



Date received	Date recorded	ID	O, I, P, L	Name	Form of Delivery	Text	Attachments/Images
Of submission to GCP	Date added to spreadsheet	e.g. 1,2,3	Organisation, Individual, Public Figure, Landowner		(Twitter, email, letter etc; save a copy or screenshot to the drive and provide a link)		
12/09/2019	16//9/19	1	I		twitter	When I wonder will @GreaterCambs look into a proper #Rail link between Haverhill & Cambridge? This "travel hub" at #FourWentWays will not ease the A1307 congestion between #Haverhill & #GrantaPark @RailHaverhill #ReinstateStourValleyLine 	
30/09/2019	21/09/2019	2	I		Facebook	How about stop paving over every bit of greenery you can and maybe get former rail lines reopened in some way. Plenty of them around and it would connect the rest of the county to CB instead of pathetic busways and cycle lanes that some don't use What's the point as you have been proven not to listen. We don't want pathetic money pit virtue signalling busways and the countryside paved over for as such. How about reusing the old rail trackbeds to connect up the county and it's forgotten towns and villages. Maybe a road bridge from cam causeway to waddlows road connecting both parts of cb and reducing congestion around the centre and Newmarket road. How about a link road connecting up the two parts of the A10 going around the east of Cambridge that would also act like an outer ring road along with the A14 and M11 thus reducing the amount of traffic having to go through the city? Might also want to consider something along lines of below "app-hailable small bus with intelligent routing" in a slightly different city  (and switch to electric vehicles throughout) pickmeup.oxfordbus.co.uk GCP cont to meet with local & environmental reps to work on details of potential enhancements & lessen impacts of proposals where possible" Via LLF or are other meetings taking place? With whom? At Local Plan Workshop cllrs had not been asked to input "environmental improvements" You won't listen to anything anyone has to say so tbh what's the point in this? You already have your plan and will do it regardless just like the histon road fiasco and screwing the businesses along there. Hope they take you to court for loss of custom and income Agreed. Absolutely no interest in light rail. Guided bus way looks good idea http://sam4qe.com/time-to-speak-up-over-local-transport-plans/ http://sam4qe.com/time-to-speak-up-over-local-transport-plans/ [text from above web page copied below] Time to speak up over local transport plans I was going to write about the current outline planning application for 'Newbury Farm' on Wort's Causeway (aka site GB2 in the Local Plan), but local blogger [name] has beaten me to it and covers most of what I would have said here. I have subsequently had a bit more detail through from the developers about the community engagement so far: they reckon that about 130 people came to the events they held at Netherhall in July, and of the 62 written comments at that stage, 53 came from QE postcodes. Given the sensitive site location; the loss of ecologically valuable hedgerows; the concerns about availability of school places; and the traffic implications for the local area, I hope that as many residents as possible take the time to read through the planning documents. Chris's article above provides full details of how to comment on the application: note that the closing date for input is 17th October, next Thursday. But of course Queen Edith's is spoilt for choice when it comes to people running consultations on things, and so I thought it might be worthwhile capturing a few thoughts about the Cambridge South East transport consultation, running until 4th November. You may remember that this is the Greater Cambridge Partnership project charged with moving people between the 'Three Campuses': the Biomedical Campus at Addenbrooke's; Babraham Research Campus; and Granta Park. The first round of consultation in 2018 indicated that respondents preferred the idea of an off-road busway between the A11 and the Biomedical Campus, rather than various on-road permutations, and now the consultants have worked up the off-road scheme enough to put it back out for comment. I went to the exhibition at Long Road last night (9 October) to get an update. Impacts on Queen Edith's There are several aspects of the proposal which will be controversial – the siting of the Park & Ride (what they call a 'travel hub') at the A11 end; the incursion through the Green Belt and impact on views from the Gogs; and the positioning of the stops relative to the population centres of Sawston, Stapleford and Shelford. However, I'm going to restrict my comments here to the aspects that I think will have most impact on Queen Edith's and its immediate vicinity. The scale of the infrastructure: over the majority of the route, the busway 'road' plus shared use path for pedestrians and cyclists is approximately 15m wide. For comparison, the cycleways plus carriageways over Hills Road bridge total about 14m wide. My major concern is with the shared use path – this currently defined as unsegregated/marked and 3m wide. Again, for Consultation Cambridge SE plans. Docs ref to "bridges"& "mitigation". Yet Granta eastern arm Cam was invisible? Don't @GreaterCambs @lewis_herbert read papers? @Feargal_Sharkey is making quite a splash! Yet no input from river experts Cam Valley @RobMungovan or local residents? Went to @GreaterCambs exhibition South East Transport plans. River experts not consulted. Yet options impact Granta east arm of Cam + Nine Wells Springs. Include bridges. Pics from @greenarteries factfinding with Cam Valley & @RobMungovan @WildTroutTrust found Granta dire straits	
30/09/2019	28/09/2019	3	I		Facebook		
01/10/2019	29/09/2019	4	I		twitter		
09/10/2019	10/10/2019	5	I		twitter		
04/10/2019	10/10/2019	6	I		Facebook		
04/10/2019	10/10/2019	7	I		Facebook		
04/10/2019	10/10/2019	8	I		Facebook		
13/10/2019	14/10/2019	9	I		twitter		
21/10/2019	24/10/2019	10	I		twitter		
23/10/2019	24/10/2019	11	I		twitter		
11/09/2019	24/10/2019	12	I		Website		
11/09/2019	24/10/2019	13	I		email		
12/09/2019	24/10/2019	14	I		email	I am writing with a question relating to the phase 1 improvements at the junction of the Haverhill road and A1307, and the creation of an underpass. Are there any plans to also reduce the speed limit on the Haverhill Road at the same time? I seem to remember the consultation document talked about encouraging cycling and access to the Magog Downs and Wandlebury. The current speed limit of 60mph on a narrow road does not provide a safe route to cycle from Stapleford, and reducing the speed limit to match the 50mph on the A1307 (or extending the current 40mph section along the length of the road) would significantly improve the situation.	

				<p>When I raised the issue of habitat fragmentation it wasn't for Nine Wells itself but for the arable habitat which supports unusually high numbers of threatened farmland birds. The hedge in question is a crucial part of a network of habitats for these species.</p> <p>Above all the grey partridge use the hedge for shelter and breeding but feed in the fields on either side and so my question was whether the busway, especially during construction, would disrupt their breeding if the route ran beside the hedge rather than along the railway line. Corn bunting would also be similarly affected, as would linnet and yellowhammer.</p> <p>The hedge is also well used by migrating birds. This autumn I have recorded several whinchat and yellow wagtail and in other years redstart and turtle dove, all in or on the hedgerow.</p>
14/09/2019	24/10/2019	15 I	email	<p>I had sent my report for last year to [name]. I am away at the moment but will send it to you as well as soon as I can.</p> <p>It has always seemed a strange blind spot with 'consultations' concerning public transport that the professional users of our roads are never consulted.</p> <p>I have frequently discussed this with taxi drivers who have claimed 'no one ever asks us', but who are the victims of often foolish decisions made by a box-ticking programme, road closures, changes in flow of traffic, that contradict all logic and can appear to be made by those who never actively use the roads.</p> <p>The same is true, of course, with bus drivers, commuters to research laboratories, lecturers.</p> <p>Ask those to whom it really matters!</p> <p>Dear [name],</p> <p>Thank you for your reply. However, I think it is likely the speed limit reduction would be supported for the following reason:</p> <p>Earlier this year CCC Highways department agreed to a proposal from Stapleford parish council to reduce the speed to 50mph. However, the proposal was withdrawn for two reasons. The first was cost - the district council would have need to contribute £5K to the project. I imagine this cost would not apply if the speed limit was changed at the same time as the junction changes, it may even reduce the cost. (If the speed limit on the Haverhill road is reduced to match the speed limit on the A1307, rather than to keep it at 60mph, there will be no need for any signs to mark the change in speed limit.) This was the view of the council when they withdrew their funding bid:</p> <p>"Within the next 5 years or so, we should have work in hand at the Farm end of Haverhill Road to improve the dangerous cross road and replace with a diversionary safer crossing point to the north, in which no doubt, the project cost will allow for the slowing of traffic from 60mph as permitted at present."</p> <p>The second reason that the district council retracted its application was that the CCC highways authority wanted to remove the current 40mph buffer zone on the approach to the village. With the mass transit proposals to add a stop in that location on the new tram line, there will continue to be a need to reduce the speed of vehicles over that stretch of road (or even extend the size of the zone.) Again this was explicitly mentioned in stapleford's council's decision to retract the bid:</p> <p>"The lower entrance into Stapleford will probably by then have the competing needs of the new Guided Busway or similar Mass Transit scheme, and the Axis residential development cutting across from Haverhill Road to Hinton Way. Both these schemes will have far reaching consequences for safety and speed"</p> <p>So it was the view of the district council that the right time to reduce the speed limit would be now, at the same time as the other changes are made to the road. Indeed, with the change to the road junction layout I would suggest that there is more reason to reduce the speed limit - since the view of cars turning into the Gog Downs car park will now be around a corner when approaching from the A1307.</p> <p>Although I would welcome any improvements to the path beside the road, it is unlikely to become wide enough to be really suitable for cyclists, and the current speed of the cars can be unnerving to pedestrians.</p> <p>The Parish Council have met and discussed the various options for the new travel hubs which will be sited in or very near our parish. In discussion, the Parish Council favoured Site C, which places less impact on the Fourwentways (A11/A1307) roundabout and offers greater flexibility for future expansion, which is an important factor in future proofing.</p> <p>The Parish Council also notes that Site C offers similar pedestrian and cyclist distance to Babraham Research Campus or Granta Park to Site B, though the additional stop located approximately on Site B.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that Site C proposal includes a new bridge for the public transport and pedestrian/cycle use. The Parish Council takes the view that the route might be along the old Newmarket Road and then over at the Granta Park roundabout and along the old rail route.</p> <p>For all sites, the Parish Council recommends that GCP makes all efforts to make the links to the Granta Park and Babraham Research Campus as short, appealing and accessible as possible to encourage year-round use.</p> <p>The Parish Council feels strongly that the Pink or Black route should be used, as this follows the old rail route from the past. While the Council appreciates these options pass near a Country Wildlife site, this seems an effective re-use of an historic route that is still visible.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that Sites A and B are located in the green belt: development here would be less desirable.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes the constraints on Site A: in addition, this option requires traffic from the A1307 to divert onto the A11/A505 and traffic eastbound on the A11 must continue beyond the A1307 junction for approximately 1.4 km to reach the Site.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes the good access to Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park from Site B: however, the council also notes the constraints on Site B. Importantly, Site B requires all morning traffic to use the Fourwentways roundabout and load onto A1307 north: it would seem that evening exit would also be northbound for around 1.5 km and return southbound, past Babraham High Street.</p>
16/09/2019	24/10/2019	16 I	email	
19/09/2019	24/10/2019	17 I	email	
23/09/2019	24/10/2019	18 O	Babraham Parish Council email	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I will be attending the consultation at [location] but I'm also writing as I'm pleading for safe cycle routes from Duxford / IWM / Heathfield to this same location.</p> <p>I live on [location] behind the [location]. To be able to cycle to work on Granta Park, I have to chance my life crossing slip roads onto and off the M11 on the roundabout at junction 10 where drivers enter or exit the roundabout with motorway heads on at ridiculous speeds. Then cycle over the railway bridge on the busy A505 where traffic passes at 50mph (or more!) on a single carriageway road or take the back road and carry my bike over the station.</p> <p>Please please please can we have a cycle path from this area to the new hub and a spur to Whittlesford station? This would also help with access to Duxford Airport when Marshalls move there. It's so frustrating.</p> <p>Hello</p> <p>I have read the booklet posted recently. I am concerned there is no mention of safety Viz multi use path.</p> <p>I regularly use the multi use path parallel to the busway and a few weeks ago was hit hard from behind by a cyclist causing a cut leg, bruised ribs, damaged shoulder muscles and a squashed lunch in my bag pack.. I have had and witnessed numerous near misses.</p> <p>The difference in speeds and misplaced perception of safety as there are no cars make a multi use path a dangerous place.</p> <p>Will there be marking's to separate faster and slower uses?</p> <p>How will an injured user be evacuated?</p> <p>Will there be carriageways?</p> <p>Will there be CCTV?</p>
24/09/2019	24/10/2019	19 I	email	
25/09/2019	24/10/2019	20 I	email	

