the landscaping of projects like this. A neat park with a cycle path and a pond is not an adequate replacement for the untended, untidy, wilder areas they replace, in terms of biodiversity. It may increase access to open spaces for the population but nature also needs undisturbed wild areas. For example the landscaping round the new Addenbrookes route is incredibly bland &

Please scrap this scheme and implement a far more environmentally sustainable project based on an existing transport corridor.

The cross section view shows that you are planning to build this route as a road, rather than a guided busway. This will make it more difficult to convert to driverless operation in the future. Current bus services operate very infrequently in the evenings and at weekends. This encourages people to drive to keep their travel time options open. It is essential for the success of the Metro that services are fully

The costs of options not using Green Belt have not been made available to the public, therefore the public have not been able to comment on the additional cost of protecting the green belt

Any of the options are better than present.

As it's EU money it's a great shame that they were stupid enough to allocate Cambridge this money  
Let's hope when there are food shortages in the future that you decisions makers are at the bottom of the que

Na
integrate in some detail with the Greenways project.

'

I don't need access to the Biomedical campus so would only be interested in the service going beyond there to either the Rail station or into the City Centre. Not sure that this gives me any information about this but I appreciate that this is not of much importance at this stage

Please do not forget the villages further out from Cambridge.

A cycle path from Bartlow to Linton would be welcome.

When can you start?

See item 4. The Joint Assembly Agenda minutes for the September meeting included the following comment under item 10, page 8:  
"The Joint Assembly: Observed the fact that Granta Park and Babraham Research Institute, the two main employment hubs of the area, were not shown as linking to the proposed sites. The Director of Transport recalled that the Joint Assembly had

The proposed number of parking spaces is woefully low. This must be increased. Trumpington park and ride is already over flowing - learn from this. Put in a multi storey car park from the start.

The timeline is too slow - this should be in place by 2022. Also need to future proof for growth of sites if needed and with CAM (ie, use same technology)  
I don't support rubber tyre approach at all - light rail better

On this project, but on others more widely across Cambridge, street lighting should be prioritised for cyclists.

The route going through the villages (instead of outside) may be more expensive and harder, but that is no excuse. Sometimes the more complex solution is the better one, as it ensures the project is more viable in the long run and doesn't become irrelevant for being too difficult to access

I think it is a good proposal. My only comment is that this route should have priority over any roads it crosses. This is for the bus and the bike lane. We need to make public transport and cycling have priority over car drivers to encourage more to use them

I don't cycle much around the area around the A11 here, at least partly I think because it is relatively difficult for cyclists. I applaud this project. Please carry on.

N/A



Whilst I support this project, I would have preferred the Metro that would run as far as Haverhill that would have a large Park & Ride facility at the south of Haverhill. THAT would reduce congestion on the A1307 dramatically.

I work in Granta Park and live in Cambridge. I took the commuting bus from Cambridge Train Station everyday, but always wanted to ride a bicycle for commuting. However I am a bit concerned to ride along some extension in the route where there's no pedestrian or cycle path. With this new route I could realize this dream and avoid using the bus.

I love this

It's some drivers that make this road bad not the road itself. The traffic queues create frustration for drivers which results in bad driving

There's No benefit for 1307 users between Haverhill-Granta park (all will still have to drive what's known as the "most dangerous road") and congestion of the A1307 between Granta Park - Haverhill is getting worse year by year.

Haverhill-Cams desperately needs a second public link (we've plenty of buses... its

A poor short-sighted scheme. High capacity, high frequency schemes are needed between actual destinations, not fields by main roads. A glorified park and ride scheme. Reopen railway to Haverhill instead and integrate into existing rail network including Cambridge South station. That would benefit Haverhill, Linton, etc. Also, yet again this is presented as a fair-accomplish, and is basically a consultation in

Site C is the best option by far!
Please use this money to build Cambridge South railway station. This plan will not be popular with travellers.
Far too expensive. Money could be better spent elsewhere. The volume of traffic will only increase with your proposals and are detrimental to other road uses particularly given that buses only pass through hourly!
While I welcome alternative public transport options given how slow the buses in the south are to get into the city centre, the improvements to cycle paths in the area is also really important. As someone who cycles to Granta Park every day, current access via bike is dangerous in places. Ensuring these new cycle paths are well connected to existing cycle paths and the proposed greenways routes, will

See previous comments again re the impact on local property values in the direct view and influence of option C; what compensation arrangements will be put in place to ensure there is not a negative financial impact.

Install plenty of electric car chargers to encourage people to buy and use electric cars. Thanks for the opportunity to fill out this survey.

Just hurry up! This has been too long coming, get on with it! Please.

It's really important that it is easy to access from North and South A11 and East A1307. Option B is the only option which delivers on this without causing Four Wentways to clog.

Good

Bring it on as fast as you can!

Keep up the good work and lets get this done!!!

The proposed off road route into the Cambridge Biomedical Campus may only appeal to commuters who work there. Anyone going further afield may stick to their existing routes. There are a lot of NHS staff that use the existing bus service from Haverhill into Addenbrookes. Increased and faster services at peak times would help to reduce overcrowding on these buses

Cost is currently a problem for users of the bus route along the A1307, and will impact the success of this project. Travelling by car will almost certainly be faster, so if the bus is equally or more expensive then uptake may be poor.

Would prefer a wider shared path e.g. 4m

A more strategic approach is required and consideration of fully directional junctions and interchanges on the M11, A14 and A505 offering an effective ring-road to Cambridge and multimodal transport hubs.

Strongly oppose this illconceived, unsustainable & environmentally destructive project.

There is a pedestrian bridge already crossing the railway to access the DNA cycle path between Great Shelford and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The bridge is located just north of where the Kings Cross and Liverpool St railway lines meet. Can access to the western side of the bridge be improved and sign posted?

The principles of high quality bus routes into Cambridge from travel hubs to reduce vehicle traffic into the city is an excellent one. However while the bus route planned is of a high quality the associated cycling/pedestrian and equestrian route does not meet the same standards.

Site A seems to be the most logical site.

Ensure that the routes are truly prioritised and not constrained by car routes that stop other P&R being effective to Cambridge

As above I strongly object to these proposals. They seem ill conceived and will only exacerbate traffic congestion inside and outside Cambridge, increase travel times, detrimentally impact the environment and directly adversely affect the local economy.  
To genuinely address the problems public transport needs to be made quicker,

None of these proposals will alleviate the problem of HGV traffic

These proposals in no way address the significant volume of HGV traffic travelling along the A1307 from Haverhill to Four Went Ways, neither do the first series of proposals which are supposedly underway at the present time.

One worry that I do have for the plan is the use of shared use cycle/pedestrian paths. In my own experience (and that of many others) these have a tendency to result in conflict between the two types of users. We must remember that pedestrians also includes children, dog walkers and people walking with headphones who may not be aware of the dangers posed by passing cyclists or

Although the project looks good, I don't agree with the prospect of building more and more across the countryside. Instead, I believe that the focus should be on updating and connecting existing routes to be more bike and public transport-friendly to make commuting more efficient and environmentally friendly without the need for a brand-new project.

Build this, fine. Integrate with the busway. But in the future this route needs heavy rail simply due to the massive capacity upgrade it would provide. The busway services at rush hour are ridiculously full and still take hours to cross the city. The problem is not with the cross country sections of these services, but the city itself and if no change is made to prioritise busses and ban general motor use the city





'I strongly believe the plans as shown are unfit for purpose and should be abandoned.

Instead, given the seriousness of problems we have with climate change, pollution, and congestion, a solution that encourages the use of public transport should be It is essential that this is planned as part of a wider transport system. Current car users driving into Cambridge will be deterred from using the new link if it seems inconvenient because of, eg, any difficulty in accessing the car park, the need to transfer from one form of transport to another at the biomedical campus if travelling on into central Cambridge, and the cost (of which there is no mention).

In general, I support any effort to improve cycling route to the Biomedical Campus, Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park, in terms of improving safety and connectivity of the route.

Would be great to see less focus on development for personal cars and more for public transport (for the environment).

The whole route goes through green belt and should be stopped. In particular the section in between Nine Wells and Hinton Way should not go ahead and the route should follow the existing cycle path and railway line for as far as possible.

Forget the travel hubs and just provide a fast bus and cycle route!

Safer cycle routes across and around the A11 and current road junctions is paramount to encouraging more people to cycle and a reduction in current traffic congestion.

I strongly support the principle of the project. The specific proposals also seem good.

<p>Is there a consideration for a A1307 bypass for the Abington completely so that the extra traffic the traffic hub creates does not impact the village. If the bypass went north of the Abingtons then a hub near the current location C could be entered from the north side.</p>
<p>Glad this is being looked into as traffic in the past 14 years since I moved into the area has worsened by the year. Much of the traffic is clearly exacerbated during school term, indicating that need for better school bus or alternative transport system for students studying in Cambridge town centre.</p>

Station at Cambridge South needs to be built ASAP for workers at biomedical campus

Build a tram network underground and have the travel hub built out of renewable and low impact resources, hiding the travel hub into the earth with a green roof will mean that will last longer and not plight the surroundings.

I think projects like these are crucial to cope with the growing needs of Cambridge in a sustainable manner that does not relies on car ownership and make public transport and cycling the most efficient way to go around. Please get inspiration from countries such as The Netherlands or Denmark, and think with a "bike first" approach.

I can see that parking at the village hubs could be an issue. You probably dont want to develop new park and ride facilities but there will be an increase in on street parking near these facilities. Just look at the resi streets near the station at Shelford - no parking at the station so people park on the road and walk to the station. No provision does not mean no parking, it just goes elsewhere.

Glad to see this problem area being addressed. Currently dealing with the A14 works on a daily basis but considering a job move to Granta Park so this would be a very useful development.

Ridiculous that you seek opinions and then rule out the best options - i.e. railway or just build houses where they're actually needed.

Cambridge South train station to serve the Biomedical Campus would be a huge benefit, providing that the frequency of trains is sufficient, particularly at peak times.

My only suggestion is whether we can have the cycle path wider. The route into Cambridge along the guided busway is exceedingly popular and at peak times there are a lot of pedestrians as well as cyclists. Safety would be improved if the path was wider e.g. 4 m or even 5 m. I applaud the 2 m separation between the proposed bus way and the cycle path to improve safety.

A width of 3m for the shared use path is insufficient, and a dividing line must be marked on the path. 3m would be sufficient if all users were going at a similar speed, and you just had 2 lines of use going in opposite directions. If the path is intended for use by horses, walkers, bikes and ebikes then these groups all travel at different speeds and overtaking will be necessary. Safe overtaking requires a

A complete waste of public money and derogation of green belt land. We need to reduce the carbon footprint, I don't see this has solving that. Cambridge is over populated now, so we don't want to make it worse.



<p>As both a cyclist and pedestrian, 'shared use' paths are not good and not best practice. I have been hit by a cyclist on a shared use path as a pedestrian. There is not enough room for people to comfortably walk and have cycling in both directions. It puts people in direct conflict. The shared use paths clearly show a lack of investment for true sustainable travel and active travel. The planners are</p>
<p>What is the benefit to the Babraham or Abington villages? The scheme aims to make them mega car parks. Very few residents of the villages work for companies on the biocampus so this scheme is for the benefit of the highly paid employees of those companies located on the campus. Where is the upside for the villages who have to live with the impact of significant increase in pollution and road traffic?</p>

Please provide separation between cyclists and pedestrians - dual use doesn't work in my experience.

I walk extensively around Cambridge on the footpaths and on the dual use paths - I am regularly having to take avoiding action whilst cyclists tend to be aggressive towards pedestrians in situations where the two come together.

This project together with the overall CAM transport proposal would have a hugely positive impact on Cambridge's future growth.