14/10/2019	24/10/2019	21 I	email	<p>A1307 bus route Option B</p> <p>A number of people in Babraham have approached me about this option which is in our Parish. . . if it happens! The entrance and exit from the site is on the dual carriageway going into Cambridge. Firstly this will not help conjection on the approach to 4 Went Ways from Haverhill and secondly and more import for Babraham how do drivers get back onto the A11 or the A1307 going towards Haverhill – as there is no right turn from the P&R. This will mean they have to turn left and then go through Babraham or go to the Babraham campus and round the roundabout and all the way back again. Surely not. Babraham is a small village with a busy school and a narrow bridge, we have problems now with too much traffic, HGVs and speeding . . . this will surely just add to the problem. Maybe a spur off the roundabout at 4 went ways would be a solution . . . if this is going to be the chosen site. I will be interested to hear the thoughts on this.</p> <p>Concerns specifically to travel hubs at Stapleford and crossing Hinton Way, Great Shelford.</p> <p>As a resident [location] and councillor [parish] I feel the travel hubs at both locations are ignoring essential human traits of bringing and leaving cars which as we have heard on behalf of local residents [parish] will inevitably congest the areas directly surrounding these hubs, very much like happens around Addenbrookes.</p> <p>Lack of consideration in current plans shows a lack of understanding, focussing on minimal hub infrastructure and relying on motorists using the A11 main parking but Stapleford and Great Shelford have considerable traffic from the A1301 (via A505) which will not be serviced and lead to motorists parking around the hubs to join the buses for the short transit to the Addenbrookes Biomedical Campus. This was verbally discounted at the consultation evenings by those delivering the proposals so that level of comprehension is not encouraging.</p> <p>Some form of parking control or provision, working with local Parish Councils will be needed as a by product of these hubs will be a potential to develop around them for the growing population needs. Much as is already being talked about at Foxton with rumours of a new town development in that area already circulating. Again denials of future developments at the consultations do not carry weight when hubs like these are introduced.</p> <p>As a resident living [distance] from the proposed hub at [road], yes it will make travel to the campus easier, so long as I or my partner remain mobile (still able to walk a reasonable distance) If we find ourselves immobile the few disabled parking slots will soon be used making the hub unusable. The Addenbrookes Campus itself is huge and as a person growing older getting around the Addenbrookes site is a daunting proposition. However although great to have the hub facility so close it will generate significant chaos with parking all along Hinton way, as it will around Stapleford [redacted] along the Haverhill Road and surrounding by roads. Without some road control (Timed double yellow lines, enforced) Hinton Way as a current Emergency Route will cease to be so and significant concerns can be expected from the emergency services if these plans impact negatively on response time. Cars will park where there are no restrictions, as they do around the streets up to half a mile from Great Shelford Station or as has been noted where cars park and users then convert to bikes for final ride into Cambridge.</p> <p>Point to note, people take dogs to Wandlebury for walks in cars up to three times a day so please don't assume humans are common sensical they are not? Unless rules or measures are put in place.</p>
15/10/2019	24/10/2019	22 I	email	<p>Some acknowledgement of parking provisions, sufficient to deter road parking will need to be considered with local Parish councils.....otherwise the benefits to those travelling from distance will be outweighed by the daily and unrelenting misery of local residents (like that which happens around Addenbrookes now)</p> <p>I request that you review these proposals. I consider that they are flawed because a) the main issue is to travel to/from Cambridge itself rather than just between the Campuses and b) even if the need is for travel between the Campuses, these proposals do not make more efficient use of existing means of transport.</p> <p>Travel to and from the Biomedical Campus is restricted by very poor road layout and operation around and within the Campus. For example just look at the very poor traffic flow at and around the front of the hospital. I strongly advise that you do not permit any more development on this site until you have properly addressed the immediate and long term traffic needs of this site. Frankly you should have done this when the site was first developed, indeed I remember asking about this when I was younger when work on the New Addenbrooke's Site started and I remember being assured that this would not be a problem.</p> <p>You have previously suggested a bus lane on the A1307 and direct access from the A1307 to the Biomedical Campus via a link east of the Campus. I think this would help but you also need to improve other existing means of transport and I consider that you should be planning to use the train line with or without a parallel tram line to Cambridge South and onwards. If you did this and properly addressed the traffic flow problems on the Biomedical Campus then I think the problem will be eased. I consider that just providing a new public transport system as you propose will only compound the problem.</p> <p>I consider that ignoring more use of the existing train line is not acceptable. I note that having additional transport parallel to the rain line is dismissed. Have you considered moving Shelford Station to the other side of the level crossing? This would provide more space for a parallel track on the other side.</p> <p>I cannot see that your current proposals will benefit most people living in Sawston, Shelford and Whittlesford as it will be easiest for them to continue to use the train especially if the Cambridge South Station is built. In my view these proposals will only benefit a relatively small number of people who want to travel to and from the Campuses and other than that I cannot see that these proposals will do anything more that to destroy much countryside at huge expense and greatly damage our environment. I have to ask – do any of the planners involved actually live in this area?</p> <p>Finally having seen the chaos at Cambridge train station at busy times and the difficulty of getting to and from the City centre by whatever means, I must urge you to please do something about this. I cannot see why you have set out the roads around there as you have.</p> <p>Whatever you decide, please ensure that the public vehicles are as efficient as possible and do not use fossil fuels. Please do not use any more mis-guided buses.</p>
16/10/2019	24/10/2019	23 I	email	<p>I would be grateful if you would not publish or make public my personal details.</p>

				<p>Hello</p> <p>I have been thinking about the current proposals.</p> <p>I am broadly happy with the proposed route given the many constraints of the area.</p> <p>I have a few concerns I would like to raise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the 3m width for a shared use cycle/pedestrian path is not very wide if the route is as well used as I'm sure you hope it will be. Try cycling the guided bus route from Trumpington to the station in rush hour and you will see what I mean! 2. The effects of the route being in very close proximity to Nine Wells should be mitigated as far as possible by planting broadleaved and evergreen trees in the field between the reserve and the route. I hope the route will be as close to the railway as possible, preserving the maximum distance from Nine Wells which already feels so encroached upon. 3. I presume the crossing of the brook near Nine Wells will be next to the existing crossing with the DNA path. This needs some thought and sensitivity to the needs of the brook. 4. The testing of autonomous buses from Trumpington Park and Ride out of hours should be widely publicised locally as some children/teens may play on /around the busway at times when they believe no buses will be running.
17/10/2001	24/10/2019	24 I	email	<p>Could you tell me what investigations have been carried out by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and what conclusions have been reached on the possible solving of surface traffic problems in Cambridge by the introduction of a sub-surface metro system? If not, why not?</p>
21/10/2019	24/10/2019	25 I	email	<p>need more frequent buses in the evenings and on Sundays to serve the hospitals</p>
03/10/2019	30/10/2019	26 I	event	<p>low bridges restrict buses to single-decker</p>
03/10/2019	30/10/2019	27 I	event	<p>need to connect up the public rights of way network to create circular routes</p>
03/10/2019	30/10/2019	28 I	event	<p>pricing of P&R and public transport needs to be carefully considered to incentivise modal shift</p>
03/10/2019	30/10/2019	29 I	event	<p>An outrageous waste of public money in a scheme which could be better served by a rail reinstatement</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	30 I	event	<p>Why cover agricultural land (food) with concrete?! Shared pathways don't work - walkers different speed to bikes - wheelchairs + prams run through messages left by horses. No parking to join "bus" so where do cars go as not everyone can get to pick up point. Waste of money. use old railway line</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	31 I	event	<p>A waste of money. There is some sense in making a park and ride near Babraham to serve Abington, Babraham (and also Hinxton?)</p> <p>The service stops at the back of Addenbrooke's, making an easy journey into Cambridge not easy.</p> <p>The proposed bus routes linking to the proposed busway stops would need to run about every 10 minutes and if they could be run like that and to existing (or new) park & ride hubs there is no need for the new busway.</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	32 I	event	<p>no need to carve up the countryside with this.</p> <p>Why would this plan of a bus route through fields be in any way a potential plan? Destroying the environment, heron areas, sky larks not to mention creating future residential opportunities. Creating traffic on Hinton Way, where already 22 mins of every hour are closed by the railway line gates.</p> <p>traffic diverted through Shelford would be environmentally detrimental. The guided bus that exists in Cambridge does not attract enough people - why would this ?</p> <p>Over £150 million to destroy fields for a bus route for some walkers between Babraham & Addenbrookes?</p> <p>We have bus route, bike paths, park & ride & trains - This is a political plan for future developers to invade Great Shelford & Stapleford in the guise of helping Cambridge traffic it is a poorly presented option.</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	33 I	event	<p>I like the idea but question if it needs to go through Shelford as already well served.</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	34 I	event	<p>Shelford stop is too far out</p>
15/10/2019	30/10/2019	35 I	event	<p>it would be useful of any bus to connecting to the Shelford stop also goes through/around Little Shelford as well. The village is poorly served for public transport</p>
15/10/2019	30/10/2019	36 I	event	<p>I would like to know what the impact on traffic along Hinton Way would be</p>
21/10/2019	30/10/2019	37 I	event	<p>I didn't receive details thru' my door - I live down a little lane</p>
21/10/2019	30/10/2019	38 I	event	<p>use route A as it's easy to connect Biomedical centre from A1307, A505 + Sawston. Also old railway line available</p>
21/10/2019	30/10/2019	39 I	event	<p>Option C will have a bad impact on the residence of Little Abington Cambridge Road. And will also cause even more traffic on parts of the A1307 which is already a dangerous route and in congested in the rush hours!!!</p>
21/10/2019	30/10/2019	40 I	event	<p>Option C is the least best. - no need to spend more at all</p>
21/10/2019	30/10/2019	41 I	event	<p>good to talk to folk. Hard to visualise properly until we are certain of Cambridge South station. Surely this has greater priority</p>
09/10/2019	30/10/2019	42 I	event	<p>Stapleford cyclists will not use it - cost and no bicycle at city end</p> <p>pedestrian will not get to the bus hub @Addenbrookes</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	43 I	event	<p>cars - no parking ex for disability - discrimination</p> <p>the cross-section of the route clearly shows the road surface sunk by perhaps 0.5m. This will reduce the visual impact where the route crosses open farmland in the green belt and this feature should be retained. However, the member of staff who I questioned about this wasn't sure if the recess would be retained in the final scheme. I strongly feel that the recessing should be retained if the scheme goes ahead, which I sincerely hope doesn't happen</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	44 I	event	<p>Having read the above concern I would also hope that the sunken tramway surface would be retained. Where it crosses the green belt - particularly south east of Stapleford and crossing black barn lane. A vista of beauty + linked to historical sites of interest such as Magog Down + Wandlebury.</p> <p>Also of concern is the proximity of the line of houses at the edge of Stapleford village on Haverhill Road and its crossing of Black barn lane - leaving a small outward piece of land which developers would soon be seeking building permission. Black barn lane is a very popular recreational route for walkers + cyclists which should be preserved as green belt + for the environment. I would hope that every care will be taken to preserve + minimise the impact of the scheme for the future.</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	45 I	event	<p>Sink it in a cutting. Multi-user path one side, wildlife corridor the other. Take advantage of the cutting to pass under Haverhill Rd, Hinton Way and Granhams Rd rather than crossing them at grade.</p>
14/10/2019	30/10/2019	46 I	event	<p>Forget the stops on Haverhill Rd and Hinton Way, they are not conveniently located for the villages and risk attracting car parking.</p>
29/10/2019	30/10/2019	47 I	twitter	<p>@GreaterCambs SE Transport plans refer to Granta arm of Cam+ new bridges + linear park. Yet River experts Cam Valley Forum @WildTroutTrust @RobMungovan residents & cllrs not consulted despite media & concerns (pics). Will landscape consultees benefit financially? Re Gogs? River?</p>

				<p>LPC are responding to the consultation on the A1307 and Cambridge South East Transport Study, and to correspondence sent from Suffolk Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for consulting us, keeping the Parish Council updated on proposals and taking seriously our concerns and ideas. We hope that we will continue to work together to improve safety for road users and improve journeys on public transport, including bus/ off- road or rail options.</p> <p>However, we have now been made aware of a letter from Suffolk Chamber of Commerce "advising" how their businesses should respond to your consultation. Most of the issues they raise are already being dealt with through the GCP proposals - safety, public transport links, rail - and that these might extend to Haverhill in later phases.</p> <p>We are aware that this body has proposed dualling the A1307, with new roads north or south of Linton, which we and the A1307 Villages Forum, have consistently opposed. The effect of their proposals would seriously adversely affect our villages and quality of life, merely for the benefit of a Suffolk town. What they see as "Improving" the A1307 would leave Linton and other villages open to additional noise and air pollution, as well as more traffic congestion, rat running and unwanted, unsustainable development. The consequences for our environment, health and quality of life could be enormous. Why should we take the pain of Haverhill's unsustainable expansion?</p> <p>Haverhill needs to take responsibility for its own traffic, with links to the A14 to the north and A120/M11 to the south, rather than routing it via A1307, dumping all their HGVs and commuter traffic on South Cambridgeshire. There seem to be no proposals to pay for any changes to the A1307, despite the S106/CIL that they might accrue from their expansion.</p> <p>The developments in Saffron Walden are also routed towards the A1307 or through their historic town centre; a route from Haverhill, south of Walden to the M11, would obviate their traffic problem, too.</p> <p>The proposed developments around the A11/A505 were discussed at a meeting of the SCDC planning forum. It is obvious that this area is a focus for science and research, to the benefit of the region. We see that the Biomedical Campus has its own housing areas at Kneighton Park and close to Addenbrookes. Wellcome will have its own housing, the Genome campus, Huawei, Agritech and other research and industrial sites will have housing near Hinxtton and Sawston.</p> <p>The proposed North Uttlesford Garden City is a game changer - with development here, just across the A11 from research sites -providing housing for their staff. Further expansion of Haverhill is negated - there is no longer a need for their housing. Haverhill would no longer be a "Key Town" for staff housing; staff would be housed close to their work.</p> <p>The Combined Authority has granted funding to Haverhill for their Research Park - currently only the pub appears to be open here - which would give work to Haverhill. This is to the benefit of Haverhill and might also save them from being just a dormitory town for Cambridge. Each area needs to look to being self-sufficient, reduce travel and minimise their carbon footprint. The suggestions of the Chamber would add to the problems of South Cambs, be detrimental to villages along the A1307, and have been superseded by proposals from other counties.</p> <p>Times change, priorities change and there is no longer a need for Haverhill to expand. The villages of our own county must take priority. The A1307 should return to being a local route. Suffolk should look to its own transport links - and pay for them.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully Ms Kathryn Wiseman Clerk to Linton Parish Council</p>
28/10/2019	30/10/2019	48 O	Linton Parish Council email	<p>Concerned about public transport in the southeast of Cambridge. @ccc_connect made submission to @greatercambs public consultation. Submit your views by 01 Nov 2019. You can read our submission at: www.cambridge-connect.uk/cambridge-southeast-busway-2019-consultation/</p> <p>[text from link above -]</p> <p>Cambridge Connect made a submission to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Cambridge Southeast Transport Public Consultation, which ends 04 November 2019.</p> <p>Our submission "Cambridge Southeast Transport, Greater Cambridge Partnership Public Consultation" (PDF, 4MB) sets out the detailed reasons for our view that the new public transport route extending from Addenbrookes to Granta Park should follow the alignment of the existing and former rail line through Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston.</p> <p>As in our previous submissions, we take an integrated view across the whole region rather than considering only one specific section in isolation. Specific corridors need to be considered in their wider context, including with schemes such as Cambridge South Station, East-West Rail and with Cambridge metro plans put forward by the Combined Authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the GCP.</p> <p>Focussing on elements of the Cambridge Connect scheme that relate specifically Cambridge Southeast Transport, our submission drew the following main conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cambridge Connect supports development of a new public transport route in the Southeast following the alignment of the existing and former rail lines via Great Shelford / Stapleford. 2. Based on current evidence, we do not concur with the conclusion that a new public transport route (whether light rail or busway) aligned with the existing and former rail line through Great Shelford is not feasible. 3. Cambridge Connect does not support the route proposed by the GCP because of unacceptably high and unnecessary impacts on the Green Belt and on the highly valued rural landscape which lies in close proximity to Gog Magog Hills, which have not been sufficiently taken into account. 4. Cambridge Connect supports light rail as the mode of delivery for the public transport route. 5. Cambridge Connect supports grade separation of the existing rail line and the proposed new light rail line at Granham's Road, where a new road bridge should be constructed over the public transport route. This would become the main vehicular route from Great Shelford to the A1307, with closure of Station Road / Hinton Way to through traffic, and pedestrian & cycle access continued via an underpass under the railway and light rail lines. 6. Cambridge Connect supports a Park & Ride at Granta Park, although has not made site-specific assessments. The scale and size of the site chosen should take into account delivery of the new public transport route to Haverhill, which will influence demand for Park & Ride at this location. 7. Before progressing new busways, a detailed plan for delivery of the long-term strategy for Cambridgeshire public transport needs to be adopted. Local solutions should then be designed so they integrate seamlessly into the overall strategic plan, both in terms of technologies used for the metro and also the routes. 8. This strategy should be at an advanced stage of development when implementing local solutions, even if this would mean a short-term delay in delivery of some local improvements. This
01/11/2019	04/11/2019	49 O	Cambridge Connect twitter	