I have concerns about foot/bridlepath running parallel with guided busway system, with no barrier and where this has already shown to be dangerous with cars "wandering" onto it. A segregated railway would be a safer option.

There are no details on how you safely cross from one side of the transport route to the other, particularly for wheel chair users. I assume it would be on a dropped kerb basis as a traditional road?

See question 8

Facilities for cycle storage at p&r sites. Good cycle paths alongside metro lanes



Options A or B BUT NOT C

Site C is a bad choice - A or B are OK

C would increase traffic congestion around and in Abington village and need a costly bridge over the A11 and still not provide good access for the Granta park and Babraham people

I think this definitely needs to be done, including the Cambridge South train station, to help link up important research parks to Cambridge & the Addenbrooks area.



I hope that if this gets approved it' doesn't create a gateway for residential development around the route.

Please consider horse riders!

Travel hub C is the only viable option which would aid the motorist and access to the City of Cambridge City and Research hubs around the City. Hubs A & B not only have a huge impact on the green belt and conservation areas around villages in and around sites of special interest. Preservation of these villages in their unique environment in the green belt is essential to protect farming and its economy in a

To have this extended to Haverhill, Suffolk, suggested hub at Haverhill Research Park.

We really need to see improvement in the A1307 corridor. I want to be able to use public transport or cycle to work but at present the A1307 is a death trap.

Can you not include upgrading the A 505 (dualing) from site B to M11 junction 9 Duxford to provide the option of better motor / national bus access and access to the air shows at Duxford. Also link site B to Whittlesford Park and ride railway station.

Connectivity which links the many science/business parks in this area of Cambridge where there is lots of growth. In addition to many housing developments planned for this area there should be the demand and hopefully the uptake of well linked services.
The off road routes should be extended to Linton to take the pressure off the A1307. Suffolk should pay for an extension off-road route to Haverhill. No further development of Haverhill until it sorts out its own links to M11 and A14 - it is extremely stupid to build housing where there is no work and transport hubs without road infrastructure. Cambs is creating enough housing for its workers



Any improvements to cycle infrastructure are greatly appreciated

Just to restate what I said in (5) in case it is more appropriate here:

Renewable power generation (e.g. wind turbines) should be incorporated into plans. The flat, sparse terrain surrounding this area has a particularly high potential for wind energy.

Bring back the railway and all of this would be unnecessary!

I regularly cycle in this area, especially along the DNA path and on to Sawston. The path is too narrow and not adequately lit. This means that I don't use it in the evenings as it feels too dangerous. Far too many cyclists without lights and people not paying attention to existence of others.

I support the plan to make it easier to use options other than automobiles.

Surely the quick fix is to build a new train station at Cambridge South. At the moment people are forced to drive as there is no train stop and buses take too long and cost too much,

Seems like a very good idea!

I think it is essential this scheme goes ahead. I have considered working in Cambridge but the transport issues are a cause for concern. Looking at an available role on the Biomedical Campus last week, there was just no obvious easy way to reach the location from where I live (just outside Haverhill) so it just wasn't feasible. whereas if you are travelling from Huntingdon etc, you can make

Sites B and C would appear to add more traffic to the 1307 which is already overburdened.

This is a wholly misconceived and inappropriate proposal. It is destructive and not wanted. Stop wasting (public or privately sponsored) funding on this before you go too far.

It would be good to have a shuttle bus service, perhaps utilise the 19 The Big Green Bus service to connect Newmarket, Burrough Green, Balsham and Linton. Balsham has only one Stagecoach bus service, the 16a in and out of Cambridge and the 19 only has a limited number of services.

There does not appear to be any provision for parking at the intermediate stops. If people can't park near them they are much less likely to use them. Other than by car there does not appear to be consideration of how people from nearby villages will to get to the travel hub, Linton, Balsham, Hadstock etc. A joined up system is needed if people are going to be attracted to this sort of

Pub,if transport needs to be better on this side of cambridge, it costs a fortune and it very irregular. I have two teenage boys and getting them anywhere is complicated and expensive.

I do not understand why there is no consideration of transport to and from the Genome Campus - that seems to be excluded from the planning.

Crucial for these proposals to deliver safe and convenient cycling, with adequate widths and careful junction layout.

It is great that finally there is a plan. I also hope someone thought carefully about the price the passengers have to pay. If the fare fees are high the project will be just waste of money. It has to be remembered that people always choose cheaper option even though it might be less comfortable. I used Babraham road park and ride and have to say I felt as I was ripped off. Traveled with young children and My major concern and objection to the plan is a proposal for a shared, unsegregated pedestrian/cycle path. That is a VERY UNSAFE, unacceptable proposal. The cyclists are a real treat to pedestrians, and one cannot walk or run safely on the same path as cyclists. Please don't ignore the danger of shared paths, they should not be allowed. While the car traffic is subject to rules and

Unless a Cambridge south train station is built, I think the benefit will be limited. More spending on cycle infrastructure would help, with a wider shared path. Light rail would seem to be a better option.

A1307 is being improved so presumably making it easier and faster to drive into Cambridge, so why would car drivers leave their cars as far out as the proposed travel hub near the M11 while most of the residential streets in the southern part of Cambridge continue to allow FREE ALL DAY parking??? Where is the incentive to reduce commuter traffic?

Of the proposals, I would support Site B as it more easily serves people travelling from any direction. It could also be accessed by a new slip road from the A11/A1307 roundabout into the site. Although the shape of the site is linear, the negative impact is only marginal and regular users would soon adjust to the layout.

Please do not do this.

Waste of public money that could be better used elsewhere. The disruption it will cause as well is going to be awful and guaranteed it will cost more than estimated, overrun and not benefit the many only the few and the companies involved

Please, please don't go with site A. You'll remove congestion into Cambridge but cause a completely different problem on a different piece of road.

As above

I was surprised by how unaware of the existing public transport options, traffic congestion around the A505/Granta Park / A11 junctions, and the lack of any apparent thought about how it might be used to get to Granta Park / Babraham Research Campus there was when I spoke to the people at the consultation session. However, they were friendly and polite and open to discussion, so thanks

Another huge waste of time and money. Improve the current public transport system and current roads. Use the money to subsidise and extend the bus routes

<p>One cannot reach a firm conclusion on these proposals until it is known whether or not the route will be used by the CAM.</p> <p>On the track beside the route it is imperative that cyclists are physically segregated from pedestrians. Riders of horses should not be allowed anywhere on the route. How will it be safe for farm machinery to cross the route?</p>
<p>I fully support these forward-thinking plans and look forward to being able to use the new route!</p>
<p>My main concern is the impact of the new service on traffic flow on existing roads, particularly Hinton Way. Traffic signals at each crossing are proposed, giving priority to the new service vehicles. But the proposals include new shared-use paths. How will non-motorised users, particularly cyclists, be controlled at each crossing? There will be far more cyclists than new service vehicles needing to</p>

Look at the wider picture, The proposals are too insular and miss the larger problem which will become more urgent as Haverhill grows rapidly

There is a new green cycle route, north of the Dernford reservoir to access to the DNA cycle path, this seems to duplicate the current route via Mingle Lane and seems to be of limited additional benefit. I cannot see it will encourage people who currently don't cycle from the villages into town to start.

I have not seen any evidence of an analysis on impact to traffic in stopping traffic 8-16 times a day in two busy village roads (Haverhill Rd & Gog Magog Way) plus the inevitable parking issues as people drive to these inconvenient locations.

The soul of beautiful, historic Cambridge is being destroyed. The beautiful surrounding countryside is being wiped out by monstrous housing estates and enormous road systems. The wildlife, the ecosystems are being destroyed. What are you doing? People choose to live in Cambridge because it is a small city with easy access to the countryside and all its beauty. Stop destroying it.

As stated above, I believe the proposed schemes are a total waste of money, will negatively affect local residents, road users, wildlife and must be shelved.

Light rail is better for the environment & uses existing technology. It could be battery powered too.

Not at all happy about the CAM system, as it is unproven & uses rubber tyres which still cause air pollution & contribute to microplastics going into the drains.

I can't help thinking that the £150m-odd this route is going to cost could be spent on providing a lot of new electric buses and drivers to vastly improve the bus services in terms of frequency, more routes, and ticket costs, which would take away the congestion, without all the new construction.  
As it stands, it seems out of your hands that buses will actually be provided on this

What is the purpose of the shaded purple line in the map? Is it a county boundary? Why is it relevant?

Why has the Guided Bus concept fallen out of favour? Is it now considered a non sustainable mode of transport? Surely extending the network out to Babraham

As stated in other sections the proposed route through the green belt is unnecessary and ridiculous when the A1307 can be greatly expanded to have a busway along that. I resent this whole process as there have been no communication to the community over the impact of this proposed route. I hope the whole project fails miserably.

As above  
Please consider buses for Balsham.



N.a.

1) I would like to see backing for an off-road extension of the cycle route beyond Abington towards Haverhill. The current suggested greenway, even with upgrades, towards Linton is inadequate and will not encourage large numbers of cyclists to use it. A separate dedicated route, would however, encourage greater cycle usage.

Dead against site A. This will only increase traffic along [road] where I live. It is already a dangerous road without pavements. The road is too narrow to cater for an increase in more traffic. There is also a weight restriction which is ignored.

The sooner it happens the better

Project is a sound approach to alleviating congestion on one of the most intensively used approaches to Cambridge.

I welcome CAM and its extension to Haverhill but regarding the proposed work planned for the A1307 between Fourwentways and Haverhill to improve the safety of this road. I have always thought all that was needed is a complete ban on overtaking and reduce the speed limit on the clearway parts to 50 mph. Its overtaking that causes all the crashes on that road.

Please comment on exactly how these infrastructure development proposals, based on rather spurious growth projections, will help us achieve carbon neutrality in time.

More joined up thinking about public transport in general is needed - not everyone travels to Cambridge and stays there! An easy route to Cambridge Station would be great and would encourage me to use the train rather than drive for longer journeys. I often drive to Royston to get the train to London if I want the Kings Cross or Brighton line or to Cambridge North for the Norwich direction. At the

Concerned that Nine Wells will inevitably be adversely affected and that efforts to lessen the impact will not be in keeping with it's historic importance and natural beauty.

As the need for these hubs also seem to be supporting traffic from Haverhill - is Suffolk CC paying for any of this?

As Addenbrookes cancelled building another car park are they paying to support expanding Brabraham as they have tipped out a lot of their staff from parking on

More consideration should be given to improving the 13 bus service and if park and ride is still seen as a solution, site hubs at Haverhill and south of Linton.

As a Sawston resident I feel a travel Hub is need on the A505/A1301 (McDonalds) junction.

When you arrive at Cambridge south station/ biomedical campus will it be a seamless transition into Cambridge central or will you be required to get off and change? As I don't think journey times will decrease if don't continue onto Cambridge without stopping.

This will have a negative impact on the village around the hubs causing more traffic on the A1307

When can we expect to see some information on a light rail link, or similar to Haverhill which is what has been needed for years now?

I think it's marvelous that these schemes are being considered for all forms of transport, so well done

It is encouraging that public transport travel options for this area are being considered as the population of the area is increasing and the Greater Cambridge region is booming.

Option C is not only the most expensive but also the one that impact normal families and their possible financial security the most

Love your careful planning.  
Love your public publishing & discussions.

See above
When we moved to Great Abington it was so quiet. We hardly ever saw anyone or cars on our lane. Now it is a high speed race track to the monstrosity that is Granta Park. The planning application for the huge new building showed screening conifers which of course did not happen and nothing can hide that enormous ugly block that is so tall and overbearing. Planning department is a disaster.
Options using the old railway route should be reappraised to provide access from Shelford etc.. and avoid cutting across the Green belt.
Deal with the traffic issues on A1307 from Haverhill as part of this proposal. If it is not easy to get to, we might as well carry on driving into Cambridge!