					<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 means the A1301 and a very minor last bit of the A1307. At present our routes are A1301 with links North along the Haverhill Road, Hinton Way and Granham's Road. The bus route takes us further to the new Addenbrookes Road. Park and Ride go from Babraham (using Haverhill Road for access) or Trumpington (using A1301 for access). We have a very popular Rail link via Great Shelford Station; this would be even more popular if more trains stopped or a light railway went through this route. At present the A1301 is gridlocked until around 9:00am, the A1307 is only accessible because it is stationary from Granham's Road into town, and the level crossings make most journeys longer than necessary.</p> <p>With due respect, the proposed route across the last section to the new Cambridge South Station to make the link to Cambridge makes no sense for us as it bypasses us. The route has obviously no benefit to Great Shelford or Stapleford residents as the only way to access the buses is to cycle to the two proposed stops. Anyone who can cycle at present will continue to use the existing cycle paths to get to their destination. They will not go the longer route to access a bus they have to pay for to do a journey that is perfect now. Therefore the proposed passengers are not cyclists! This being the case, who are the passengers for these final two stops?</p> <p>As stated, we recognise the need to make access for villages further out of Town, but really fail to see why the route has to environmentally destroy the protected areas north of Stapleford and Great Shelford. The environmental cost is far in excess of the benefits. Routing the busway across the only three routes we have into Cambridge means that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> During the build time (probably over a year) we are cut off from Cambridge, Addenbrookes, the Biomedical campuses, etc as the three roads are crossed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Each of the three roads will have a crossing on them, controlled by lights we assume, which adds to the congestion especially as two of the roads already have level crossings in Great Shelford. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stops are to be built with disabled parking at Stapleford, which impact the protected views and the environment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The route itself cuts the Green Belt making an unsightly and unnecessary blot on the environment and causing enormous negative impact to the wild life and fauna of the area. <p>The slightly less impact result would be to route in a cutting from Sawston to the new CS Station. This will obviously have financial impact to the scheme and will still not solve the problem of benefit to the two villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford.</p> <p>Our request to you is that you relook and cost the light railway route or busway using the disused railway line. We agree that in places this would be single track but in todays digital age there seems no reason why the buses or light rail cannot be electronically controlled with passing places where necessary. This system worked for decades with the railway lines and a baton to pass so digital control seems very simple. There is still a route, including bridge width, for a single light rail to run through this route.</p> <p>Our conclusion is that the proposal you are pushing through is the one that you find the simplest and cheapest to construct with no consideration to the residents of the area you are destroying. At no time have you consulted directly on this last part of the scheme. All attention has been on the travel hubs, park and rides, the A1307 and the route from Sawston out of town.</p> <p>We feel that this proposal is wrong and would ask that you take a more realistic and holistic view in your reassessment of your plans.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Mike Winter Parish Clerk</p>
31/10/2019	04/11/2019	50 O	Great Shelford Parish Council	email	<p>The Association welcomes this latest opportunity to contribute (making decisions) for progress on a project which is important to our members and Trumpington residents more generally. We are pleased to note that explicit account has been taken of our request that "descriptions of the project recognize it is concerned with both the A1307 and A1301 corridors", not the A1307 alone [TRA consultation response of 1st April 2018, page 1; TRA letter of 3rd June 2019 to Joint Assembly members; and Consultation Document, page 2]</p> <p>The GCP's questionnaire has not been used for this response as it does not suit what we want to say, being designed more for use by individual members of the public. However, account has been taken of it.</p> <p>The new public transport route</p> <p>The Association's support for the main route option chosen by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) has always been subject to seeing more detail of the route and proposed mitigation of its environmental effects. We support the more detailed route now proposed, including the stops proposed for Sawston, Stapleford, Great Shelford and the Cambridge Biomedical campus. The proposed location of the stop within the Campus "... near the proposed Cambridge South Station ..." is also satisfactory, subject to seeing the design detail at a later stage. [Page 4] The Association accepts the arguments given for not following the former railway route as much as possible, as was proposed at an earlier stage. [Page 4; Spring 2018 consultation document, page 8; and the TRA's consultation response, 1st April 2018, page 3]</p> <p>Greenway links to the stops at Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford are shown for cyclists but not pedestrians. [Consultation document, page 5] It is not possible, therefore, to assess whether they are adequate, and the GCP's assurance on this point is requested.</p> <p>We expressed strong support for the GCP Executive Board's decision on 11th October last year "... that officers draw up landscaping and ecological design proposals ... maximising the potential of the off-road option including considering the possibility of a linear park alongside ..." We asked for more detail of the three areas of environmental opportunity identified by officers to the Local Liaison Forum on 7th May this year – including NWLNR – and, additionally, asked for "details of how it is intended to link the ... areas, so that the public is able to experience them as a continuous park." [TRA letter to GCP Joint assembly members, 3rd June 2019]</p> <p>As far as we can see, the consultation document does not respond to our request. It simply says "Some sections of the proposed route would provide opportunities for creating linear parks ... Options for improving biodiversity ... will look into opportunities to connect existing habitats along the route ..." [Page 7] The indicative landscaping diagram between Cambridge and Sawston gives little information and is difficult to read. [See the project's webpage documents] This suggests that, with the welcome exception of NWLNR, the linear park proposals are limited in extent, which, if correct, would be disappointing given the significant environmental impact of the busway along its route. This will be an important aspect of the anticipated statutory consents process, and we ask to see before then more definitive proposals to achieve our objective that the public can experience it as a continuous park linking the sections of the route the GCP has in mind. This should be possible with creative treatment of the multi-user path alongside the busway.</p> <p>The Association's consultation response dated 1st April 2018, asked for mitigation with regard to the existing "DNA Path", with its link to Francis Crick, the MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology and Cancer Research (UK). [Page 5, second paragraph] We understand that this path will be replaced by the new route and its new multi-user path alongside, and have suggested that the link with Francis Crick is "maintained through a suitable new piece of public art." The GCP's assurance that this will be the case would be appreciated.</p> <p>It is not explained in the "typical cross section at stop" diagram why the waiting areas at the sides of the route are of different widths - 2.0m on one side and 3.5m on the other. [Page 5] An explanation will be appreciated.</p>
31/10/2019	04/11/2019	51 O	Trumpington Residents' Association	email	

31/10/2019	04/11/2019	52 O	Cambridge University Hospitals email	<p>As Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, we welcome the project to provide improved transport connectivity from the south east of Cambridge to the city. I write on behalf of the Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust to provide comments on the current consultation 'Cambridge South East Transport Consultation', published in September 2019.</p> <p>About the Cambridge Biomedical Campus</p> <p>The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city of Cambridge. The CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and patient care.</p> <p>Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CUH) is situated at the heart of the campus and has over 1,000 beds, 10,000 members of staff and is one of the largest and best known acute hospital Trusts in the country. The 'local' hospital for our community, delivering care through Addenbrooke's hospital and the Rosie maternity hospital, CUH is also a leading regional and national centre for specialist treatment; a government designated comprehensive biomedical research centre; a partner in one of six academic health science centres in the UK – Cambridge University Health Partners (CUHP); and a university teaching hospital with a worldwide reputation. CUH with its health system partners have recently secured funding from Government to develop a new specialist children's hospital serving the eastern region and following a further public announcement of additional significant funding CUH now has the opportunity to plan a new hospital on the CBC as part of an integrated healthcare system for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.</p> <p>Other CBC partners include The Royal Papworth Hospital one of the largest specialist cardiothoracic hospitals in Europe and the UK's main heart and lung transplant centre which relocated to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus during April 2019. The hospital currently treats 24,000 in-patients and day-case patients, and treats 73,600 outpatients per year. The new site on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus has 310 beds served by circa 1,700 members of staff. During 2019, Cambridge University have opened two buildings dedicated to healthcare research on the campus and Abcam, a commercial business supplying clinical sources for research work have occupied their building. The three developments bring an additional 1200 members of staff to site. AstraZeneca will occupy their new building in 2021, bringing with them a further 2000 members of staff.</p> <p>Why this consultation is important to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge University Hospitals:</p> <p>With world-leading academic and industry scientists on the same site as the teaching hospitals of the University of Cambridge, the campus is the optimum environment for the rapid and effective translation of research into routine clinical practice.</p> <p>With the cost of healthcare set to increase as the demand from an aging population soars, we are set to develop the treatments of the future also creating the next generation of UK life sciences companies. We have the foundations in place to generate the ideas, products and revenue to deliver the future success of the UK's flourishing life sciences industry.</p> <p>The Campus will therefore continue to grow, creating jobs and bringing investment to Cambridge but we do this in collaboration with the city and its residents. Our achievements and success reflect the endeavour, persistence and brilliance of the people who live and work here.</p> <p>The Campus has 17,250 researchers, industry and clinicians all working on one site. By 2021, it is estimated there will be 21,000 people working on the Campus increasing to 26,000 in 2031, and up to 30,000 beyond 2031. Investment in the Campus over the past three years totals more than £750m. The CBC is the biggest employment site in Cambridge, with further space to grow. The campus is well-connected, located within seven minutes from Cambridge central station – 45 minutes from King Cross station, London, 30 minutes from Stansted Airport and two miles from the M11. Routes in and out of the campus for staff, visitors and patients can be challenging if traveling at peak times or from more rural areas as there is significant congestion on roads, which impede access for both public transport and private cars.</p> <p>The annual campus travel survey in 2018 noted that 25% of journeys to the campus were made by bicycle and 19% were pedestrian. We are aware that almost 6500 members of staff are on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. We welcome the project to provide improved transport connectivity from the south east of Cambridge to the city. I write on behalf of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to provide comments on the current consultation 'Cambridge South East Transport Consultation', published in September 2019.</p>
31/10/2019	04/11/2019	53 O	Cambridge Biomedical Campus email	<p>About the Cambridge Biomedical Campus</p> <p>The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city of Cambridge. The CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and patient care.</p> <p>Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CUH) is situated at the heart of the campus and has over 1,000 beds, 10,000 members of staff and is one of the largest and best known acute hospital Trusts in the country. The 'local' hospital for our community, delivering care through Addenbrooke's hospital and the Rosie maternity hospital, CUH is also a leading regional and national centre for specialist treatment; a government designated comprehensive biomedical research centre; a partner in one of six academic health science centres in the UK – Cambridge University Health Partners (CUHP); and a university teaching hospital with a worldwide reputation. CUH with its health system partners have recently secured funding from Government to develop a new specialist children's hospital serving the eastern region and following a further public announcement of additional significant funding, CUH now has the opportunity to plan a new hospital on the CBC as part of an integrated healthcare system for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.</p> <p>Other CBC partners include The Royal Papworth Hospital one of the largest specialist cardiothoracic hospitals in Europe and the UK's main heart and lung transplant centre which relocated to the Campus during April 2019. The hospital currently treats 24,000 in-patients and day-case patients, and treats 73,600 outpatients per year. The new site on the CBC has 310 beds served by circa 1,700 members of staff.</p> <p>During 2019, Cambridge University have opened two buildings dedicated to healthcare research on the Campus and Abcam, a commercial business supplying clinical sources for research work have occupied their building. The three developments bring an additional 1200 members of staff to site. AstraZeneca will occupy their new building in 2021, bringing with them a further 2000 members of staff.</p> <p>Why this consultation is important to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus:</p> <p>With world-leading academic and industry scientists on the same site as the teaching hospitals of the University of Cambridge, the Campus is the optimum environment for the rapid and effective translation of research into routine clinical practice.</p> <p>With the cost of healthcare set to increase as the demand from an aging population soars, we are set to develop the treatments of the future also creating the next generation of UK life sciences companies. We have the foundations in place to generate the ideas, products and revenue to deliver the future success of the UK's flourishing life sciences industry.</p> <p>The Campus will therefore continue to grow, creating jobs and bringing investment to Cambridge but we do this in collaboration with the city and its residents. Our achievements and success reflect the endeavour, persistence and brilliance of the people who live and work here.</p> <p>The Campus has 17,250 researchers, industry and clinicians all working on one site. By 2021, it is estimated there will be 21,000 people working on the Campus increasing to 26,000 in 2031, and up to 30,000 beyond 2031. Investment in the Campus over the past three years totals more than £750m. The CBC is the biggest employment site in Cambridge, with further space to grow. The Campus is well-connected, located within seven minutes from Cambridge central station – 45 minutes from King Cross station, London, 30 minutes from Stansted Airport and two miles from the M11. Routes in and out of the campus for staff, visitors and patients can be challenging if traveling at peak times or from more rural areas as there is significant congestion To The Greater Cambridge 'Partnership'!</p> <p>As a resident of Great Shelford I am totally against and upset at the proposed new transport routes.</p> <p>They will do NOTHING for local residents.</p> <p>They will increase the pain of getting in and out of Great Shelford especially in addition to the level crossings.</p> <p>Hence more stopping cars and more pollution in the middle of open fields.</p> <p>Nobody will bother cycling up steep inclines to get to the ludicrous isolated stops.</p> <p>This is a gross waste of money.</p> <p>Why does nobody care about the countryside and maintaining the landscape?</p> <p>Because I'm sure that nobody that backs this or will use it is local.</p> <p>People live and work here BECAUSE of the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Despite what anyone says - these new routes will lead to new housing in the longer term and destruction of yet another village.</p> <p>Please do not go ahead with these selfish and poorly thought out plans.</p> <p>IMPORTANT:</p> <p>Please can you tell me how many residents of Great Shelford or Stapleford have told you they will use these routes ?</p>
31/10/2019	04/11/2019	54 I	email	Kind regards

We have always felt any Hub should be the other side of Linton as this is the main bottle neck but understand that Traffic Flow data indicates that traffic coming from Linton does split up at Fourwentways with some traffic going north and south on the A11 as well as into Cambridge on the A1307 hence the need for a Hub at the A11.

Having examined the 3 proposed Travel Hubs we would like to make the following comments:

- We do not like Site A because at present this junction gets very busy with Granta Park traffic in the morning and evening and the additional hub would cause more issues with the site close to the A505 underpass.
- We do not like Site C as we feel that the location of the Hub will cause even more traffic issues on the A1307, east of the A11, than already exist morning and evening, even with a roundabout there. This is also a very expensive option.
- Site B is our preferred option. It is screened away from the underpass junction and the A11/A1307 junction and would help local village traffic access the A505 and A1307. It would also be a better site for the proposed electric tram connection.

However this site would need some form of right turn exit onto the A1307 for cars returning to Linton or the A11.

We also question the plan for a shared-use path (pedestrian, cyclists and horses) via Bourn Bridge Road which is narrow and also has Protected Verges maintained by the Parish Council. It also has two right angled bends in Lt. Abington and goes through Gt. Abington with the pub, School, Institute and Shop all in close proximity. We believe that the Pampisford Road would be a better alternative? The shared user path could be taken up to the Granta Park roundabout and then along Pampisford Rd which has a decent amount of verge on the right hand side and come in at the Hildersham junction with the A1307 where there will be a Pegasus crossing. This also fits in better with the plan to improve the pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A11. Also a shared path along Pampisford Rd would enable residents of Gt. Abington to walk to Granta Park which is not advisable at present as the road is used as a 'rat run'.

Shared use paths are very important in the area as we are surrounded by main roads and it is not safe for pedestrians, including pushchairs, cyclists, horse riders and wheelchair/mobility scooter users to be on the roads and the shared paths would link with Babraham and Sawston and also Linton.

With regard to horses there are in the immediate area around 100 of them and the shared user paths would make riding a lot safer and also enable us to cross the A1307 in safety so we can then access the Roman Road.

At present only cyclists and pedestrians can cross the A11 via the bridge but I believe discussions are taking place to be able to access the underpass by the river so then shared user routes to the east can be accessed by all.

[Name]
[Address]

31/10/2019 04/11/2019 55 I [email](#)

The estate of James Binney, Will Trust (JBWT), owners of Pampisford Hall (a Grade II listed building, listed building and registered park and garden (Grade II), together with the freehold estate mostly under arable cultivation. This is the last traditional agricultural estate with its own family occupied house in this district. The purpose of this letter is to respond, so far as we are able, to the current consultation exercise for the Cambridge South East Transport's "Better Public Transport Project." Please note that at this stage we strongly object to the proposals. Specifically, we object to both in manner in which these proposals are emerging and to the lack of any systematic assessment of the environmental effects of the proposed route or any of the proposed options for the travel hub.

The Pampisford Estate came into being in the late 18th Century after enclosures for the Parker Hammond family and was acquired a century later by James Binney, whose descendants occupy it today. Safeguarding the architectural heritage, including the listed structures and monuments, careful stewardship of the land as well as promoting the fauna, flora and wildlife, in particular on the four SSSI's, the Grant river and its woodlands lies at the heart of the Trust's work, as has been the case since its inception. The Arboretum surrounding the Hall is of international repute and scientific importance as a contributor to the gene bank of conifers thriving on chalk. It includes many rare, wild collected, recorded species.

The Hall lies about 8 kilometres south-east of Cambridge, on the south east edge of the villages of Pampisford and Sawston covering about 50 hectares. It sits on higher ground in a triangle of land enclosed by the dualled A11 (which resulted in some 50 acres being taken from the estate) and the A505 Royston Road which forms the northern boundary. Now only two approaches remain, both lying to the north. One serving the family, employees and visitors to the Hall, offices and estate buildings. The other serves the farming operation as well as for forestry, sheep and cattle grazing plus game management. The former known as Whittlesford Drive is from the west and is marked by gates (also listed as grade II). The latter is from the north and originally entered the park off the A 505 but has been realigned as a result of road improvement before turning south through the parkland to the listed mansion.

The estate lies within a wider chalkland landscape and parts of it lie within the Green Belt.

JBWT is increasingly concerned by the apparent lack of recognition of the Greater Cambridge Partnership for these designated heritage and environmental assets which characterise the wider estate, which in turn serves to support and sustain them. This approach is very antithesis of the approach the Trust has long taken to safeguard the estate.

So far as we can tell from the very high level "initial proposals for site layouts, facilities and access arrangements for road vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists", JBWT's landholdings would be affected in differing degrees by both site A and site C. In addition, the pink looped route to site B runs directly to the north of the Hall, arboretum and park.

Your consultation exercise, as we explain further, does not enable us and those who advise JBWT, to clearly identify the potential effects of these initial proposals upon JBWT. It maybe that site B via the more direct brown route does not directly affect land in JBWT's ownership but the proposed public transport route to all three proposed travel hubs is not yet clear.

The current public consultation exercise fails to identify, let alone assess or have any regard for the need to preserve and enhance, these important designated heritage assets and the valued natural environment in which they lie. Equally it fails to explain the site selection methodology.

The earlier 2018 public consultation exercise which included indicative route options on or alongside the A1307, as well as through the rural landscape to the north of the villages, also wholly failed to identify, let alone assess at any level, the presence of these designated heritage assets and the wider natural environment. Consideration was given to Wandlebury Country Park and Magog Down but not to other features we have identified.

Irrespective of how a duty to consult arises, there is a duty of procedural fairness. One of the four basic requirements (known as the Sedley criteria and endorsed by the Supreme Court in R (on the application of Moseley) V Haringey LBC [2014] IWL R 3947) is that the proposer must give sufficient reasons/information to permit of intelligent consideration. If the proposer of the consultation fails to make the public aware of the presence and potential impact upon these designated heritage assets, let alone assess wider environmental effects, we fail to see how the

01/11/2019 04/11/2019 56 L [Town Legal LLP on behalf of James Binney Will Trust/Pampisford Hall](#) [email and post](#)

have filed in and submitted response but unable to attach my comments in more detail.
Here is a copy of that submitted form and my two sheets of comment .

[Initial]

In April 2018 I sent in my comments on the proposals with the two main points being:-

- 1) That it was highly questionable that there was any need for a newly constructed rapid transport route.
- 2) That the Wandlebury to Stapleford landscape was probably the most attractive landscape around Cambridge.

The proposals now put forward continue to propose a newly built transpo1i system at an estimated cost of £150m and which will cut through open countryside in some of the best landscape around Cambridge.

The Three Campuses to Cambridge repo1i of August 2016 stated that the impact of any transport improvements on the environment will be an important part of developing these ideas. Very clearly this objective has been forgotten about in deciding to urbanise this area of countryside.

Rapid transport systems go together with large populations and dense employment areas. This situation just does not exist in this sector of Cambridge. To try to suggest that Gt.Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston are large centres or population requiring such a system is absurd.

To compound the point siting them on the outskirts of the village does nothing to improve transport links. Clearly the proposals realise this since no general carparking provision is sited at these stops.

The reality is that employment areas are scattered around Cambridge and the car is the only practical method of transport.

All the villages have a bus service running through their centres, and there is a station at Shelford. There is a bus service running along the 1307, and if further dedicated bus services between the campuses are required these can be run at no additional infrastructure costs just as the Granta Park one runs at present.

Proposing to, in effect, build a damaging new road through open countryside can hardly be said to be sustainable.

Rapid transit systems to be beneficial have to be rapid and there is not the population to justify such a system. If it is rapid at rush hours then what is going to happen at the road crossings ,all of which take much traffic at rush hour? To suggest that there could be bus services to these village stops is just absurd.

The idea that walkers and horseriders will enjoy using a shared path adjacent to the new transit system is illogical. Both walkers and horseriders get into this present landscape to get away from the urbanisation. This proposal would seriously erode the environment and do little to alleviate the congestion on the 1307 at the roundabout by Babraham Road Park and Ride and certainly not fulfil the environmental aims sent out in the 2016 document.

It seems that from the outset there has been an obsession to link the high tech centres of Addenbrooke's, Babraham and Granta Park with a high tech transpo11 system regardless of need. The fact that the 2016 document was entitled 'Three Campuses to Cambridge' reflect that goal and now this is disguised by calling it Cambridge South East Transport where virtually all the money is to be used on the Campus Project and not looking at the most serious SE Cambridge transport problem, the traffic access from the A1307 into Addenbrooke's.

[Name]

I am writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public Consultation 2019. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Great Shelford.

For the last eight years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, which includes the fields between the reserve and Granhams Road which would be impacted by the busway. I use a combination of methodologies from the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) Breeding Bird Survey, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Volunteer and Farmer Alliance and, more recently, the UK Butterfly Monitoring Scheme (UKBMS). My submissions to the BTO and UKBMS also record mammal and dragonfly populations.

The fields I survey support important breeding populations of threatened farmland birds, as well as water vole, brown hare and other mammals, plants, and invertebrates. My study has demonstrated that in particular the fields support exceptional populations of grey partridge and corn bunting (species that have declined by around 90% since 1970 and are 'red list' birds of high conservation concern) and the site may well be among the best in Cambridgeshire for these species.

The area affected by the proposed busway route

Figure 1 below shows the area I survey. The proposed busway route would most immediately impact on Fields 3, 4 and 5 and the hedgerows that run between them.

[Fig 1: Pairs of grey partridge (P) and corn bunting (CB) in Spring 2019]

Figure 1 also shows the breeding pairs of grey partridge and corn bunting in Spring 2019:

- Across the area as a whole 14 pairs of grey partridge bred. Of these, 5 pairs bred in Fields 4 and 5.
- Across the area as a whole 11 pairs of corn bunting bred. Of these, 5 pairs bred in Fields 3, 4 and 5.