It's quite hard to find a clear benefit to Abington residents. A few might use the bus to travel to CBC but the 13 bus is more convenient to access. There might be a small reduction in cars going to Granta Park but an increase due to the parking hubs. It seems that hub A would probably generate least disruption to existing traffic congestion in the village.

I am fully supportive of enabling those further down the A1307 to access Cambridge and the campuses but feel that this proposal is short sighted, has major environmental negative impact and by the time it is completed it will be obsolete and unfit for purpose. You need to have a future proof proposal that will work for the next 100 years as the railways did and still do!

Please provide an adequate number of stops in larger/key areas.

Do not build on our fields which are used for crops.

As above.

There is already congestion on the A1307 towards Cambridge until after 0900 on weekdays. An additional roundabout and a signalised crossing for access to Site C would add to that, and make it even more difficult for people in Little Abington to get on to the A1307. It is also apparently not going to be possible to access that site on foot if it were to be chosen.

I strongly oppose this carving up of the countryside and the damage it will cause to village life

'A comment following on from the likely stop in Stapleford on the Haverhill road, combined with the changes in phase 1 to the junction with the A1307.

It would make sense to reduce the road speed from the current 60mph to 40mph (or possibly 50mph) - most sensibly when the junction is remodelled - for the

During the times I have used Cambridge's existing shared-use paths, I have not always felt safe as a pedestrian sharing the same path as cyclists going at frankly anti-social speeds. For the sake of safety and amity, it would seem prudent to have more segregation by type of user to the paths.

Roundabouts work better than traffic lights. It is good to see new roundabouts in some of the proposals.

Still don't think the option of a really well designed route chosen by walking along the A1307 has been properly considered. I would oppose a bad 1307 route but I know it well and think a good designer could make it work

I am very much in favour of a greenway along the Sawston bypass (A1301), this would cut down on my and many other people's cycle commute into Cambridge and making it a safer route as well. This would then become a viable every day commuting option instead of driving. This is important especially with all the new sites on the biomedical campus opening soon with all the extra commuters.



Let's get on and do it.
Site B would be the best option and would not affect village residents in Abington or Babraham. Also traffic flow along existing roads would be less affected.
I think more electric charging points should be incorporated to encourage the use of electric vehicles.

Unless a good solution for the rest of the A1307 to Haverhill is planned and implemented at the same time, these solutions will NOT solve the problem of transport links into Cambridge from this side of town. A more significant scheme is urgently required that recognises the congestion on the entire length of road and solves the current safety issues.

What has happened to the proposal to reopen the railway line between Cambridge and Haverhill?

1. Will destroy green belt of inestimable value around Shelford and Stapleford: Cambridge's green lung' of high amenity value.
2. Will add further delay and congestion to Shelford and Stapleford by adding in another 2 'level crossings'
3. Offers no connectivity for Shelford. Stapleford or Sawston. The route is too

Please use existing rail and bus routes, with hubs located nearer to residents home. Also reduced the cost of fares making cars not economically viable.

I am concerned that all the possible options will lead to further development around the Abingtons (particularly if the transport route is extended to enclose the village between the A11, the new route and the A1307.

I would support a new route improving travel by bike / foot and bus along the current route of the A1307. I believe creating a large new car park will just increase

Think carefully about Nine Wells - the site has already been put under siege and its preservation is paramount . I would not like it to become a theme park.

Just don't do it, it is a travesty and farce.

I am concerned about the impact of the proposals on the residence near the proposed bus stops.

What steps will be taken to mitigate this

E.g. parking on the roads and speeding cars

I think they are a short term stop gap, I believe the money would be better spent on the Cambridge Metro system that serves all the villages as well.

If you are serious about future proofing Cambridge and surrounding villages increasing need for transport into Cambridge then implement a proper fix that does not cost more than going in your car and stops cars sitting in endless q's caused

As per my response to q8, I'm assuming you are thinking carefully about how to increase connectivity between the science and research parks themselves, not just the home-to-work aspect.

Suffolk Chamber of Commerce welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Cambridge South East Transport Consultation, and we are responding on behalf of our many members from Haverhill and across West Suffolk. In addition to our response, we are encouraging members and the wider business community from across West Suffolk, especially in the Haverhill area to engage with the

I am mainly replying to this consultation to object to the proposal that pedestrians and cyclists should be relegated to a shared use path. Busy sections of such paths create conflict and danger to both types of users - this has resulted in a fatality in the case of the shared path between Cambridge Station and Addenbrookes, caused by a cyclist swerving to avoid walkers. Though cyclists

I think I've said most of what I want to say.

as above

Busway route should be next to existing road, not running through greenbelt land.

I think its wrong that the original route options along the A1307 are no longer being considered - the difference of support in the previous consultation was not that significant and, the costs were considerably lower and the route would link properly with the existing Park & Ride. It would also be much less disruptive to the greenbelt

There is no doubt that putting the proposed transport routes - and all the associated stop locations/parking etc - across this precious piece of agricultural greenbelt land would have a markedly negative impact on the environment, in the following ways:

a) it would destroy the nature of that land itself - and all the wildlife that depends on

I live in Abington and we are all particularly concerned re rat running through the villages' 'High streets and along the Pampisford Road and I think that Plan B is the best option.

Introduce better, efficient, cheap on road bus routes now rather than spend all this money on a route which does not go near the centres of Stapleford and Shelford and ruins the countryside.

#### 1. Stapleford Commuters,

A, Cyclists, these have an acceptable existing route all the way to their work in Cambridge, those that would continue to cycle all the way would have to backtrack to access the cycle-way (extra travel-time) and those parking their bikes at the stop, would have to pay to travel and then find a way to get to their work in

This is once more a total waste of money mealy creating more of a bottle neck in Cambridge.

This is a classic example of building businesses in the wrong places. Then destroying the lives of local people, and the environment, to support the businesses.

Don't layer bad decisions on top of bad decisions.

I still remain unconvinced that the likely cost of this project (c. £150M) could not be spent more wisely with the introduction of strategically-placed bus lanes on the A1307 (but still building a new travel hub, probably Site C). This would avoid a significant proportion of the construction costs. The funds not used for constructing a busway could be used for buying electric buses and training more drivers. Buses are the number of parking spaces in site B going to be sufficient for future demand?

First, build Site B then eventually create extension and a new stop to go to site C as overflow car park.

One further point I would like to add is, that to avoid further congestion on the A1307, which is already over capacity and a dangerous road to negotiate, I strongly believe that a direct link from Haverhill to the M11 at junction 9 would be of great benefit both on grounds of safety and improved traffic flow.

See my comments above.

This route option is a destructive and completely unnecessary proposal with seemingly future development plans that would be even more destructive. Causing more traffic congestion and pollution in local Villages is not providing a suitable answer to Cambridge traffic problems - the unspecified 'bus' should not be practised at the expense of the surrounding

As residents of Great Shelford, we strongly oppose this scheme. In addition to its immediate erosion of the green belt, if it goes ahead, its existence will increase the likelihood that future development of the green belt will take place in this area.

A study of mass transit and active travel options is due to be commissioned by Uttlesford District Council, aimed at exploring opportunities to integrate North Uttlesford Garden Community with nearby settlements, science parks (including Granta Park and Babraham Research Campus) and emerging transport projects such as CSET and CAM. The Greater Cambridge Partnership has been invited to

I strongly oppose the project on the grounds that it destroys natural habitat and local countryside. Forward long-term thinking and care for environment would make us choose an option that uses existing communication routes, and does minimal harm to the environment.

This in an excellent proposal all round and well thought out.



The A1307 seems a more logical route for a Busway. There would be less damage to existing villages and green spaces, and would presumably be a less costly option.

1. The proposed mass rapid transit route would adversely affect highway safety and/or the convenience of [road] residents as road users. The flow of traffic on Hinton Way would be increased as people try to access the proposed guided busway stop on Hinton Way (and there does not appear to be any proposal to widen Hinton Way or to add a cycle path which could at least mitigate this effect).

I have expressed some of my views in the boxes above, my main objection being the cost both financially and environmentally. It seems as if this is being designed by people from large cities imposing a city solution on Cambridge, which is not an urban environment - at the moment. I can see that if this metro system is built - housing and buildings will gradually extend beyond the current boundaries of the

The philosophy behind this project is dominated by the misconception that everyone wants to go to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. They do not. Many people are going further into Cambridge. This highly costly project does not address this issue at all, and will ultimately be seen as a white elephant which has destroyed Green Belt land in the process.

Parking on all roads in the areas around the public transport stops will result in yellow lines or parking restrictions otherwise there will be problems for emergency vehicles, residents, the nearby school, playing field and village facilities. The expenditure would be better targeted for additional parking and better access to and from the Park and Ride facilities at Babraham Road and Trumpington.

I believe the provision of a fast public transport route from Babraham to Cambridge would be a very positive step. However I am deeply unhappy about its route through the green belt east of Stapleford and Great Shelford. I would like to see it routed either alongside the very edge of the A1307, or hugging the main conurbations and roads within Stapleford and Great Shelford. The open fields

The Coppice Avenue Resident's Association ('CARA') strenuously objects to the route of the proposed new transport link on behalf of the residents of Coppice Avenue, on the following grounds:

1. The proposed mass rapid transit route would adversely affect highway safety and/or the convenience of Coppice Avenue residents as road users. In particular: As local residents, we strenuously object to the route of the proposed new transport link, on the following grounds:

1. The proposed mass rapid transit route would adversely affect our highway safety and/or our convenience as road users. In particular:

- the flow of traffic on Hinton Way would be increased as people try to access the

The proposal of the route via shelford and stapleford really does not make sense.

If there was no train station then I'm sure it would be welcomed, or possibly if it went direct to town. But there is no real benefit to shelford or stapleford. The point of introducing a whole new transport system is if there is none, but there already is one - the train station.

<p>Great Shelford Parish Council wish to make the following response to the Public Consultation document.</p> <p>The Parish Council fully support the proposal to make transport into Cambridge a much less stressful occupation, especially along the key routes. In our area this</p>
<p>See above. These developments are not wanted. They will inevitably pull Shelford and Stapleford in towards becoming just part of the city of Cambridge, which no one wants. Developers will seize the opportunity to push for more housing on a large scale around the development and in the foreseeable future we won't be living in villages but rather in a suburban sprawl. It's very likely that ugly 'Great</p>
<p>Destroying the countryside</p>

Use of the existing railway line would be preferable to carving straight across greenbelt around Shelford and Stapleford. A junction at Whittlesford could take the new route alongside the A505 to the same travel hub site.. A new stop at the old Spicers site would give the same benefits as the proposed stop on Babraham Road. The route could use existing trains, new trams on the same tracks, or a

Please rethink the project and replace it by a metro type link between Haverhill and Cambridge.

The bus route would inconvenience and negatively impact many people if put in place. It would be negative for the environment, and people (some more than others).

This development is not needed in Great Shelford, as existing bus, cycle and rail routes are performing well for the residents of the village. Thus, the project will benefit no one, instead causing traffic, pollution and disruption for the entire village.

The guided busway, as well as being the most expensive of the options which were originally presented to us, is the WRONG CHOICE. In particular, residents of Coppice Ave., Orchard Road and Mingle Lane will be sandwiched between two crossings when we leave our houses.