Understanding the ecology of species like these is essential when planning an infrastructure project like the proposed busway. Several aspects are important:

- Both grey partridge and corn bunting are ground nesting birds. They prefer to nest in dense vegetation, ideally at the base of hedgerows or failing that in grassy margins. The hedgerow between Fields 4 and 5 in Figure 1 is extremely important for both species. Corn buntings use hedges and telephone wires as song posts and also nest in undisturbed grassy areas along the railway line.
- Grey partridge move out into the neighbouring field to feed, principally at dawn and dusk. They do

01/11/2019 04/11/2019 57 I

[email](#)

copy of completed consultation questionnaire

01/11/2019 04/11/2019 58 I

[email](#)

Figure 1 - [map] Pairs of grey partridge (P) and corn bunting (CB) in Spring 2019

Cambridgeshire Light Rail
Prepared by [name] 1 November 2019 (v1)

1 Introduction 3
2 Summary conclusions 3
3 Long-term transport planning 5
4 Sustainability 5
5 Light rail: general benefits for Cambridge Southeast 5
6 Specific comments on route proposed by GCP 7
6.1 Practical feasibility, constraints and costs 7
6.2 Improved connectivity and integration 10
6.3 Environmental benefits, landscape values and sustainability 11
6.4 Opportunities for long-term gains – a proposal for developing an integrated approach to improvements in rail and public transport at Cambridge Southeast 11
7 Specific comments on Park & Ride proposals by GCP 13
8 References 13

1 Introduction

Cambridge Connect was initiated to promote a strategic and sustainable approach to public transport in Cambridgeshire. Emphasis is placed on the potential of light rail as part of that strategy, and on an integrated and multi-modal approach to meeting the transport needs for Cambridge and the surrounding region. We recognise the need to link local solutions into broader regional strategies.

Within the immediate Cambridge region, we have proposed a light rail line from the Girton Interchange in the northwest to Granta Park in the southeast, via the University West Campus, city centre, Cambridge Central Rail Station, Addenbrookes, Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston. The line would extend ~22 km (~14 mi) and we call this route the 'Isaac Newton Line' (Figure 1) (Harris et al. 2019). The light rail line would follow existing and former rail alignments, run underground within the historic city core, and follow the busway alignment between

Dear Sirs,

I strongly object to these proposals. I support all the currently well stated objections.

The system has absolutely no value to this neighbourhood and actually creates many negative issues by reducing the quantity of life, increases local journey times and increasing passing traffic and at massive costs to everyone.

The better solution would be to create bus lanes on the A1307 from the A11 junction with a large park and rideau that site. This would also be much more cost effective.

Yours sincerely

[name]

Proposed bus route through Green Belt land in Great Shelford.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a resident of Great Shelford and am writing to you regarding concerns I have over the Cambridge South East Transport Project and the proposed bus route through Green Belt land in Great Shelford.

My concerns are numerous. First that the land to be utilised for this is Green Belt. It was designated as such to prevent urban sprawl and to enhance the quality of life for local people. Once this bus route is in place inevitably it will open the door to further development in the immediate vicinity that will damage irretrievably the Green Belt and change the character of our village. It will cut a swath through beautiful countryside. We get no second chances with this, once it's gone it's gone. Should this be sacrificed to provide a link to what is in effect an overflow car park for Addenbrookes? We have a duty to protect the area for future generations.

When one looks at a contour map of the area it is absolutely clear that the route runs through the Gog Magog Hills. It may not intrude upon Wandlebury Country Park or Magog Down but the effected area is part of the hills nonetheless. This a unique area to Cambridge, and has long been cherished by the people of the city as a special place. Not only that it is an area of archeological importance holding ancient earth works. Has due consideration been given to this to ensure that no such sites are on the proposed route?

It would also be hugely damaging to the environment and local wildlife. In our garden alone we have deer, foxes and a badger sett. Their safe habituate will be reduced by encroachment of the roadway, situated only a few hundred yards away will pose a grave threat.

In Hinton Way we already have one level crossing, the introduction of another controlled junction will cause delay and inconvenience to local people.

The idea of having a bus stop/station in Great Shelford when taking into account the cost will offer little or no benefit to local people. We have a huge park and ride at Babraham a little over a quarter of a mile away! It is in short unnecessary and a waste of public money. What it definitely will do is to make the building of a large number of houses on the Green Belt here more likely.

In my submission there are other alternative routes that should be re-considered. Notably the disused railway line. There may be additional cost involved but that must be considered against destruction of the Green belt and environmental impact.

Apart from these concerns, should it be decided that the route will have to cut across the designated Green Belt farm land it seems illogical to me that it be positioned so far north. Surely

Figure 1. [map] The Cambridge Connect Isaac Newton Line and the proposed GCP Southeast Busway

Figure 2: [photo] Much of the former rail alignment remains as an elevated embankment suitable for reinstatement

Figure 3: [photo] Croydon Tramlink alignment immediately west of Beckenham Junction station. The light rail line is at far left, while the remaining three lines are heavy rail.

01/11/2019 04/11/2019 59 O Cambridge Connect [email](#)

02/11/2019 04/11/2019 60 I [email](#)

02/11/2019 04/11/2019 61 I [email](#)

Dear Sir or Madam,

Camcycle is a volunteer-led charity with 1,400 members that works for more, better and safer cycling for all ages and abilities in the Cambridge region. We have specific comments on the proposed indicative designs for cycling infrastructure and the surrounding context.

General

- Pathways must be designed for cycling by people of all ages and abilities, who may be making journeys for any purpose, at any time of year and under all typical weather conditions.
- Separation of carriageways or busways from pathways is vital for safe and effective design. We appreciate the proposal for a 2m planted buffer separating the busway and pathway. We would further recommend that steps are taken to mitigate the dazzling effects of bus headlights at night, for example, by planting a hedge in the buffer.
- A minimum width of 3m for a shared-use pathway should be considered only where expected flows of people walking and cycling are low. We recommend that shared-use pathways adjacent to carriageways or busways should be at least 4m wide, and that where pedestrian flows are expected to be higher, the pathways should be segregated by use. The cross section of a segregated pathway should indicatively be a 2m dedicated footway, a 3.5m cycleway and a separate grassy pathway provided where equestrians need it.
- Pathway design must take into account forward visibility at typical cycling speeds, visibility splays at junctions, minimum desirable curvature (both horizontal and vertical), the swept path of people cycling while pulling trailers, and pathway maintenance requirements such as preventing overgrowth and preparing for winter usage.
- Infrastructure in the vicinity of the Strategic Road Network (such as bridges, underbridges or connecting pathways) must follow the CD 195 'Designing for cycle traffic' standard from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

Bus stops

- The cross section shows a narrow 3m-wide shared use pathway hemmed in on one side by the cycle parking and on the other side by the bus shelter.
- In such an arrangement, people attempting to use the cycle parking will be facing away from the pathway as they wrangle their bike backwards out of parking spaces, and they will inadvertently and inevitably conflict with people trying to cycle along the pathway.
- Access into and out of the cycle parking should be separate from the pathway, either by shifting the cycle parking away from the pathway, or by providing access from a different direction.
- Shelters and other fixed objects should not be placed so close to the main cycling pathway because they obstruct visibility and may block the views of people trying to cross the pathway safely. They also pose collision risks when the pathway is crowded.
- The passenger waiting area will need to be wider than 2m in order to allow buses to deploy their ramps.
- We recommend following the Transport for London Accessible Bus Stop Design Guide¹, which deals with all of these issues, including the design of cycleways at bus stops.
- The design of the cycle parking must follow the Cycle Parking Guide SPD2 specifications for layout and dimensions (or its successor document), and there should also be some provision for larger cycles such as cargo cycles.

Junction design

- In this image the cycle parking is shown separately from the pathway, which resolves the conflict between people wrangling parked cycles and people riding on the pathway; however, the bus stop passenger waiting area is still inadequate.

I am very much opposed to the proposed rapid public transit route which is planned to run across green belt land between the A11 and the biomedical campus.

1. It does nothing to address the main hindrance to traffic flow on this route which is the bottle neck getting into the city along Trumpington Rd and Hills Rd, yet you are prepared to ruin one of the best views (from the Gogs) in south Cambridgeshire. It will need to be fenced especially near the villages to prevent pedestrians/ children/ cyclists straying on to the actual bus route, as I gather there have been several serious accidents on similar schemes, and this will make it even more of an eyesore. In addition, as a result of the car parks which will be built, the project will greatly increase the traffic flow through local villages, especially Stapleford, Sawston and Great Shelford. These villages already suffer from completely unchecked speeding traffic, despite money spent!!! installing 20mph signs.

2. There will also be disruption and the risk of accidents (if the proposed 16 buses an hour actually materialise) at the crossing points along Haverhill Rd, Hinton Way and Granhams Rd. We already experience traffic queues from the Shelford Railway level crossings not only at peak times!

3. This will be a very costly project and I feel the money would be better spent subsidising and improving the routes and frequency of the existing public transport facilities especially at peak times, together with, perhaps, some restrictions on private vehicle access to the city at peak times. After all traffic flow is not too bad outside these peak times. The route of the No 7 bus was altered and as a result it takes even longer to get into the city than it used to. It is also fairly unreliable and when it does run, there are only 3 buses an hour (not 16!!!). I suspect the Haverhill bus route is similarly underprovisioned

4. Have we any statistical evidence from, for example, the guided bus route north of the city that such projects are fully used and do indeed relieve the pressure on the main roads into the city? Is the A14, for example a lot less congested than it was?! ...even if the guided bus is used, the continuing congestion seems to indicate that even more motorists then take advantage of the space on the roads. Public transport has to possess considerable advantages in order to separate motorists from the convenience of their own vehicles

5. I fear this would be the case south of the city as the plans indicate some rather "convenient" areas of green belt land, especially to the north-east of Stapleford village (and probably all along the route) which might look rather tempting for developers....So even more houses would be built, without taking any account of any other infrastructure needs such as education provision, water supply, sewage disposal etc. This would result in even more cars, which would add to the congestion, even if some of the households did use the new transit route. One starts to wonder if this isn't the prime reason that this particular route was chosen when other suggestions following the existing roads were discarded without full explanation, (not many votes were cast altogether for any of the schemes but I expect interested parties would have made sure their voices were heard).

Yours sincerely

03/11/2019 04/11/2019 62 O Camcycle [email](#)

03/11/2019 04/11/2019 63 I [email](#)

				<p>Pampisford Parish Council's response to the Greater Cambridge Partnership plans for A1307 and a new Park and Ride site at the A11/A505 junction.</p> <p>Pampisford Parish Council has grave reservations about the Greater Cambridge Partnership's plans for the ameliorating the traffic issues associated with the A 1307 between Abington and The Cambridge Medical Campus.</p> <p>Answering the questions in the online consultation was not suitable for Pampisford Parish Council.</p> <p>The proposed routes for the busway will cut a swathe through Pampisford farmland, situated entirely in the Green Belt. This is good quality agricultural land which if used can never be returned satisfactorily to arable cultivation.</p> <p>We would have preferred the use of the existing verges of the A1307 to create a bus and cycle lane up and over the Gogs. This would have been a much cheaper option, which would then have allowed funding for improving local cycle paths from Pampisford, Sawston, Stapleford and the Shelfords.</p> <p>The upgrade of the cycle path north out of Sawston is welcome but ways of connecting it more satisfactorily through Stapleford and Great Shelford are urgently needed, as is an upgrade of the DNA path north to the Addenbrookes site. Also a proper continuation of the Babraham road cycle path out of Sawston, which does not involve getting a bike over the pedestrian bridge towards Granta Park. As well as the continuation of the cycle path from MacDonald's roundabout, along A505 to Whittlesford station and beyond. More connectivity with the existing cycle ways should be of paramount importance, before making new routes.</p> <p>We feel that none of the suggested 3 Park and Ride sites are ideal</p> <p>A is too far south of the junction of the A1307, A505 and the A11</p> <p>B would be situated on very wet land which has engineering and water movements implications and the access to the A1307 apparently shows traffic leaving the site turn righting right across the A1307. The access should be as a spur from the A1307/A11 roundabout.</p> <p>C is again away from the junction, in the Abington direction. Why has the field between it and the A11 not been suggested, again with an exit directly off the roundabout? C is also on rising land and so will be very visible from a distance.</p> <p>There is brownfield land in the vicinity of the road junctions and at least some of this should be used.</p> <p>We find it strange that the consultation has reached this stage without approaches being made to the landowners, who will have a much better feel for the optimum positioning of the busway routes and Park and Ride sites.</p> <p>We are aware of the traffic pressures on this part of South Cambridgeshire and the need to large numbers of people to move across it particularly at the start and end of the working day. However to procedure with any these suggestion before the consultation on the A505 is completed seems completely wrong, particularly with regard to siting of a park and ride site and its associated roads.</p> <p>The consultation process is deeply flawed as the general public were asked to choose options without enough details of how any of the suggestions would actually be delivered including how junctions with existing roads would be organised.</p> <p>Aureole Wragg Mrs A M Wragg, Chairman Pampisford Parish Council, 1 High Street, Pampisford, Cambridge, CB22 3ES</p>
03/11/2019	04/11/2019	64 O	Pampisford Parish Cc email	<p>the Greater Cambridge Partnership wants to grow and share property and improve quality of life for the people of Greater Cambridge, securing Greater Cambridge's future through multi-million pound improvements in vital infrastructure.</p> <p>It is important to bear in mind that this better public transport project needs to address not only the issue of accessing Cambridge, and particularly the Cambridge Biomedical Campus area, more easily than at present but it also should have a role in addressing travel to and from significant employment sites such as Granta Park / TWI and the Babraham Research Campus.</p> <p>Public Transport route</p> <p>It is important that any new public transport route minimizes the impact on agricultural activities in the area and therefore a route on or very near the former railway route between Great Shelford and Haverhill has a great deal to commend it. The proposed route follows very much the line of the old railway except close to Stapleford and Great Shelford. The route as proposed near these villages, if take forward, would need to be especially sensitive to local topography and landscape.</p> <p>I can understand the suggestion to use the line of the old railway close to Great Shelford station, but there are difficulties in creating a ground level route immediately north of Great Shelford station. A priority high quality public transport route crossing Hinton Way / Station Road close to the existing railway line and station would cause more frequent hold ups in that area than now with just the station crossing closures.</p> <p>Sensitivity and working closely with residents and parish councils in the Great Shelford and Stapleford area is essential to planning an accessible and acceptable route.</p> <p>A new Travel Hub</p> <p>In my view, a new Travel Hub not only needs to work for those wishing to access Cambridge and in particular the Cambridge Biomedical Camus area and travel further into Cambridge, but also those travelling out from Cambridge to the important employment centres at Granta Park / TWI and the Babraham Research Campus.</p> <p>Therefore any Travel Hub and associated public transport stops needs to be located such that there is easy access to all these employment locations.</p> <p>High quality agricultural land is a vital resource of any country. All three proposed Travel Hub locations are situated on high quality agricultural land, and in my view, further consideration needs to be given to other potential locations which have a significantly different character and which would minimise the need for high quality agricultural land to be taken out of agricultural use.</p>
03/11/2019	04/11/2019	65 P	Tony Orgee email	

I hope you don't mind me submitting my comments by email, rather than trying to shoehorn them into the consultation form.