Haverhill is an area with cheaper housing than Cambridge ,Cambridge is an area with very expensive houses , move some of the jobs in Cambridge out to Haverhill , you will then gain a dedicated workforce as there working day will be reduced by 2 hours .

see comments

NO TRAM STOP IN STAPLEFORD

The proposed shared-use path is 3m wide, which is most definitely not wide enough for two-way cycle traffic as well as pedestrians. 3m might be wide enough just for two-way cyclists, but further provision must be made for pedestrians. And there must be some way of delineating the path - at very least a white line, but preferably a kerb - between cyclists and pedestrians.

see comments

At 3m wide, the proposed shared-use path is not wide enough for two-way cyclists AND pedestrians. In addition, there must be a separation of the path between the two groups of users.

We greatly support the use of autonomous and/or electric buses for the route. We would also greatly support a service continuing through the night (could be greatly reduced e.g. once per hour) to enable shift workers to travel to and from work at all times via the route, as well as supporting safe travel home from those returning from evenings out in Cambridge or other parts of South Cambridgeshire

Please, please not a stop at Stapleford. It will cost so much money and will be little used, please ask, how many people will walk to it.

I do not want the transport system and stops coming close to quiet villages like Stapleford.

I expect costings will go through the roof once the groundwork starts and the end cost will not justify the benefit. Far preferable to put a proper metro system in place because the existing scheme seems to be very limited in scope and irrelevant to the vast majority of locals

More effort should be put into developing public transport options for the whole journey not just a glorified park and ride. Until public transport can be developed into something that people want to use rather than something people have to use because they have no other options, the traffic situation will not improve.

A significant proportion of those who do want to commute from the villages to the biomedical campus will cycle. People in the villages also currently have the option of park and ride at Babraham. The cost of running the route through the villages does not seem proportionate to the benefit those in the villages will experience.

All points in section 8 above

- Any new NMU route needs to link into the rights of way network.
- All new links should be multiuser.
- Options for surfaces other than tarmac for the multiuser path should be considered.
- Essential that any crossing of the A11 and A1307 should be available to all NMU's

The better option would be to develop the A1037 with bus lanes and very large park and ride at the A11 junction.

The project is fundamentally flawed and should be abandoned. Instead of concreting over a large area to make a car park in the middle of nowhere and force people to use cars, there should be multiple mini travel hubs close to the centre of each village and major employment centre (specifically, at the centre of Granta Park and the Babraham Campus), with a decent bus service between all of them. I would like to add to the letter I have already sent that we have not been provided with projected passenger numbers and how those numbers are being calculated. We are told there will be a bus every 6 minutes in both directions which will cause huge disruption, congestion and associated pollution. Apparently you have no idea of the number of people that will be travelling on these buses. We therefore



The proposals for a hub at the A11 using the 1307 route should be considered far preferable

This project seems like a knee jerk reaction to a perennial problem. A very costly attempt to "de-clogg" Babraham Road whilst not discouraging extensive on-site parking within the City; for example on University Campus.

Efficient and effective integrated public transport within and across the city is poor. I am an individual local resident who has read the readily available material and asked questions at a public exhibition in order to gain an oversight and appreciation of the benefits and disbenefits to the wider community. It is my right and expectations that my views have validity.

See above. Very strongly opposed to this development of green belt land.

I need more information and will attend meetings.

(Same as comments under Question 8.)

I support a new scheme that will reduce commuting traffic on the A1307 into Cambridge. It is a shame that it doesn't begin in Haverhill. I drive on the A1307 to the existing Babraham Park and Ride and from here ride my bike into Cambridge to get to work. All three of the proposed sites are too far for me to cycle to work

All three proposals are poor compromises .you need to build a guided busway along old railway track to link Haverhill and Cambridge. This would remove commuters from A 1307. More creative thinking needs to occur between counties of Suffolk and Cambridgeshire. The three compromises drawn up are Cambridgeshire to Cambridge solutions. Please leave Pampisford road alone.

We feel very strongly that a stop should not be placed in Stapleford.  
A stop in Shelford is close enough for residents to walk to.

The new public transport routes are a waste; all the money required and disruption caused to build this route for only a few buses to travel along, while the road running parallel (A1307) remains clogged at rush hour. Currently, the reason people drive rather than take the bus is because buses are too expensive, too crowded, unreliable and not frequent enough. This plan will not solve any of these

I reiterate the points I have made in item (8). I am horrified that this option for the route has been decided upon when the most logical option was to construct a dedicated bus lane alongside the A1307 which would have been the cheapest and quickest route to build and be far less invasive on the countryside. This chosen option would appear to be an underhand way of destroying the green belt and

My main concern is the stop on Coppice Avenue which will create an enormous amount of traffic and disruption.

I do recognise the need for change, and for improvements to our infrastructure. However, this is an expensive and destructive way to seek to improve transport arrangements for people who live miles away from the communities that will be most impacted. If you are really committed to encouraging the use of public transport and more sustainable travel generally, why not introduce a congestion

Adverse effect on green belt and the environment. More noise, people, vehicles. Deleterious to the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford.

See 8) above. Need more joined up thinking - it is not just a Cambridgeshire problem but workers (esp low paid) have to live outside of City and even the County - workers are needed from neighbouring authorities so need to link in with them for suggested improved transport works/networks.

This proposed transport route should run adjacent to the existing road line of the A1307 with stations at the end of Hinton Way and Haverhill Road

This proposed carving up of the local landscape is purely to allow development by the back door.

Anyone wanting to use the transport route could either walk or cycle to the end of

The new proposed route is very badly conceived and poorly thought out. There is no local demand for a new route through beautiful countryside (Esp Ninewells) just to link the A11 to Addenbrookes. The noise, traffic pollution and negative impact on the environment at Shelford and Stapleford has not been considered

adequately and must take precedence. Locals already have good transport links,

1/ This is a grotesque amount of money to spend for very little gain, and I cannot believe there are not cheaper (or simpler) options to solve the traffic problems.

2/ Within the consultation document there is no guarantee that electric vehicles will ever be used. We could end up with yet more diesel buses polluting the local environment.

These proposals appear to be all about opening up the corridor of green belt land between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granta Park, for development.

If this new transport route is built, and if this swathe of green belt land is then developed, we will be back to square one with even worse traffic congestion, and the legacy of degraded environment for future generations.

Urbanisation negatively impacts wildlife. I like that you are trying to increase public transport in Cambridge but I think that needs to be done via the improvement of the current systems not by adding more roads

Hopefully, in the future, the route can be extended to Haverhill. They should never have shut the railway!

'

Stop this now

Agree that the traffic is dreadful and only getting worse, I just don't see how this would alter the current situation.

Maybe widening the Babraham road from the Hinton Way roundabout or direct route to the cbc from there would be the cheaper option with less environmental impact..

Please see my comments above. I am a resident of Hinton Way and feel strongly that you are ignoring the code of the Green Belt. Remember the Green Belt was created for a reason to protect the identity and beauty of the environment. Please review your proposals.

Thank you!

I strongly oppose the bus route cutting through the green belt and blotting the landscape. There is no benefit to having stops on both Haverhill Road and Hinton Way and people from the village would not use them. Traffic congestion and pollution will increase on our village roads if traffic is stopped by trains crossing these roads.

The other route options seem to be dismissed too fast.

I think a park and ride closer to Haverhill would be more suitably, reducing traffic on the A1307. No thought has been given to Abington Village or the house owners on the A1307.

Make better use of existing Park and Rides provide more spaces.  
Increase the amount of buses used at peak times on the local bus service.  
Build a new Park and Ride near Haverhill

Keep it a lot further away from the Stapleford village boundary. It will ruin our environment and everything we loved when we chose to move here, with this plan. Leave farm land alone. It is full of wildlife. It is good for mental health. It produces food. Please don't ruin it and turn us all into faceless towns. Local Community life is important. I am sure all the villages will feel the same. Let it run alongside the A

You need to build a safe and fully accessible cycle route between Babraham, Granta Park, the Abingdons, and Cambridge, including a fully accessible bridge over the A11.

Totally opposed to the project and would join the thousands of residents who feel the same way in preventing it.

I have no strong views for or against the scheme, except as follows.

There should be separate foot and cycleways, with lighting, similar to the West Cambridge path, in these locations: within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus; where the new route shares an alignment with DNA Path/Sawston Greenway, and

You have alleged a route following the old railway alignment is not feasible because of space constraints, residential building etc., but you have not provided us with detailed problems relating to this alternative. Nor have you estimated how much more expensive it would be. I wonder if you have seriously examined this option or dismissed it out of hand? In any case have you put a monetary value on

No estimate made, or cost included, of loss of unique environment of green belt land very near country parks

Spend money improving the current roads. Improve the road layout at waitrose lights..its a bottleneck, maybe better a one-way system. Enforce cycles to use the cycle lanes and not the road. Put up barriers on cycle lanes to stop the bikes speeding so much

I cannot support destruction of the finest countryside in the Gog Magog Hills, which presently has inestimable recreational benefit for the Cambridge population. Carving up this farmland will also encourage infill development, destroying what remains of the Cambridge green belt. Cambridge will expand, but the lives of its inhabitants will be impoverished.

I think Option Hubs A or B are the best choice - as long as car access back on to the A1307 is organised. It is important that paths open to EQUINES are really included.

A waste of money

As per above, reducing impact on environment and controlling traffic in and around Cambridge is a good idea. These plans are not good enough to justify the cost and scale of the project. It also does not seem to have the sustainability and scalability required to Cambridge's growth.

'Village' stop locations and design. The Shelford stop is half a mile from the 'centre of gravity' of the village. The north part of Shelford is walking distance, though footpaths will need upgrading. The central parts of Shelford and Stapleford are not. The stop design is a half way house between an urban stop and a 'park and ride', with a car drop-off and disabled parking only. I anticipate that this will

It's totally unnecessary. There are roads already, what we need is much more frequent, much cheaper buses to run on them. And buses that are properly marketed to encourage people to use them.

As an example of Stagecoach's current abject failure to market their own bus

As mentioned above, please get on with the measures necessary to reduce private car use in Cambridge. Once those measures (e.g. low emission zone, congestion charging and working parking levy) are in place then there will probably be no need for this scheme as the existing roads will be clear enough for reliable bus services.



Widen the A 1307.

Separate park and ride buses from regular traffic lanes.

Separate pedestrians and all bicycles from all traffic (cars buses guided buses - people fall into the path of the guided bus and get killed ).

Stupid to be creating a route through countryside that disabled and pedestrians

I am writing in response to the Greater Cambridge South East Transport: 'Better Public Transport Project' Consultation. Some of these points were raised in the previous consultation on the proposals for the A1307 Corridor. These are concerns that have not been addressed in the subsequent work.

Disagree with this route when there is an old railway track that could be used, as in other places where the busway is now ie Long Road, Cambridge. A lot of money to be spent for destroy the countryside by covering it with concrete.

The Shelford and District Bridleways Group has made comments above regarding what we would like to see if this scheme does go ahead. This does NOT constitute support of the scheme as a whole. Overall, we think this is an ill-advised use of public money, and would prefer to see public funds instead directed into: 1) improved, on-road public transport that is frequent and cheap; 2) maintenance of

- Any new NMU route needs to link into the rights of way network.

- All new links should be multiuser.

- Options for surfaces other than tarmac for the multiuser path should be considered.

- It is essential that any crossing of the A11 and A1307 should be available to all  
The bus road proposal is literally a blot on the landscape. The route should be built along side existing and disused public transport rail corridors. It hard to believe the preferred route will comply regulatory obligations to consider the landscape and additional and unnecessary movement within it. The bus road proposed will be energy inefficient compared to energy efficient steel wheel on steel rail where Cycleways must be wide enough and properly shielded from other traffic.

Pedestrians and cyclists should also be clearly separated, especially with proliferation of more (faster) electric bikes. Unsupervised /unlit cycletracks also attract illegal motorcycling (as frequently now happens on the sections nearer Addenbrooke's).

Cycle paths are dangerous if not properly segregated from both traffic and pedestrians. Do not like shared use paths, especially when poorly lit and remote - have witnessed too many accidents on the existing cyclepath by guided bus route..

I think a better solution to the crossings at Hinton Way and Haverhill Rd should be considered. The frequency of the trams (likely to increase over time) will cause delays on both roads (viz current delays at the the Gt Shelford Station level crossing). Road bridges over the tramway with suitable landscaping could be a solution.

'I do not trust the motivations of the Council regarding this scheme BECAUSE:  
- choosing a more expensive scheme than necessary, with more negative effect upon the local ecological structure doesn't make sense  
- unless this is actually about circumventing greenbelt rules in order to enable land-capture. Including a housing development is very suspect. Calling it a Retirement

I support alternatives as proposed by Stapleford Parish Council.

See above. In summary: we don't need/want this. It's too expensive. The A1307 route would be preferable. We would prefer to live with the existing transport options rather than sacrifice the rural character of the two villages.

The existence of the route, in time, will attract developers and the growth of villages to the south of cambridge thereby adding to the population wanting to make use of cambridge. and its services such as the hospital. Thereby creating a need for more working population. An upwelling circle.

2G3S

Response to Greater Cambridge Partnership consultation on the: 'Cambridge South East Transport: Better Public Transport Project'

You should not be offering a bus-based system and dismissing a light train system. Your proposal is for an environmentally and culturally destructive system and the costings used are opaque fictions born of a particular kind of economic calculations that take no account of real people, real working practices and real lives. They have no empirical basis.

Park and Ride is an urban concept; it should not reach beyond the Gogs. The traffic from Haverhill will increase as 2600 new homes are built. The people will not give up their cars to bus travel

I support cycleways but they must be separated from busway and pedestrians, for safety reasons, especially in unlit more remote locations. Addenbrooke's is the problem from a traffic perspective, not Shelford or Stapleford who have rail, existing bus and cycle options.

As a principle, GCP should make use of existing routes (ie. beside or on the A1307) or historic routes (in this case the old Haverhill rail line) where possible. Light rail or trams should be considered due to much greater carrying capacity and increased sustainability (reduced pollution and rolling resistance).

I think that the plan to have a route along the A1307 has not been given sufficient consideration and the proposed new road scheme has too big an impact at this time. I would prefer the A1307 lane scheme to be introduced and tried before carving up the countryside.

This entire proposal seems like it is set up to ferry people from Cambridge to the Science Parks at Abington/Babraham, and is therefore quite limiting to whom it is useful. Anyone travelling from beyond the Abingtons, i.e. Linton, Haverhill, from where a huge number travel in to Addenbrookes/Central Cambs/train station, and further away does not benefit, and would create a multi stage journey if they do

- ensure sufficient cycle parking and an adequate sized drop-off zone + turning area, to give ease of use, and thereby encourage people to use it.
- make every effort to get it constructed quickly, ahead of schedule if possible, consistent with value for money and due consultation.

I think it ruins the environment, breaks up the village and opens a possible avenue to build houses on the green belt which would be a disaster for the environment and our ability to grow food which, of course, is essential. More development is not true progress.

Why are you doing this, for gods sake just put in a better bus service

Wonder about price point as Sawston has a poor area.

**DO NOT EVENT START UNTIL YOU HAVE SORTED EXISTING PARK + RIDE  
CAR PARK AND BUS SLANES. ALSO EXEND BUS TIMES INTO EVENING**

This whole project is a complete waste of money + will benefit only a small number of people in the community  
it is a complete disgrace.  
ruining our countryside for future generations.  
What about climate change.

Where are the costings for each proposed

the reinstatement of the railway line in greener, better able to serve community needs and cheaper over a 10 year period

We cannot understand how a route through fields was preferred rather than along a main road - this option of the fields presents further changing residential potential

The cyclepath at Cambridge end is already not wide enough (DNA path). Needs to be 4 m cyclepath + separate pedestrian route from Cambridge to Great Shelford. 3m proposed isn't wide enough already. need to ensure cyclists can cross busway near Addenbrooke's junction/DNA path splits near Addenbrooke's Road bridge. Please also remove car parking charge or car parking in Cambridge to improve air

rail is the ideal  
roads are clogged & hard & expensive to maintain  
Houses are being built before ways to move people organised  
\*\*respondent changes wording of Q2 to "How often, if at all, do I use any part of the proposed public transport route?" and answered "daily"\*\*\*

the proximity to Addenbrooke's hospital of the route raises the question of ambulances being able to proceed easily through the local villages with proposed stops. Hinton Way in Stapleford/Great Shelford is of particular concern as there is already the railway station which impedes flow of traffic. The stop further along Hinton Way could make this road an extremely difficult road to proceed along and

If no other alternative C + the black route is my preferred as I am really concerned that the other options would use Bourn Bridge Road as a 'rat run'!!!

have always supported excellent bus services! also traffic calming measures (to date)! CAM would be too expensive for ten years time ??

regarding Stapleford stop:

1) cyclists have a good route all the way into work locations in Cambridge using once bike all the way so would be unlikely to cycle backwards to bus stop, or park bike, pay a fee to get to biomedical campus & still have to get to work.

2) motorists have no parking

I feel shared use paths are an excellent idea and should be as many as possible to encourage more people to enjoy the countryside

The sooner the better to provide a quick and environmentally sustainable route at Cambridge

The consultation document, which is short on some areas of informative detail, plus

comments reported leads me to ask some questions:

1. What is the strategy for interlinking with CAM proposals and other transport modes?

\*\*the respondent ticked more than one box in response to several questions.

These were:

Q2 - how often would you use the route - Answer - daily & weekly

Q3 - How far do you support overall proposals - Answer - Strongly support & support

The stop in Hinton Way would cause a great deal of traffic delay in view of the frequency of the proposed service in both directions. Hinton way is far busier than Granhams road or Haverhill Road & especially busy between 8am & 9.30am & between 4.30 & 6 pm. Residents Only Parking would be essential between my property at 154 & Coppice Avenue to prevent access to & from my residence &

The shared use path from Newmarket rd along Borun Bridge Rd should be planned to preserve the 'Protected Verge@ which is annually studied by Abington Naturewatch.

Linear parks are a welcome plan as we in Abington are cut off from healthy walks on foot paths cut-off by fast traffic & no crossings.

'\_

The plans make provision for potential habitat creation either side of the route, together with an increase in biodiversity. We broadly support such. Having seen other recent transport projects providing for similar, we suggest that those acquiring authorities that work with land owners at the design stage and take account of the land owners concerns as to siting of such habitat creation, are less

It is easier to walk from/to sites A and B to/from the science parks at Granta Park and Babraham.

if the scheme is eventually extended to Haverhill along the old railway line the proposed bridge over the A11 for site C will be in the wrong place.

For 40 years the major increase in traffic on the A1307 has been generated by the expansion of Haverhill district (Suffolk). They must engage & contribute money to the solution right at the start.

I have seen morning rush hour traffic heading towards Cambridge start queueing from the Horseheath bypass. This is the obvious place for a hub.

In general, I will always support improvements in public transport around Cambridge. The more bus options there are the less attractive travel by car becomes.

However, with this proposal I have found it difficult to understand just what the objective of the scheme is. The consultation document seems to just assume that 10. A study of mass transit and active travel options is due to be commissioned by Uttlesford District Council, aimed at exploring opportunities to integrate North Uttlesford Garden Community with nearby settlements, science parks (including Granta Park and Babraham Research Campus) and emerging transport projects such as CSET and CAM. The Greater Cambridge Partnership has been invited to



11) Please indicate your interest in the project. Please tick all that apply.	12) If you usually travel in the area, please indicate how you do so. Please tick
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Motorcycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in Cambridge	
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	On foot, Other

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle

I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Van or lorry driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Van or lorry driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot



Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car passenger, Bus
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus

Other	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot

Resident Elsewhere	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Motorcycle, Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Motorcycle, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Motorcycle, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Bus, On foot, Other



Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Not Applicable

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger
Resident in Cambridge, Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car passenger, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Bus, Cycle

Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	
Other	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle, Cycle

Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area, Other	On foot, Other

Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Motorcycle, Bus, Cycle, On foot
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle



Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Other
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere	On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus

Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Bus, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle

Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Car passenger, Van or lorry driver, Bus
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	

Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, On foot
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Motorcycle, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car passenger, Bus, On foot



Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Other
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver

Resident Elsewhere, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Bus
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Van or lorry driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver

Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer	Van or lorry driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Not Applicable
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Bus



Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger, Bus
I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger, Bus
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot

Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident Elsewhere, Local business owner/employer	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle

Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, On foot
I regularly travel in the area, Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Van or lorry driver, Bus, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere	Not Applicable
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Van or lorry driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area, Other	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Van or lorry driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle



Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Van or lorry driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere	Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle

Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Van or lorry driver
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle, On foot
I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Local business owner/employer	Car driver
I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus

Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Other	Not Applicable
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus



Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Van or lorry driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in Cambridge, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Other
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Other	Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car passenger, Bus



Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, Other
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, I regularly travel in the area	Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot
Other	Not Applicable
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot, Other

I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area, Other	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle



Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, Local business owner/employer, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Motorcycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area, Other	Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Bus
Resident in Cambridge	Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other

Resident in Cambridge	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area, Other	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Cycle
Other	
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Bus, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in Cambridge, Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area, Other	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle
Resident Elsewhere, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot, Other
Resident in Cambridge	Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident Elsewhere	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle
Resident in Cambridge, Other	Bus, On foot
Resident in Cambridge	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car passenger, Motorcycle, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Cycle, On foot, Other
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Motorcycle, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle, On foot

Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus, Cycle, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, Cycle
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I occasionally travel in the area	Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Local business owner/employer	Car driver, Cycle

Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Bus, On foot
Resident in South Cambridgeshire, I regularly travel in the area	Car driver, Bus
Resident in South Cambridgeshire	Car driver, Car passenger, Bus, On foot
Other	Not Applicable



13) If you travel in the area of the proposed transport route for leisure or any other reasons. please	14) If you commute in the area, please indicate your usual	14 a) Postcode of destination (if known).
Cambridge city centre		
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB2 3ds
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1RB
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	cb216al
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ

Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB3 9AN
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Babraham Research Campus	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8BS
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	cb2 3eq
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	City House and Academy House (AstraZeneca), Cambridge
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8EA
Cambridge city centre, Other		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QH
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Great Shelford	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0AH
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Other	Cambridge city centre	any where within cambridge where firm sends me
Cambridge city centre	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT
Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	Cb19nj
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Other		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Other		

Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB22 5LE
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB5 8EG
Cambridge city centre		CB2 1RR
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB20QQ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other	Cambridge city centre	CB2
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other		various

Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		CB22 3DW
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Great Shelford	CB22 5NE
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Other		CB9 7AA
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB1 7EG

	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	cb2 3qn
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		CB21 4NW
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Sawston, Great Shelford		
Other	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre		
Other		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT



Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre		CB1
Cambridge city centre, Other	Granta Park	Commute from CB41BJ to CB21 6AL
	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Cambridge city centre	Cb1 2ga
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre		

Cambridge city centre, Other		CB22 4QX
Other	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Other		
Other		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB3 0AP
Cambridge city centre	Genome Campus	CB10 1DR

Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Babraham Research Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	Cb5 8pb
Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		Cb227gg
Great Shelford	Great Shelford	cb22 5ab
		CB21 4UD
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Granta Park	CB21 6DG

Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Granta Park	CB21 6GH
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other		CB1 8SH

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0RE
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB28QF
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Sawston	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	C
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Great Shelford	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB22 3HJ