The width of the shared use path: – this currently defined as unsegregated/marked and 3m wide. For purposes of comparison, the Hills Road cycleways are about 2.7m wide but the busway track will be serving cyclists in both directions plus pedestrians. There are already relatively frequent crashes on the current DNA path because of heavy usage so on this basis I cannot see how 3m will be adequate in the future for safe usage by the increased volume of users one might expect. Moreover, if the path is also supposed to be attractive to pedestrians, 3m width won't make for a relaxing environment with bikes passing in both directions in close proximity.

Approach to and through the Biomedical Campus: at the consultation event, the consultants described the plan for the installation of traffic lights on the roundabout to give the buses priority. I would like to see the traffic modelling of the impacts of those lights on traffic congestion from vehicles entering the Campus from Trumpington in the morning and leaving in the evening. I understand very well that this is a sustainable transport project and that private vehicles will come bottom of the travel hierarchy but I am concerned that the result of years of disruption from the construction will simply be more congestion in our local area.

Proximity to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve: The consultants at the Long Road event confirmed that the gap between the railway and the edge of Nine Wells is just over 80m, so obviously the creation of a 15m busway plus cyclepath will encroach on this beleaguered space. However, there is also the need to 'four track' (ie double) the railway line which needs to happen before Cambridge South station can operate. The extra width for this four tracking is not shown on the Cambridge South East route map and to run a consultation without clarifying this point seems somewhat disingenuous (it could push CSET infrastructure much closer to Nine Wells).

Crossings on Hinton Way and Haverhill Road: the proposed route tracks north of both Shelford and Stapleford villages and thus will require new signalled crossings of Hinton Way and Haverhill Road. I seem to remember being told that when the service is running at full capacity there will 12 services an hour in each direction, which will mean hold-ups for people traveling between the A1307 and the villages, the effect of which will be compounded by the fact that there will also be more traffic on Hinton Way and Haverhill Way as people drive to drop passengers at/collect passengers from the stops. I am also concerned about the intrusive nature of the crossings on the rural landscape, not only through the need for visual signals but also (presumably) car traps similar to those on the Guided Busway or other physical deterrent to drivers.

Design and location of the stops: it seems to me that the consultation significantly understates the land take required for the stops. The consultation literature shows cycle parking, disabled parking and drop-off areas but there is no provision shown for drivers waiting to collect service users, or for village buses to ensure onward connectivity. Given the extent of the tarmacing, presumably you will also need extensive SUDS (swales, balancing ponds)? The proposal for only 200 bike parking places across the Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston facilities seems to make it inevitable that many people will drive because they will be very unlikely to walk outside the village/business park footprint on rural roads with poor pavements or on isolated tracks. Opportunities for biodiversity net gain: the consultation document states "GCP is committed to ensuring the scheme delivers a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain with a target of at least 20%". However, that ratio applies over the whole length of the route and I have a sinking feeling about the ability to deliver improvements on it draws closer to the Biomedical Campus. We have spoken many times about the potential for this project to be conceived of as a linear park, but the current proposals get nowhere near achieving this. Given that this is a project being developed by a consortium which has quality of life as one of its objectives, and which is run by three councils all of which have declared a climate emergency, I am left feeling distinctly underwhelmed.

I hope that's helpful input ☺

Hobson's Conduit Trust has, since 1991, been responsible for the care of Hobson's Brook which rises from the springs at Nine Wells and flows into Cambridge. The chalk stream meanders running into the heart of Cambridge is a significant ecological corridor, a unique historic waterway and an important flood risk management asset. Nine Wells is designated a Local Nature Reserve and a Local Geological Site. White Hill and Nine Wells together form a site of significant archaeological, heritage, geological, geomorphological, ecological and conservation interest. The Trust's responsibilities are to preserve this historic chalk stream for its ecological and public amenity value. Our remit is the provision of a water supply to Emmanuel, Christ's and Pembroke Colleges, the University Botanic Garden and the Trumpington Street runnels. This means that an adequate flow and good water quality must be consistently maintained. Our concerns are therefore with the section of the proposed busway which runs from the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to Great Shelford. The impact of the proposed busway on the landscape is most acute at the point where it passes between the railway and the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. The Trust is not opposed to the development of the public transport network in SE Cambridge. We recognise that the coherent development of infrastructure is vital for the future health and wellbeing of the city and its region. Whilst we have a number of comments to make for this consultation, we wish to be a positive force ensuring the best possible outcomes of development in the south of the city in terms of both biodiversity and long term environmental benefit. Hobson's Conduit Trust are keen to work with other stakeholders in fulfilment of a long term vision to improve the biodiversity of the White Hill/ Nine Wells area and the historic watercourse of Hobson's Brook. The proposed transport route provides new opportunities to allow this to take shape and progress. Special Characteristics of Nine Wells and Hobson's Brook

Having looked carefully at the Consultation paper, there are a number of areas which we would like to discuss further:

1. Physical impact

There is no avoiding the fact that a 15m wide busway passing through the field (only 80m wide) between the Nine Wells LNR and the railway line will have a significant impact on this sensitive spot. We are most anxious to minimise disruption to the area of and around the construction site itself, especially Hobson's Brook and the Nine Wells LNR. Clearly this needs to be done with great care to minimise harm to the ecosystem during the construction phase of the work. Compression and compaction of the soil, damage to tree roots and disturbance to wildlife must be kept to an absolute minimum. The construction zone should be delineated as far from Nine Wells as is feasible.

The crossing point of the Brook will result in the watercourse being covered by a bridge for a 15m stretch. The watercourse also needs to maintain a continuous flow of good quality water to the Cambridge Colleges and the Botanic Garden who are supplied by the Brook.

On the positive side, we would like to: ● be involved with the design and planning of the implementation of the crossing of the brook. The crossing should be located as close as possible to the railway. The route of the busway should then continue to follow the railway line as closely as possible from the point where the busway meets the shared use path to the south, as far north as the Addenbrooke's Road railway bridge. We would like to see a large scale map showing the detail of the proposed route from the Cambridge Biomedical Campus through to Shelford.

● ensure that Public Access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve from the existing cycle path beside the railway is maintained throughout the construction process ● take this opportunity to create access to Hobson's Brook under both the proposed bridge and the existing railway bridge. This would allow for a future riverside footpath to join the existing path along Hobson's Brook from Addenbrooke's Road, and from there all the way along the Brook to Cambridge.

2. Archaeological impact

The whole area around Nine Wells is thought to contain significant archaeological remains. There is thought to be a Neolithic Henge on White Hill to the NE of the Nine Wells LNR. There are

03/11/2019 04/11/2019 66 I

[email](#)

04/11/2019 04/11/2019 67 O

Hobson's Conduit Trust

[email](#)

04/11/2019	04/11/2019	68	O	CTC Cambridge	email	<p>...writing to you on behalf of CTC Cambridge, a local group of cycling enthusiasts in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public Consultation 2019.</p> <p>This letter is a detailed reply to the latest consultation leaflet proposals for a new public transport route and associated Park and Ride site options. Our response is primarily concerned with the details of the shared-use path that is proposed to be constructed alongside the new bus road.</p> <p>We support the proposal to build a new shared-use path for cyclists and walkers alongside this new public transport route. We think this path will be welcomed by people cycling to work, to school, to the shops or for leisure. We think this new path should be designed to a higher standard and should be included in the planned network of greenways.</p> <p>While we welcome the proposal to create a new shared-use path we think the current proposals need some important changes. In particular, we think the plans should be revised to widen the path to 4m instead of the 3m width that is proposed. We also think the design of the bus stops needs to be changed to remove the potential conflicts between people using the shared-use path and people using the bus stop.</p> <p>We also think it is important that all the plans include a direct desire-line shared-use path connection to Granta Park regardless of the bus road and Park and Ride options that are chosen. We are concerned that the plans do not appear to include this direct desire-line cycle route to Granta Park in all cases.</p> <p>Lastly, we are concerned that the proposals may cause delays to starting work on much needed improvements to the existing DNA path (Sawston Greenway). We observe that the proposed new bus road will overlap with the DNA path and we are concerned that this overlap could create uncertainty over making changes to the DNA path. We think that major improvements to the DNA path are needed urgently for safety reasons and it is essential that these safety improvements are progressed quickly and are not delayed.</p> <p>The rest of this letter gives more details on all these issues.</p> <p>Direct desire-line path to Granta Park</p> <p>We think it is essential that the shared use path is built to a high standard to support high levels of use by cyclists and walkers. We think the path should be constructed with a width of 4m (instead of the 3m width proposed) to support high levels of use.</p> <p>We think the path alongside the St Ives busway demonstrates the importance of this extra width. Most of the St Ives path is around 4m wide and we think these wide sections work well with minimal conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians. Narrower sections create more conflicts and should be avoided.</p> <p>We also think the path should include an additional branch that diverges from the bus road if necessary to provide a direct desire-line cycle path to Granta Park regardless of which route is chosen. In this context, we have a preference for the black, pink or purple routes as these would automatically provide this wanted direct cycle connection to Granta Park. If the blue or brown route is chosen we strongly recommend that the plans include a separate branch of shared-use path to provide a direct shared-use path to Granta Park - this branch of shared-use path could follow the line of the purple route to Park and Ride site A followed by a branch connection to Granta Park. In all cases the path should provide a desire-line direct connection to Granta Park via the existing A505 underpass and A11 bridge (the same route as the existing A505 cyclepath for the last section).</p> <p>We want to emphasise the importance of creating this direct cycle connection to Granta Park for different users. Firstly, and most obviously, it is important to provide a convenient and direct (desire-line) cycle route for commuters to and from Granta Park. Secondly, it will provide the first section of a cycle route to Hildersham and to Linton via Granta Park and Pampisford Road. In both cases cyclists want a direct cycle route – it would not be acceptable for this connection to be an indirect dog-leg route (e.g. a dog-leg via park and ride site B).</p> <p>In the longer term, this new 'greenway' cycle route to Granta Park has the potential to be extended with further improvements beyond Granta Park. An off-road cycle path could be constructed along Pampisford Road – possibly as part of a bus road extension, or perhaps using the old rail line – to provide an improved off-road cycle connection from Granta Park to the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Abington Parish Council (LAPC) recognises the need to look for better options for public transport to key locations in and around Cambridge including Addenbrookes Hospital/biomedical campus, schools, railway stations at Whittlesford and Cambridge, and the city centre. Sawston and Linton are also important destinations for residents of Little Abington for shopping, schools and NHS Primary Care centres. • The existing Stagecoach 13 bus service is excellent. It offers good, regular access to Cambridge, including the hospital. It also links the Abingtons to Linton and Haverhill. • Collaboration is required to develop and implement a strategy to improve the road and transport network in this area, including on the A505, A11 and A1307. The recent approval of the planning application to develop the Wellcome Trust Genome Campus site at Hinxton makes this even more important. • There is an immediate need to increase capacity at the existing Babraham Road and Trumpington Park & Ride sites. They are often full by the middle of the day, leaving people with little option but to drive on to the city centre, adding to the congestion and then paying astronomical car parking fees which were imposed to support a strategy for reducing traffic in the city centre. • Cycle routes need to be considered. With the evolution of e-bikes there are more options for travel and commuting by bicycle. Cycle routes must also be maintained to ensure the safety of all users of these paths. • This is an extract from LAPC's response in 2018 "A solution needs to be found for completing the route from Newmarket Road (the old A11) to Granta Park. The route is used for cycling, walking or running by school children going to and from school or the School Playing Fields, local people and by Granta Park employees. Now that the landowner has closed access from Bourn Bridge Road down the Old Coach Road onto Granta Park there is no safe cycling route between Granta Park and the old A11/ Newmarket Road entry point to the cycleway. In peak hours there is heavy and speeding traffic on the Newmarket Road and there is no off-road cycling provision or, a footway on part of the route, . Although this could be added without substantial works for the most part, the bridge will be a bottleneck. A more feasible option is to route the cycleway down Bourn Bridge Road with a turn off towards Granta Park on the Old Coach Road which would not need much work to improve its surface. We understand this route already has an easement permitting access for people with a right to go to Granta Park i.e. employees, gym members and residents who might wish to use the remaining elements of the permissive pedestrian route. With removal of the barrier in Sluice Wood erected by the landowner this would reinstate a long established route for pedestrians and cyclists. There are PRVs on either side of Bourn Bridge Road. Although it would be a pity to lose them one option may be to consider using one PRV as a cycle route or possibly to take a strip of land from he fields so that the PRV provides some separation between the road and the cycle route. <p>We are concerned about routing cyclists through the village. Bourn Bridge Road, Church Lane and the High Street are not suitable. Routing a cycleway across or around the perimeter of Granta Park., on to Pampisford Road making use of the existing verges to make a multiuser path to the proposed new junction would be a better option. The excellent multiuser path around the Babraham Research Institute demonstrates that this would be feasible without jeopardising site security. It would also improve provision for pedestrians on Pampisford Road."</p> <p>PROPOSED ROUTE/STOPS. OPPOSE...</p> <p>...because additional consideration is required to ensure that these add benefits to people travelling to / from stops, particularly those proposed for Sawston / Babraham. Whilst the proposed route would run close to Sawston and onwards to the Biomedical Campus it is of limited value because it would not enable easy access to the centre of Sawston or to the medical</p>
04/11/2019	04/11/2019	69	O	Little Abington Parish Council	email	

04/11/2019	04/11/2019	70 L	Pigeon Land and Lands Improvement Holdings	email	<p>We are instructed by Pigeon Land and Lands Improvement Holdings to respond to the consultation being held regarding the Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) proposal for a new transport route linking the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to a new transport hub near the A11/A1307/A505 roads.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to comment on the CSET in relation to the land interests we are representing (Figure 1). The circa 200 hectare site, known as Cambridge South, is bound to the west by the M11, to the north by Hauxton Road and Addenbrooke's Road, to the east by the A1301 and to the south by the Cambridge Line railway which runs from Cambridge to Hitchin. Proposals for the development of the site to provide over 1,000 homes and 85,000sqm of commercial uses have been put forward to the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan Review.</p> <p>We recognise that there is an opportunity for CSET to help support the growth of Cambridge and its economy which are both important to the growth of the UK's sciences, research and development economies. We also welcome the indication that the authorities are planning positively for the future growth expected in this part of Cambridge.</p> <p>Principle of development</p> <p>The new public transport route proposed would connect a new transport hub close to the A11 (final location to be determined) with the villages of Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford. This route would then connect with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus on the south-eastern edge of Cambridge, and then potentially in the future on to Cambridge city centre via connections to the existing Guided Busway. The stop at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus is also to be linked to the proposed Cambridge South station to enable maximum connectivity between transport modes.</p> <p>The principle of the development of a new public transport route is supported by Pigeon Land and Lands Improvement. Its aim to better connect the villages to the southeast of Cambridge with key employment at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus through the provision of an off-road, autonomous metro system will reduce the pressure on the existing difficult highways conditions on the south side of Cambridge whilst also ensuring that Cambridge Biomedical Campus remains an attractive place to work and that Cambridge remains an attractive place to live. The growth of additional public transport routes on the south side of Cambridge are necessary to support the continued growth of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus as one of Cambridge's key employment sites and as a national centre for scientific research and development. The principles of any future potential connections from key employment locations to the city centre are also supported.</p> <p>Public transport infrastructure provision and investment also supports the unlocking of land to the south of Cambridge for the provision of housing. The affordability of housing is an acute issue in Cambridge and influences the attraction and retention of talent, and so new connections being offered in locations close to the city and to employment offer opportunities for housing growth in locations able to support sustainable infrastructure-led development.</p> <p>Wider transport proposals</p> <p>It is key that the CSET aligns with the other transport proposals for Cambridge, including the proposed Park and Ride at the M11, and the proposed Cambridge South station close to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. In 2017, Government allocated funding to support the development of proposals for the Cambridge South station, which would allow quick access to the city centre. This Cambridge South station is also potentially the linking point for East West Rail, which will once completed allow for connections to be made by rail across to Bedford and Oxford.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the CSET will have the benefit of linking villages, benefitting the A1307 corridor. There is also the potential to benefit the A1301 corridor through Great Shelford and the Hauxton Road/Addenbrooke's Road on the edge of Cambridge. The effects on anticipated journey times are clear and these are supported as it puts a larger population within a</p> <p>Please see the comments made below on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum (CLAF).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 NMU's even if there needs to be more than one crossing route. • The Nine Wells area paths are already well used by cyclists, pedestrians, dog walkers and equestrians with the permissive network and the existing RoW. The existing routes need to be protected although this does not mean they should not be realigned but they need to be available all users. This is a much used recreational area for employees from the hospital campus during their work day breaks as well as local residents. More links into the surrounding area and RoW network should be included in any expansion plans for this area. • It is important that any increase in on street parking associated with the travel hubs should not impact on local residents, including increasing the risk to children walking to school, the elderly, mobility impaired people, etc. • There should be consideration given to having a barrier between the NMU path and the vehicles on the busway, given the tragic accident which occurred on the Guided Busway at Trumpington. <p>The members of CLAF have filled in the consultation questionnaire, however have asked me to forward on the main points mentioned above.</p> <p>North Uttlesford Garden Community responses</p> <p>1st November 2019</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Peter Brett Associates (PBA), now part of Stantec, is acting on behalf of Grosvenor Britain & Ireland (Grosvenor) who have been appointed by landowners to promote through the Local Plan process, a site referred to as the North Uttlesford Garden Community (NUGC).</p> <p>The Site is located to the north of Great Chesterford, Essex to the east of the A11. The Site is approximately 470ha in extent and lies within the administrative boundary of Uttlesford District Council (UDC). The district boundary with South Cambridgeshire forms the northern and western boundaries of the site.</p> <p>Currently the site, referred to as the North Uttlesford Garden Community (NUGC), is identified in the Draft Uttlesford Local Plan where it is described as follows.</p> <p>North Uttlesford – The whole garden community will comprise 5,000 new dwellings, of which a minimum of 1,925 homes will be built by 2033 and a range of local employment opportunities and services and facilities including schools, health, retail and leisure. This garden community will maximise opportunities for economic linkages with the Wellcome Genome Campus and Chesterford Research Park.</p> <p>The plan was heard at the Uttlesford Local Plan Examination in July 2019 with an initial Inspectors response anticipated before the end of 2019.</p> <p>Response to Study & Consultation</p> <p>Whilst Saffron Walden will continue to provide an important local role for administration, employment and general services for residents in the North Uttlesford District, the emergence of a new community of the scale and location proposed at NUGC will help meet, in part, the housing needs of the surrounding Business and Research Parks and the significant job creation forecast to occur in the wider Cambridge area. Therefore, the emerging transport strategy for NUGC has, and will continue to, explore investments into delivering improved connectivity between the geographic area of north Uttlesford district, South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge.</p> <p>The above objective therefore clearly aligns with the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) plans to help deliver faster, more reliable and high-quality public transport links for journeys to the south east of Cambridge and therefore Grosvenor, in the context of the emerging proposals for NUGC, support the study and the associated objectives. These views were also expressed in the previous consultation of April 2018.</p> <p>The particulars of the proposals being consulted upon now are as follows and we have structured our response accordingly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the more detailed proposals presented in the consultation including Stop Locations for a new public transport route between the A11 and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus; 2. whether the proposals would positively or negatively impact on the environment; 3. the options for a new travel hub near the A11/A1307/A505 and the routes to them; and 4. new walking, cycling and horse-riding links. <p>1. More detailed proposals presented in the consultation including Stop Locations for a new public transport route between the A11 and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus;</p> <p>We continue to welcome the public transport route that now forms part of this further consultation. This would provide a new segregated public transport route between the A11 and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus via Sawston, Stapleford, Great Shelford with onward connection to Cambridge City centre. It would partly follow the route of the dismantled railway line. There would be a 3.0m wide multi-user path alongside the proposed transport route.</p>
04/11/2019	04/11/2019	71 O	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	email	
04/11/2019	04/11/2019	72 O	Grosvenor	email	

Figure 1 - [aerial map] Site location in south Cambridge context

					<p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above request.</p> <p>About Railfuture Railfuture is the UK's leading independent organisation campaigning for better rail services for passengers and freight. Railfuture is a voluntary group representing rail users, with 20,000 affiliated and individual members. ... Railfuture Ltd is a not-for-profit Company Limited by Guarantee. This response is being given behalf of our large membership throughout Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>This is our response: Railfuture East Anglia supports the concept of a fixed link between Cambridge Bio Medical Campus and Granta Park Research Park.</p> <p>We do not support the proposed preferred route that avoids the major centres of settlement. We do not support the proposed method of operation rubber tyred vehicles on tarmac, assumed to be initially buses but eventually by the so far untried, untested, bespoke CAM system. We do support the Cambridge Connect proposed of Light Rail Transit (LRT), it being environmentally efficient in energy and a well tried and tested easily implemented 'off the shelf' system. We do support a route from Cambridge South Station and Cambridge Bio Medical Campus (CBMC) via Shelford Railway Station to Granta Park (and eventually to Linton and Haverhill). We support the route that is LRT operated and parallels an existing busy transport corridor, the Network Rail Mainline Railway south of Cambridge railway station, the busiest in East Anglia because existing movement along this route will easily 'absorb' additional movements and noise etc from LRT....ie there will not be additional movements "in the landscape" as there will be in the GCP proposal. There will be very little new land-take is required compared to GCP proposal. It leads into a former and still extant transport corridor, the former railway line to Haverhill and Sudbury. This is "frozen" into the landscape already. Hardly any additional land take needed although in monetary terms this right of way will have to be purchased.</p> <p>LRT will serve the considerable population of the Shelfords/Stapleford and Sawston directly. Walking and cycling paths can be constructed to the LRT giving active health benefits. Connections are available at the adjacent Shelford station to a range of local destinations. Bus interchange is possible at Shelford Station for further destinations.</p> <p>We do recognise that: work will be needed to get the LRT through Shelford as it is assumed the LRT will parallel the NR Mainline. it is assumed there will be an LRT stop at Shelford Station. it is assumed that there will be an interchange between the two and that the level crossings at Granham Road and Hinton Way/Station Road will have to deal with. Here is my feedback on the proposed plans.</p> <p>I do not support the building of a park and ride on any of the sites near Abington.</p> <p>This is because of the vast size of the carparks being proposed which will completely ruin the rural aspect of the village, will create a high level of car noise, air pollution and significant congestion. We effectively become a car park for Cambridge and the surrounding businesses</p>
04/11/2019	04/11/2019	73 O	Railfuture East Anglia	email	
04/11/2019	04/11/2019	74 I		email	[name]
03/11/2019	05/11/2019	75 I		Facebook	resident ☒ Final chance for you to ignore us you mean? "Concerned about public transport in the Southeast of Cambridge? Cambridge Connect has made submission to the Greater Cambridge Partnership public consultation. Please have a look. You too can submit your views - deadline is 04 Nov 2019. Read our submission at http://www.cambridge-connect.uk/cambridge-southeast-busway.../ and read the consultation/send feedback at https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/.../cset-consultation2019/ More swathes of countryside paved over by the GCP.
01/11/2019	05/11/2019	76 O	Cambridge Connect	Facebook	Just start reusing the old rail routes for a tram system would seem the obvious choice but that's too easy for GCP Why bother when GCP ignores the public and does what it had already decided to do regardless? [name] because it's made up of unelected people in the 'old boys' network who do not have a grasp on reality. More money to be wasted on a consultation ,bringing in advisers who want to promote their own system. Have we forgotten so soon the complete cock up and rip off of the Cambridge /St
19/09/2019	05/11/2019	77 I		Facebook	ives Busway. Cambridge and commuting belt does NOT WANT TO GET BIGGER.
20/09/2019	05/11/2019	78 I		Facebook	Also the cherryhinton cycleway one big mistake
28/09/2019	05/11/2019	79 I		Facebook	Cutting 20 minutes off the journey between Sawston and Cambridge but adding 20 minutes in the Haverhill to Cambridge journey by closing the Linton dual carriageway. Great joined up thinking, CCC need to realise the problems don't start at Four Wentways and look further afield.
27/09/2019	05/11/2019	80 I		Facebook	Had one called the guided bus way
29/09/2019	05/11/2019	81 I		Facebook	Cambridge has a bus love affair which seems odd. The UK is investing heavily in automated personal electric vehicles and such technology already exists for rail based systems. But rather than seek to place Cambridge at the forefront of a technical revolution our solutions revolve around investing in the outdated bus. It will probably be diesel powered too. EDIT: Since writing this I have managed to open the consultation document. It would appear that the future does hold some degree of electrical powered automation proposal, so I happily stand corrected.
29/09/2019	05/11/2019	82 I		Facebook	[name] well that is up to whichever company gets a contract and that is only based on what is financially beneficial to them. Buying loads of brand new technology isn't likely under that.
30/09/2019	05/11/2019	83 I		Facebook	[name] Having finally been able to open the proposal it appears some degree of automation is proposed! [name] proposed is not the same as going to happen and some degree is not the same as a whole system. New things is the only real opportunity to try these things Disused railway line from Fen Ditton round back of Marshalls.
24/09/2019	05/11/2019	84 I		Facebook	Old Cambridge to Oxford line (abiet it goes through 'Lords Bridge' Radio Observatory) [name] plenty of old lines that could be used again to connect not just Cambridge but the county and the forgotten towns and villages Like we've all got horses! ☒
26/09/2019	05/11/2019	85 I		Facebook	[name] most of us don't want to have an accident with a horse or anything else. Separation is the answer.
26/09/2019	05/11/2019	86 I		Facebook	Maybe not, but those who do want to stay safe and away from the roads.
02/10/2019	05/11/2019	87 I		Facebook	[name]: There are about 25,000 horses in Cambridgeshire, and the equestrian industry locally - *excluding* racing - is estimated to contribute nearly £20 million annually to the county's economy. So we'd rather like to be included as beneficiaries of all this public spending.
27/09/2019	05/11/2019	88 I		Facebook	[name]: Separation of vulnerable non-motorised users from fast moving traffic is ideal, yes. But there's no need to obsess about separating different types of users from each other. As I've already commented elsewhere, Bridleways have been successfully shared between horse-riders, walkers and cyclists for fifty years (before 1968 cyclists were not allowed on Bridleways) without problems.
02/10/2019	05/11/2019	89 I		Facebook	Dont mix horses and pedestrians/cyclists!
01/10/2019	05/11/2019	90 I		Facebook	Why not? Fifty years of successfully sharing Bridleways between these three user groups. What evidence have you got to suggest there would be any problems with allowing horseriders to share the access with cyclists and walkers?
07/10/2019	05/11/2019	91 I		Facebook	
08/10/2019	05/11/2019	92 I		Facebook	
08/10/2019	05/11/2019	93 I		Facebook	
25/09/2019	05/11/2019	94 I		Facebook	
08/10/2019	05/11/2019	95 I		Facebook	