Other		CB5 8RX
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Genome Campus	CB10 1SA
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Sawston	CB22 3AG
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Sawston		
Other		
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Sawston, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Other	Cambridge city centre	Cb28eb
Other	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB4 0GA
Other		CB5 8UZ
	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8PX
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Other		
	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0AA
Cambridge city centre, Other	Cambridge city centre	

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Other	Granta Park	CB21 6GH
Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Granta Park	CB21 6GP
Other		cb10
Cambridge city centre		
Other		



Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8PA
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
	Cambridge city centre	CB1
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Sawston	CB22 3EA
Other	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT

Other		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Other		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0SP
Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Sawston, Great Shelford		CB22 3HW

Other		CB21 4NN
Cambridge city centre, Other	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT
Other		CB10 1XL
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB1 2JD
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Granta Park	CB21
Cambridge city centre		Cb11 4er
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB4

Cambridge city centre, Other		Cb2 9dr
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0AW
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Babraham Research Campus	CB223AT
Sawston		C21 5XB
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Genome Campus	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0AX
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	CB1 3SN and CB21 6DF

Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Granta Park	cb21 6gb
Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford, Other	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Granta Park	CB21 6DF
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Sawston	cb223bg
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 2QQ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB9 7SQ

Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0XX
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Other	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ

	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QH
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	cb2 0qh
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8DR
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB5



Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1QN
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	cb2 0qq
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Great Shelford		EC2V 4BX
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Other	Genome Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Great Shelford	
Sawston		
		CB4 1DW
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Other		

Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB20QH
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	Cb3 0et
Other		CB224QR
Cambridge city centre, Other	Granta Park	
Other	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Granta Park	
	Granta Park	CB21 6GT
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Granta Park	cb21 6gs

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		CB25MDU
Other	Babraham Research Campus	
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other	Granta Park	CB21 6GH
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Babraham Research Campus	

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Granta Park	CB21 6AL
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1TP
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Granta Park	CB21 6AD
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge city centre	CB1 2JD
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	Cb2 0qq
Cambridge city centre	Genome Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		CB223AP
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge city centre	CB1

Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB20QQ
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre		Cambridge city centre

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other		
Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Other	Babraham Research Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Babraham Research Campus	cb22 3at
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB21BY
Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		



	Granta Park	
	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1TA
Other		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		CB2 3HW

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB5
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB5 8HW
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Sawston	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Genome Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Genome Campus	CB22 3DF
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB1 2JD
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		cb2 0qh
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0AY
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Babraham Research Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Sawston	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Other	Sawston	Cb223fx
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge city centre	Station Road, Cambridge
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB1 1JX
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other	Great Shelford	
Other	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Granta Park	CB21 6GB
Other	Granta Park	

	Granta Park	CB21 6GB
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Other	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AG
Other	Granta Park	CB21 6GB
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Other	Granta Park	CB21 6GB
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Sawston	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		cb2 1pz

Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		Cb225aq
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		CB1
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	

Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		City centre - shops. Addenbrookes hospital - outpatients. Sawston - medical centre and shops
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT
Other	Babraham Research Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre		



Other		E14 2BG
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		Cb1
Cambridge city centre	Babraham Research Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	

Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Cambridge city centre	cb22 3sn
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1TA and CB3 West Road
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Granta Park	cb21 6gb

Sawston	Cambridge city centre	
Other	Granta Park	CB21 6AL
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre	Babraham Research Campus	CB11 3EJ
Other	Genome Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB3 9EU
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Granta Park	CB21 6GH

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		City Centre shops, theatre and Addenbrookes regularly driving to Babraham Road
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Other		
Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		CB237DU
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	Cb23ds
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Sawston, Great Shelford		CB22
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB1 2GA
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB1 2DG

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		CB22 5FD
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0SP
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	Cb225ea
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Genome Campus	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB5 8HW
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	
Great Shelford		
Other		CB21 4NW
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB1 8DH
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB225AL
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QH



Cambridge city centre	Granta Park	
Other	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8PA
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Other		
Cambridge city centre		
Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other	Granta Park	CB21 6GP
	Great Shelford	
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	cb2 3qz

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB2 7EF
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		CB22
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Other	Granta Park	CB21 6GH
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 8PX
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		CB2 3QJ

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		
Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	Brooklands Ave
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Other		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Other	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		cb1 9nj
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Great Shelford	Great Shelford	Cb22 5ez
Cambridge city centre	Sawston	
Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		Cb22 5bb
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	Cb28qf
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	Cb1
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other		
Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		CB21 6AY
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Other		
Other		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB3 0DG



Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Other		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB3
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8BB
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		CB22 5BJ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		CB4 0WB
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		CB22 5AQ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other	Granta Park	
Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Sawston	cb223bg
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Great Shelford	CB22 5LZ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	

Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre		

Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB2 3DZ
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB20QQ
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	cb39EZ
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	cb28bb
Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Great Shelford	CB22 5BX

Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	cb28bb
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Other	Genome Campus	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Sawston		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB21RL
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1TQ
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB1 7UU
Cambridge city centre, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Other		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8DU
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		

Other		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0QQ



Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	Cb4ods
Cambridge city centre, Other		CB21 5XE
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		CB28PX

Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 8PH
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		CB22 5AQ
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		CB22 5BX
Great Shelford	Granta Park	

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB20SP
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	I commute to central Cambridge and central London
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	

Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB12JW
Cambridge city centre	Great Shelford	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Other	Cambridge city centre	CB30LE
Cambridge city centre	Babraham Research Campus	CB22 3AT

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Other		cb21 6bw
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		CB225SY
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge city centre	Cb4 0wg
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1TB
Other		cb10
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	cb20re

Great Shelford	Granta Park	
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	cb2 3ds
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Other		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Great Shelford	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB2 1PZ
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Cambridge city centre	Trumpington park & ride used
Other		
Other		IP28 7AY
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		Great Shelford (CB22 5AL) to Harlow by train
Cambridge city centre		CB2 1RD
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	



Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB2
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other	Great Shelford	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	CB3 9EP
Cambridge city centre		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Sawston, Other		CB1 1QD
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Other		CB In other words, many locations in and around Cambridge and the villages.
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	CB2 0SR
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	Bridge street
Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB2

Cambridge city centre	Cambridge city centre	CB1
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre		pe1 1lf
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre		

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Other	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
	Cambridge city centre	
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford	Great Shelford	
Cambridge city centre, Sawston		
Cambridge city centre		
Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		CB3 9LH
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		

Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital)		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford	Sawston	

Cambridge city centre, Sawston, Great Shelford		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford, Other		
Cambridge city centre, Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrookes Hospital), Sawston, Great Shelford		
Other		



15) Please indicate your age	16) Are you primarily:	17) Do you have a	18) How did you hear	Postcode (to identify concerns by
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB9 7RA
35-44	Employed	No	Email	
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4XF
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB9 9SE
55-64	Self-employed	No	Email	CB22 5BL
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
65-74	A home-based worker	No	Email	CB24 8RN
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB9 9HD

75 and above	Retired	Yes	Website	CB22 4QN
65-74	Retired	No	South Cambs Magazine	CB225DS
55-64	Employed	Prefer not to say	Email	CB21 4NP
25-34	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB21 4LL
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
65-74	Employed	No	Email	cb22 5el
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB9 7PH
35-44	Employed	No	Other	CB22 3LA
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	Cb21 4 lj

35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3BZ
45-54	Employed	Prefer not to say	Email	cb22 5en
35-44	Employed	No	Email	
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4LE
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3AT
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	
55-64	Employed	No	Social media	
45-54	Employed	No	Website, Email	CB22 5JL
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB24 3AH

55-64	Self-employed	No	Word of mouth	cb22 5bj
45-54	Employed	No	Email	cb90dh
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4JT
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB29BX
25-34	Employed	No	Email	
65-74	Retired	No	Email	Cb225an
55-64	Employed	No		
55-64	Employed	No	Social media	Cb21 4xh
55-64	Employed	Prefer not to say	Other	Cb223AG

45-54	In education	No	Social media	
Prefer not to say	Other	Prefer not to say	Website	
45-54	Self-employed	No	Email	CB21 4RF
35-44	Employed	No	Email	
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	CB225UT
55-64	Employed	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	CB9 7BY
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Website, Email, Other	CB39JN

35-44	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB11
55-64	Self-employed	No	Email	CB22 3DW
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4HT
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	CB21 4JH
35-44	Employed	No	Social media	CB22 3JD
45-54	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine	CB21 4RA
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB2 9ET
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3JQ
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB9 7DP

55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3AT
15-24	In education	No	Leaflet	CB22 3LA
Prefer not to say	Self-employed	No	Word of mouth	cb10 1sl
55-64	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine, Email	CB22 5BQ
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB9 7TL
35-44	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB20AL
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer	
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB223JU
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB9 9PJ

35-44	Employed	No	Local community news, Social media	CB22 5BP
55-64	Employed	No	Email	Cb17ty
15-24	Employed	No		
45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth, Other	
45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB24 8TQ
45-54	Self-employed	No	Email	
35-44	Employed	Yes	Email, Other	CB21 4LE
25-34	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB225BT
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3BZ



35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3DU
75 and above	Retired	No	Social media	CB99NW
45-54	Employed	No	Website, Local community news, Other	CB21 6AL
45-54	Employed	Yes	Social media	CB9 9HP
35-44	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Leaflet	Cb223bl
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB9 7BY
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3BU
55-64	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar		Leaflet	CB22 3BT
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	Sawston

35-44	Employed	No	Newspaper article, Social media	Cb90lw
25-34	Employed	No	Social media	
25-34	Employed	No	Local community news, Social media	CB9
Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	Other	
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
45-54	Self-employed	No	Local community news	
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3DU
25-34	Employed	No	Social media	CB4 3LT

25-34	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet	CB225JU
25-34	Employed	No	Flyer	
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3BJ
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3DT
45-54	Employed	No	Flyer	CB22 5AU
15-24	Employed	No	Leaflet	
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4UD
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3BX

45-54	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine, Word of mouth	Cb21 6BL
15-24	Employed	No	Email	CB9 7RP
55-64	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB21 6AA
55-64	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Word of	CB22 3SW
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb216bu
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5AL
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine	CB22 5
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB3 9NQ
45-54	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB1 8SH

35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3DZ
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB216AU
25-34	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet	CB223DS
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5BX
Under 15	In education	No	Leaflet, Advert on bus, Other	H
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, South Cams Magazine	CB22 5AH
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5EZ
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB2 9HE
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3HJ

45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB9 0DQ
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB21 6BS
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3LH
25-34	Employed	No	Flyer	
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB1 8DT
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB28RP
25-34	Employed	No	Website	CB24 1AU
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer	CB21 6BL
65-74	Retired		Leaflet	cb22

25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb223bl
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5EA
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 0QY
25-34	Self-employed	No	Website	CB4 2LZ
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB9 0JF
45-54	Employed	No	Flyer	CB21 6BL
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 6BL
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB8 0NY
25-34	Employed	No	Website, Word of mouth	

65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB216BE
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB21 6BE
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5HG
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB1 9GH
35-44	Employed	No	Other	
45-54	Employed	No	Other	CB22 4RL
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	
15-24	In education	No	Leaflet	
15-24	In education	No	Website	CB1 2QH



25-34	Employed	No	Other	
35-44	Employed	No	Email, Library	CB2 9FN
55-64	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB1 7US
15-24	Employed	No	Advert on bus, At Park & Ride, Social media	
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4SD
15-24	Employed	No	Flyer	
55-64	Self-employed		Leaflet	CB22 5DS
35-44	Employed	No	Flyer, Email	CB22 3BG
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	CB1 7AF

55-64	Employed	No	Website, Local community news, Social	CB1 9YL
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB1 7UX
45-54	Self-employed	Yes	At Park & Ride	CB225AQ
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	Cb88qa
45-54	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Email	CB1 7TY
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3EE
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5AN
45-54	Employed	Yes	Flyer	
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB1 7RT

15-24	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB29FP
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, Email	CB2 9EU
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9PQ
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9AP
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	Cb22 7qj
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9AX
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 6AB
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Social media	Cb22 3bz
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	CB2 9BE

25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb2 9dr
15-24	In education	No	Website, Local community news	CB2 1TA
25-34	Employed	No	Flyer	CB2 9AZ
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb21 6bl
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB223AT
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3SR
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3LT
45-54	Employed	No	Other	CB11 3ZD
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB1 7UT

35-44	Employed	No	Social media, Word of mouth	CB9 7RG
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb2 9dq
55-64	Other	Yes	Leaflet, Word of mouth	CB1 7SX
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	CB22 5FE
35-44	Employed	No	Email	
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	cb2 9jq
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	Cb24 9ha
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB1 3SN

45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB4 2PB
25-34	Employed	No	Email	SG8
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Email	CB22 5JH
35-44	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet	CB22 5EN
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, Other	CB22 5HY
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	cb225js
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB9 9QP
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB9 7SQ

55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB9 9HN
45-54	Employed	No	Other	
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, Other	CB21 6AH
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB25
25-34	Employed	No	Email	
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB9 9LR
15-24	In education	No	Email	CB2 9BY
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news, Email	CM23 3NL

35-44	Employed	No	Other	
35-44	Employed	No	Other	CB21 4JF
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet, Email	cb22 5jw
35-44	Employed	No	Flyer, Other	CB2 9JF
35-44	Employed	No	Other	
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB225AU
25-34	Employed	No	Website	CB9 9EN
45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB21 4XH



45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB21 4YP
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB6 1GA
35-44	Employed	No	Word of mouth	Cb1
45-54	Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	CB2 9JS
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6BL
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	
65-74	Retired	No	Flyer, South Cambs Magazine	CB22 3DU
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	SG8 0NW

45-54	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Newspaper article, Social media	CB21 6AS
45-54	Employed	Yes	Newspaper article	
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB17UY
35-44	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB22 5BZ
45-54	Employed	No	Flyer, South Cambs Magazine	Cb22
55-64	Self-employed	No	Social media, Word of mouth	CB21 6AS
45-54	Self-employed	No	Word of mouth	CB4 1DW
55-64	Employed	No	Website	CB10 1QA
65-74	Self-employed	No	Flyer	CB22 3NP

45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB98JG
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 6BU
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cbg 8px
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB216AZ
25-34	Employed	No	Email	
25-34	Employed	Yes	Local community news	
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB22 5UD
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB4 2TJ
25-34	Employed	No	Local community news	

75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	CB22 3BZ
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Website,	CB22 3SW
45-54	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9JL
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer	CB2 9BJ
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5BX
45-54	Employed		Local community news	
45-54	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Cambridge Matters, South Cambs	CB225BQ
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	
45-54	Employed	No	Newspaper advert, Social media	CB9 0HW

65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB216BQ
65-74	Prefer not to say	No	Leaflet	CB216BQ
35-44	Employed	No	Other	
65-74	In education	No	South Cambs Magazine	
25-34	Employed	No	Local community news	CB21 4LL
25-34	Unemployed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	Cb29pq
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, Social media	CB29BB
25-34	Employed	No	Website	cb22 5DU
45-54	Employed		Leaflet	CB2 9PB

25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4YL
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb223dl
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6BU
45-54	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6BU
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9BB
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB223AP
65-74	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB1 5DZ

25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 7NQ
65-74	Retired	No	South Cams Magazine, Website, Local	CB22 3AJ
Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	Yes	Social media	
55-64	Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	Social media	Cb1 8qz
35-44	Employed	No	Local community news, Other	CB9 8QA
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 4LT
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6AE
25-34	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9HR
Prefer not to say	Self-employed	No	Local community news	CB21 6AS

35-44	Employed	No	Email, Social media	CB1 8AQ
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	derek.jones@braham.co.uk
45-54	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine	cb22 4pp
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 4PF
45-54	Self-employed	No	Local community news	
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
55-64	Employed	No	Other	
65-74	Retired	No	Social media	CB1 2QT



45-54	Employed	Yes	Local community news	CB22 5EY
25-34	Employed	No	Email	
55-64	Self-employed	Yes	Newspaper advert	CB9
55-64	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Word of mouth	CB1
65-74	Employed	No	Email, Word of mouth	CB2 8HH
65-74	Self-employed	No	Word of mouth	CB1 8SQ
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9AW
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	cb2 9eu
45-54	Employed	No	Other	paul@menta.org.uk

45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB8 8YP
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB21 6BD
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Email	
Prefer not to say	Employed	No	Leaflet, Other	CB22
45-54	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Local community news, Word of mouth, Other	CB21 4EG
55-64	Employed	No	Social media	CB21 4EU
45-54	Self-employed	No	Social media	Cb214dp
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Social	CB22 5EA
35-44	Employed	No	Local community news	Cb21 4dp

45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3DF
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB2 9JA
35-44	Employed	No	Flyer, Email	
65-74	Employed	No	Leaflet	cb1 7rs
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6BU
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Cambridge Matters, South	CB20QZ
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB21 4RY
35-44	Employed	No	Social media, Other	CB4 1TB
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Newspaper article, Library	CB1 7US

35-44	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Flyer	CB21 6BG
55-64	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6BE
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	CB10 1PL
65-74	Retired	No	Flyer, South Cambs Magazine, Word of mouth	CB21 6AH
55-64	Employed	Yes	Leaflet	CB22 5BQ
55-64		Prefer not to say	South Cambs Magazine, Social media,	CB22 5AF
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB19BT
45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB22 3LL
35-44	Employed	No	Word of mouth	

35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB21 6GB
15-24	In education	No	Leaflet	
65-74	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Local community news	CB22 3AG
45-54	Employed	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	CB22 3DU
15-24	In education	No	Local community news	cb22 5aq
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5BZ
55-64	Employed	No	Word of mouth	
35-44	Employed	No	Word of mouth	
55-64	Self-employed	No	Local community news, Social media,	Cb225ep

65-74	Retired	Yes	Word of mouth	
45-54	Prefer not to say	No	South Cambs Magazine	CB1 0AN
35-44	Employed	No	Social media	
Prefer not to say	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet	CB22 5FF
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB225DY
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB22 3DJ
Prefer not to say	Employed	No	Local community news	Cb22 5dt
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5LW
65-74	Retired	No	Other	CB21 4DJ

75 and above	Retired	No	Other	CB9
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB225DS
45-54	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine, Website, Email	CB22 5DY
45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB22 5DT
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB22 5QT
55-64	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine, Website, Local	CB225AQ
55-64	Employed	No	Social media	CB99DF
35-44	Employed	No	Word of mouth	
25-34	Self-employed	Yes	Social media	Cb225bp

25-34	Self-employed	No	Social media	Cb225bp
65-74	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, Local community news, Email	CB22 5BX
45-54	Self-employed	No	Local community news	
55-64	Employed	No	Website	SG8 6AL
25-34	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3BZ
35-44		No	Social media	
25-34	Self-employed	No	Local community news, Email, Social	CB22 5BJ
55-64	Employed	No	Local community news	CB214EG
65-74	Retired	Prefer not to say	Newspaper article	



Prefer not to say	Employed	Prefer not to say	Social media	CB9 9DR
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5HJ
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	CB21 4ND
55-64	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Other	Cb21 6ah
	Employed			
65-74	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, Email	CB22 3DJ
75 and above	Retired	Prefer not to say	Email	cb9 9sb
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Other	CB2 0RA
45-54	Prefer not to say	No	Leaflet	

35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB19GQ
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB25 0NF
	Employed	No	Email	
65-74	Self-employed	No	Email	CB18YU
25-34	Employed	No	Email	cb223sn
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	CB21 4JQ
65-74	Retired	No	Email	CB21 4JZ
45-54	Employed	No	Email	

65-74	A home-based worker	No	Email	
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB25 9DW
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	CB22 3DP
25-34	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB11 3EJ
55-64	Retired	Prefer not to say	Email	CB225AZ
45-54	Employed	No	Email	PE19 1LW
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Cambridge Matters, Local community	CB2 9NP
75 and above	Employed	Prefer not to say	Email	CB2 9HB
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB102BN

65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CM62RN
45-54	Other	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Email	CB21 6BL
55-64	Employed	No	Email, Social media, Other	CB214LY
65-74	Retired	No	Flyer, Local community news, Email	CB21 6BJ
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, Local community news	CB22 3DQ
35-44	Self-employed	No	Local community news	Cb97wu
55-64	A home-based worker	No	Word of mouth	CB1 3TQ
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine	CB21 6AH

15-24	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb21 6bl
65-74	Retired	Prefer not to say	Newspaper article	CB9 7TA
75 and above	Retired	No	Cambridge Matters	CB22
55-64	Employed	No	Cambridge Matters, Website, Word of mouth	CB21 6BJ
55-64	Self-employed	No	Local community news	CB21
65-74	Retired	No	Flyer, Local community news, Word of mouth	CB21 6AG
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB10 2GR
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer, South Cambs Magazine	Cb21 6bl
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Website,	CB225DP

65-74	Retired	No	Other	
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB22 3BL
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB29DT
45-54	Employed	No	At Park & Ride, South Cambs Magazine, Website,	Cb224rb
55-64	Self-employed	No	Email	CB21 4YN
55-64	Retired	No	Leaflet, Email, Word of mouth	CB21 6AH
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Other	CB216BL
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Leaflet	
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB9 9DR

65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Website, Email, Word of mouth,	CB21 6BQ
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer, South Cambs Magazine, Newspaper	CB22 5FD
45-54	Employed	Yes	Email	CB21 4XF
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Newspaper	
65-74	Self-employed	No	Email	cb22 4nd
35-44	Employed		Email	
65-74	Employed	No	Leaflet	
35-44	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine	Cb225bq
45-54	Prefer not to say	No	Local community news	CB22 5EY

75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Word of mouth	CB21 6BL
45-54	Prefer not to say	No	Local community news	CB22 5bn
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Newspaper	cb22 5bx
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Email	CB22 5BQ
	Employed	No	Email	CB21 5NL
35-44	Employed	No	Email	CB21 5NL
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Social media	CB225AL
55-64	Self-employed	No	Flyer	CB22 5EA
35-44	Employed	No	Other	CB10 1PL



25-34	Employed	No	Social media	CB1 3RD
45-54	Employed	No	Email	
25-34	Employed	No	Word of mouth	
55-64	A home-based worker	No	Email	CB22 5LJ
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	CB21 6BG
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 6BJ
55-64	Employed	No	Social media	CM7 4DU
65-74	Self-employed	No	Flyer, Local community news	
25-34	Employed	No	Email	

55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB214LS
65-74	Retired	Yes	Website	cb4 2DG
65-74	Retired		Website, Email	CB21 6DQ
65-74	Retired	No	Other	CB22 5FD
65-74	Retired	No	Email	CB21 4HU
45-54	A home-based worker	No	Email	CB21 4RH
Prefer not to say	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB23 7QH
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 6AT

65-74	Retired	No	Email	cb225ay
25-34	In education	No	Website	CB22 3UP
45-54	Self-employed		Other	CB22 5JG
45-54	A home-based worker	Prefer not to say	Word of mouth	
65-74	Retired	No	At Park & Ride	Cb225an
25-34	Employed	No	Advert on bus	
45-54	Employed	No	Cambridge Matters, Email, Social media, Leaflet,	
65-74	Retired	No	South Cambs Magazine, Email	CB22 3HY
45-54	Employed	Yes	Email	CB1 9HS

	In education		Local community news	IP2 8SQ
55-64	Retired	No	Email	CB3 9EE
45-54	Self-employed	No	South Cambs Magazine	CB21 4QX
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Email,	
65-74	Self-employed	Yes	Local community news, Other	CB2 9JP
65-74	Other	No	Website, Local community news, Library	CB2 9BW
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB1 8SH
55-64	Employed	No	Advert on bus	SG90BZ
65-74	Retired	No	Email	cb1 8qa

65-74	Retired	No	Email	CB1 7TS
45-54	Employed	No	Social media	cb90dh
45-54	Employed	No	Email	cb22 5aq
45-54	Employed	No	Website, Email	cb22 5ln
55-64	A home-based worker	No	Local community news	CB22 5AL
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Other	CB216AE
35-44	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5ez
25-34	In education	No	Social media	Cb22 5bx
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	cb22 5bz

65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB22 5BH
35-44	Employed	No	Local community news	Cb22 5bb
75 and above	Retired		Leaflet, Flyer, Cambridge Matters, Website	CB22 5BT
Prefer not to say	Employed	No	Email	Cb22 5JW
35-44	Employed	No	Social media	Cb225al
45-54	Employed	No	Other	CB22 5BB
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb22 5bq
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Website,	CB22 5BX
35-44	Employed	No	At Park & Ride	CB9 8DS

45-54	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3EA
65-74	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Word of	CB21 6BL
65-74	Retired	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	CB216BQ
45-54	Self-employed	Yes	Flyer	CB22 5BX
45-54	Prefer not to say	No	Word of mouth	
Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	No	Website, Local community news, Email,	
55-64	Employed	No	Local community news, Email	cb22 5bt
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB1 7BS
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB21 6AY

45-54	Self-employed	No	Flyer, Advert on bus, South Cambs Magazine,	CB21 6AY
35-44	Employed	No		cb22 5an
35-44	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Email,	CB22 5BB
65-74	Retired	Yes	Cambridge Matters	CB9 0EA
65-74	Retired	No	Website, Email, Word of mouth	CB22 5AQ
75 and above	Retired	No	Website	CB214NG
Prefer not to say	Other	Prefer not to say	Other	CB11 4ER
35-44	Employed			
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3BX



55-64	Prefer not to say	No	Local community news	CB22 5DZ
35-44	In education	Prefer not to say	Leaflet	cb225aq
35-44	Employed			CB22 5BX
45-54	Employed	No	Advert on bus	CB9 8BX
55-64	Employed	No	Social media	CB22 5JL
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Social	CB22 5BJ
65-74	Retired	No	Flyer	CB22 5BQ

65-74	Self-employed	No	Word of mouth	CB22 5BJ
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3EH
65-74	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5EH
45-54	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine, Local community	CB22 5BP
				CB22 5AQ
35-44			Leaflet	CB22 5AQ
45-54	Self-employed	No	South Cambs Magazine	CB225FW
			Email	CB1 8SH
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22

65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Email	CB22 3UT
35-44	Employed	No	South Cambs Magazine	CB22 5HJ
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5FX
				CB225DB
35-44	Employed	No	Local community news	
55-64	Employed	No	Other	cb225js
55-64	Employed	No	Library	CB22 5EN
55-64	Employed	No	Website	

55-64	Employed	No	Website, Local community news, Email,	CB22 5AL
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Word of mouth	CB22 5DS
35-44	Employed	No	At Park & Ride	CB9 8DS
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Local community news	CB21 4LY
Prefer not to say	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet	CB21 6BQ
15-24	In education	Prefer not to say	Website, Local community news, Word of mouth	
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	CB22 5AY
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Leaflet	CB22 5DP
15-24		No	Local community news	

75 and above	Other	Yes	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	CB22 5AQ
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6BE
55-64	Employed	No	Local community news	CB225LJ
55-64	Employed	No	Local community news	CB22 5LJ
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	CB22 5AL
65-74	Employed	No	Local community news	cb225LW
65-74	Self-employed	No	Local community news	CB97G
	Self-employed	No	Website	cb22 3gp
45-54	Employed		Local community news, Word of mouth	CB22 5BX

65-74	Retired	No	Email	CB2 0AP
65-74	Self-employed	No	Website	cb22 3gp
65-74	Retired	No	Email	CB2 0AP
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB22 3EB
45-54	Other	No	Email	CB22 4NW
35-44	Employed	No	Email	
65-74	Self-employed	No	Website, Email	CB1 7UE
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	CB22 5BX
45-54	A home-based worker	No	Email	CB22 5BX

65-74	Self-employed	No	Local community news	CB22 5SY
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Email, Word of mouth	CB22 5BX
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	CB21 4JH
55-64	Retired	No	Local community news	CB21 6AA
25-34	Employed	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	CB22 5BX
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB24 6YS
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer, South Cambs Magazine, Website,	CB21 6BG
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4HA
Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	No	Leaflet, Flyer, At Park & Ride, South Cambs	CB22 5AN

				CB22 5BJ
65-74	Prefer not to say	No	Leaflet	
65-74	Retired	Prefer not to say	Leaflet, Cambridge Matters, South Cambs	CB22 5SY
Prefer not to say	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Website, Email	Cb225dx
				cb225al
55-64	Employed	Prefer not to say	Email, Social media	CB1 9YL
				cb225al
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, At Park & Ride, South Cambs Magazine,	Cb21
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer	CB9 8NS



65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Local community news, Email,	CB22 5DX
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3DY
75 and above	Retired	No	Local community news	CB21
35-44	Employed	No	Social media	
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	CB22 5BH
Prefer not to say	Retired	Prefer not to say	South Cambs Magazine, Newspaper advert,	CB22 5AL
45-54	Employed	No	Flyer	CB22 5BG
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Website	CB216AZ

55-64	In education	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6AZ
75 and above	Retired	No	Local community news	
65-74	Retired	Yes	Leaflet	sg86bl
45-54	Employed	No	Flyer	Cb216ah
75 and above	Retired	No	Newspaper article, Local community news,	CB22 5BZ
55-64	Retired	No	Local community news, Email, Word of	CB22 5AQ
45-54	Employed	No	Flyer	CB22 5BX
45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB22 5BG

15-24	In education	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Word of mouth	CB22 3AQ
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Other	CB21 4LY
65-74	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, Flyer, At Park & Ride, Word of mouth	CB22 5AN
Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	No	Leaflet, Flyer, South Cambs Magazine, Website,	CB22 5DT
65-74	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5AQ
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	CB22 5AL
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth	CB22 5BX
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news	CB21 6AN

35-44	Employed	No	Social media	CB22 5BG
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet, At Park & Ride, Email	CB225AL
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5BX
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5BG
45-54	Employed	No	Other	CB22
15-24	In education	No	Leaflet	
55-64	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB22 5BG
65-74	Employed	No	Leaflet, Word of mouth, Other	CB216BH
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4RY

15-24	In education	No	Word of mouth	CB22 5BG
55-64	Self-employed	No	Other	cb21 6bw
35-44	Employed	No	Local community news	CB225SY
45-54	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet, Advert on bus, Cambridge Matters,	
35-44	Employed	No	Local community news	Cb22 5lg
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB225AL
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Website	CB22 5AL
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	CB22 5DA
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB21 4RY

55-64	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB225SY
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer	cb21 6bl
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer	cb21 6bl
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine	CB21 6AG
65-74	Retired	No	Word of mouth	CB22 5DS
35-44	Employed	No	Email	
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news, Word of mouth	CB225AQ
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB5 8LW

65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	CB22 5DA
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	Cb22 3aq
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Library	CB22 5SY
55-64	A home-based worker	No	Local community news	Cb225nb
65-74	Other	Yes	Website	CB22 5AN
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Website, Email	CB22 3HT
				CB2 9DS
45-54	Employed	No	Local community news	CB21 6AS
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB225BQ

45-54	Employed		Word of mouth	CB21 6AS
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news	
35-44	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5AQ
45-54	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Social media	CB22 5BQ
35-44	Prefer not to say	No		Cb225aq
55-64	Employed	No	Email	CB22 5AL
55-64	Other	No	South Cambs Magazine, Local community	CB21 6BE
Prefer not to say	Self-employed	Prefer not to say	Leaflet, Email, Social media, Word of	CB22 5BQ
Prefer not to say	Employed	Prefer not to say	Leaflet, Email	



45-54	Employed	No	Word of mouth	CB22
45-54	A home-based worker	Prefer not to say	Leaflet, Word of mouth	CB22 5BG
65-74	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Email,	CB22 5LJ
55-64	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Local community news	CB22 5BX
Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	Leaflet, Email, Social media, Word of	CB22 5BQ
75 and above	Retired	No	Local community news	CB225SY
		No	Social media	CB1 1QD
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5SY

55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5SY
65-74	Retired	No	Local community news, Email, Word of	CB22 5DA
45-54	Employed		South Cambs Magazine	cb225an
55-64	Retired	No	Flyer, Word of mouth	CB22 5
65-74	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Local community news	CB22 5AN
65-74	Employed	No	Email	CB22 5BL
65-74	In education	No	Other	cb225bx
				CB22 5DB
Prefer not to say	Employed	Prefer not to say	Word of mouth	CB22

	Retired	No		CB21 6BE
55-64	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet	CB22 5SY
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet, Flyer, At Park & Ride, South Cams	CB22 5DB
55-64	Retired	No	Local community news, Word of mouth	CB22 5AQ
65-74	Retired	No	Website	CB22 5BX
55-64	Employed	Prefer not to say	Other	CB22 5AN
25-34	Employed	No	Flyer	
45-54	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5LS
55-64	Employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 3BL

55-64		No	Leaflet, Local community news, Email,	CB22 5BX
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5AJ
Under 15	In education	Yes	Leaflet, Flyer, South Cambs Magazine, Newspaper	CB22 5BQ
45-54	A stay-at-home parent, carer or similar	No	Leaflet, Cambridge Matters	CB22 5BN
55-64	Retired	No	Leaflet	
55-64	Employed	Prefer not to say	Leaflet, Cambridge Matters, Other	
55-64	Self-employed	No	Leaflet	CB22 5BX
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	

75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, South Cambs Magazine, Local	
Prefer not to say	Employed	No	Leaflet, Other	
55-64	Retired	Prefer not to say	Local community news	
55-64	Self-employed	No	Website	Cb22 5AH
				CB2
45-54	Employed	No	Email	CB1 8JG
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5BX
55-64	Employed	No	Local community news, Social media	CB9

55-64	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Social	CB22 5BH
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Social media, Word of mouth	CB21 6BE
55-64	Other	No	Leaflet, Flyer, Newspaper advert, Newspaper	CB1 7BJ
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	
65-74	Retired	No	Flyer	CB21 6BD
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, Website, Other	CB22 5BT
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet	
	Employed	No	South Cams Magazine, Local community	CB21 6BD
65-74	Retired	No	Leaflet, Local community news, Email	CB21 6AU

Prefer not to say	Prefer not to say	No	Leaflet	CB22
75 and above	Retired	Yes	Leaflet, Flyer, Word of mouth	CB21 6AE
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	Cb22 5AL
55-64	Employed	No	Flyer	CB22 5AJ
65-74	Retired	No	At Park & Ride	
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, At Park & Ride, South Cambs Magazine,	CB21 6BE
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet, At Park & Ride, South Cambs Magazine,	CB21 6BE
	Other		Leaflet	CB22 3DG and CB22 5BX (locations of land)

55-64	A home-based worker	No	Leaflet, Flyer	CB21 6BL
Prefer not to say	Retired	Prefer not to say	South Cams Magazine, Local community	CB21 6AZ
75 and above	Retired	No	Leaflet	CB22 5JP
Prefer not to say	Other	Prefer not to say	Other	