09/10/2019	05/11/2019	96	I	Facebook	[name] horse riders are unable to control their horses when in close proximity to walkers with their dogs and cyclists. My personal experience involves me walking my dogs and the rider could not control her horse and was thrown receiving serious injury, the horse had to be destroyed. The need to be kept separate, they are here in Newmarket.
11/10/2019	05/11/2019	97	I	Facebook	[name] many dog owners have less control over their dog than riders over their horses and that is a fact
12/10/2019	05/11/2019	98	I	Facebook	The only true long term solution is to get an effective light rail system in place. We are always putting sticking plasters on major wounds. Grasp the nettle for once and deal with the problem for now and the future. They need to connect up Chatteris and Sutton In The Isle. They are both very large and have nothing. Worse yet, they are filled with people who were once part of Cambridge and were priced miles out. It is owed to them to connect them back up to their communities and rebalance the huge inequality between the two regions.
12/10/2019	05/11/2019	99	I	Facebook	Curious to know what the speed reduction measures will be on the dual carriageway at Bartlow crossing????
13/10/2019	05/11/2019	100	I	Facebook	Tube Cambridge needs a tube, dig up the euro tunnel machine & get it running under Cambridge
15/10/2019	05/11/2019	101	I	Facebook	Monorail. Then we can get buses off lots of the roads. Most of the time I see great big buses less than half full, so smaller buses for lots of the routes and at certain times of the day
15/10/2019	05/11/2019	102	I	Facebook	Connections to Newmarket would be great. Newmarket is being left behind due to the self interests of some which is affecting the many.
20/10/2019	05/11/2019	103	I	Facebook	More money wasted
20/10/2019	05/11/2019	104	I	Facebook	Waste of time as GCP has ALREADY DECIDED what it will do, eh Mr Lewis Herbert !!!!!??
21/10/2019	05/11/2019	105	I	Facebook	Horses for all!
15/10/2019	05/11/2019	106	I	Facebook	Start growing the Oats then ??Oh Hang On !,..... we won't be able to, as they'll be building on the green fields or pasture land ??
21/10/2019	05/11/2019	107	I	Facebook	Why are CCC making the Linton bypass into a single lane when there is already a congestion problem. Closing the dual carriageway will have a greatly negative impact on journey times especially during the morning and evening rush. The 1307 is busy from before 6am
28/09/2019	05/11/2019	108	I	Facebook	[name] best thing would be closing the dual carriageway. People drive like idiots, overtaking in dangerous places, and slam the brakes on when they come to the end of dual section. To many people been killed on this short section of the road. So having it single means a steady consistent flow of traffic
11/10/2019	05/11/2019	109	I	Facebook	Causing congestion on main roads only pushes people onto the tiny minor road which also run through the villages. The rat run routes through Linton or Balsham have already seen several serious accidents so only a matter of time before something is more serious.
18/10/2019	05/11/2019	110	I	Facebook	Linton needs a bypass
22/10/2019	05/11/2019	111	I	Facebook	Useless CCC will do anything to upset motorists and prioritise cyclists, to be seen as PC. But now they want to look after horses too. No doubt they would love us to return to the days of horse and carts.
22/10/2019	05/11/2019	112	I	Facebook	Living in Newmarket with poor public transport links to Cambridge and the science parks, the provision of paths for commuting by horse is a Godsend.
13/10/2019	05/11/2019	113	I	Facebook	Even in wet weather opr Winter ??
21/10/2019	05/11/2019	114	I	Facebook	[name] NKT jockeys are a hardy lot.
22/10/2019	05/11/2019	115	I	Facebook	That picture needs more wildflowers please, not monoculture grass
24/10/2019	05/11/2019	116	I	Facebook	They could do with relocating the babraham park and ride to the same location of the transport hub which would further reduce cars on that road.
24/10/2019	05/11/2019	117	I	Facebook	Want a waste of money and time. Who will use it. Just build a dual carriageway from Haverhill to Cambridge. Problem solved.
27/10/2019	05/11/2019	118	I	Facebook	Nice to see GCP have responded to us all.
30/10/2019	05/11/2019	119	I	Facebook	So much for listening to what we have to say ☹
31/10/2019	05/11/2019	120	I	Facebook	Get the rail line from Cambridge to Haverhill restored, save the environment, improve safety for all and stop all the existing congestion
01/11/2019	05/11/2019	121	I	Facebook	How about planting more trees , and getting more people to start picking up rubbish , that so many just throw about , environment environment , before everything is gone ,oh and the council... just useless,
03/11/2019	05/11/2019	122	I	Facebook	Gonna have to get in place some serious Ragwort management first. Promoting Bridleways requires control across the board & when Road signs are overgrown to the degree you can't even see them, what hope is there for overseeing weed growth?
03/11/2019	05/11/2019	123	I	Facebook	They won't listen to anything we have to say so not worth saying anything unless your a cyclist of course
29/10/2019	05/11/2019	124	I	Facebook	Are you listening?...
28/10/2019	05/11/2019	125	I	Facebook	No point as you don't listen to the public in general. You just plough on with your ideas and only quote the few general public who do agree with you I think in consultation with the above consultation... We act for Axis Land Partnerships Ltd ('ALP') who have an interest, as land promoters, in part of the land across which the new public transport route from the A11 via Sawston and Shelford to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus is proposed to run. ALP's promotion agreement with the landowner means that they operate in partnership with the landowner and represent the landowner's interests in respect of any development related matters. I attach a plan of the land in question ('the Land') which, broadly speaking, is the land between the proposed Stapleford and Great Shelford stops. We wish to make the following comments in response to the consultation. ☑ Principle. Axis Land Partnerships supports the principle of a new public transport route from the A11 via Sawston and Shelford to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. ☑ Land ownership. Having regard to their legal interest in the Land and their role as the landowner's representative in respect of development matters, ALP would like to engage with the Greater Cambridge Partnership ('GCP') and their representatives to agree a route which works for both parties, and to minimise the work and costs associated with GCP's acquisition of this part of the route. ☑ Route alignment. ALP will shortly be consulting on proposals for a new retirement village for Stapleford in the southern corner of the Land. There are clear advantages for both parties to the location of this kind of development close to the proposed new public transport route, not least that the development: could improve foot and cycle access to the proposed Stapleford stop; would provide a group of regular users of the public transport service and the Stapleford stop; and would make for a very sustainable development. The route as currently proposed would constrain the proposed development and would need to cross adjoining land in separate ownership. A minor realignment of the route where it crosses the Land would mean that the route could be kept within a single ownership (simpler from an acquisition standpoint) and would ensure a site of sufficient size for the proposed retirement village. ☑ Stops. ALP supports the proposed stops on the route intended to serve Stapleford and Great Shelford and, given their location either very close to or on the Land, would like to work with the GCP to agree their eventual locations and layouts. As with the route alignment ALP's aspiration is to identify sites which work for both parties and to make GCP's acquisition of them as simple and a quick as possible. ☑ Bus connections from stops. ALP supports the GCP's proposals to review local bus services close to the proposed stops with a view to making the stops as accessible as possible for all potential users of the new public transport route. ALP considers that the proposed stops for Stapleford and Great Shelford are, broadly speaking, in the right locations taking into account the route selection and the reasoning for it. Linking the centre of the villages to the stops using existing bus services would maximise the scheme's usability and appeal for all. There is potential for these linking services to serve the proposed retirement village also, which would increase the feasibility and viability of the changes to the current arrangements which would be required. ☑ Landscaping. ALP supports GCP's general approach to landscaping along the route, around stops and at the proposed transport hub. The use of native species hedgerow and tree planting, wildflower meadows and new woodland integrating with existing woodland will not only present the best outcome for the local landscape but will offer the greatest biodiversity benefits. ☑ Biodiversity enhancement. ALP supports the GCP's aim of providing 10 – 20% biodiversity net gain as a key principle of the project. ALP will shortly be consulting on proposals for the creation of a new 50 acre country park for Stapleford immediately north-east of the proposed route over the Land, in conjunction with its retirement village proposals. It is proposed that the park will be landscaped using a similar approach to that put forward by GCP for the public transport route. ALP would like to explore the possibility of working together with GCP to deliver this country park. A partnership approach would enable the park to be fully integrated with the landscaping along the public transport route and would enable it to form part of the
04/11/2019	05/11/2019	126	L	Axis Land Partnerships Ltd email	land registry plan of land referred to in consultation response

Thank you for consulting Natural England on the Cambridge South East Transport Better Value Transport Project. Apologies for the delay in providing our response having only just returned from an extended period of annual leave.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

We note that the project consists of a new travel hub near the A11/A1307/A505, a new public transport link between the A11 and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and new shared use paths.

As indicated in our response to the initial Cambridge South East Transport Study Consultation, in our letter dated 9 April 2018 (ref. 238863), Natural England is fully supportive of schemes to develop sustainable transport proposals that will avoid adverse impact to the natural environment, deliver net biodiversity gain and improve air quality. We welcome that the project will enhance public transport services and has the potential to improve air quality. Whilst detail is limited at this stage it appears, based on the information available, that the project is unlikely to pose any significant risk to statutorily designated sites, including nationally important Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). However, this will need to be confirmed through the detailed assessment stage. This should also demonstrate that any adverse impacts to the wider natural environment including locally designated sites, Priority Biodiversity Action Plan habitat, other green infrastructure and Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land can be avoided or appropriately mitigated. We welcome GCP's commitment to ensuring that the scheme delivers a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain with a target of at least 20%, achieved through a scheme design incorporating new and enhanced habitats, connected to existing habitat where possible. Natural England particularly supports proposals to preserve the Old Railway County Wildlife Site, to enhance the setting of Nine Wells Nature Reserve through complementary habitat creation and to enhance accessible open space through the creation of linear parks. We welcome that the scheme will minimise impacts to local landscape as far as possible and that bridge crossings across the River Granta will be designed sympathetically with consideration for habitat and flood risk. We recommend that GCP take advice from relevant stakeholders including the Wildlife Trust and Council ecologists to ensure that ecological mitigation and enhancement to benefit locally designated sites and wider biodiversity is appropriately designed and managed to deliver long-term benefits for people and wildlife.

Based on the limited detail available we have no specific comments make on the three travel hub locations. Our advice is that selection of the most sustainable options should be informed through an evidence based assessment to ensure delivery of a scheme that will minimise impacts and maximise benefits to the natural environment.

A detailed ecological assessment of the direct and indirect impacts of this proposal, through the construction and operational phases, will need to be carried out. We would expect the ecological mitigation hierarchy to be applied to ensure that adverse impacts to statutorily designated sites are avoided wherever possible. Further information on SSSIs and their special interest features can be found through the following link: <http://www.magic.gov.uk/> Natural England will be pleased to offer advice on any matters relating to statutorily designated sites and best and most versatile (BMV) land, including proposed mitigation and enhancement measures, through our Discretionary Advice Service.

A significant length of the proposed route runs through Stapleford Parish and is therefore the most affected by these proposals. The GCP presentation gives only a partial assessment, minimising the issues and adding excessive weight to the claimed benefits.

We fully endorse the Response by Cambridge Past Present & Future and summarise our views on the proposals as follows:

1. Destruction of unique countryside and chalk downland

The proposed route will destroy open countryside which is of inestimable value. This is chalk down-land, high value amenity land with unique biodiversity and a unique setting for the Gog Magog Hills and Cambridge's green lung'.

A highly visible 14m wide road will gouge through the Gog Magog downland punctuated by bus-stop infrastructure and disabled car parking provision. However it is stated that 'the design would ensure it is integrated into the existing landscape as much as possible', thus providing only a vague and limited assurance on impact.

The chosen route heads north on higher ground; any route should take the lower ground to reduce visibility.

The current proposals make no environmental concessions through the Gog Magog Downs: as a minimum the route would have to be in a cutting to offer some screening.

2. Loss of greenbelt

The proposed route will destroy green belt which was designated to protect the rural setting of the village. Furthermore the busway will separate the village from its hinterland, cutting off local footpaths and bridleways.

3. A developer's charter

It opens the opportunity for developers to 'backfill' up to the route where it will be difficult to sustain arguments against development and the 'natural' extension of the village. Moreover it risks the viability of commercial farming on those fields that will be dissected and presents further opportunity to developers.

4. No connectivity or multimodal advantages

It 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 and involves an uphill walk of a kilometre or so: the existing no. 7 bus and railway service provides easy accessibility in contrast.

Furthermore the route ignores the transport needs of other campus developments such as Genome, Babraham and Huawei etc.

No consideration seems to been given to multimodal travel incorporating new bus routes and cycle routes

5. A light rail system is a better solution

Offering a bus-based system as opposed to a light train system is misconceived: it is an unproven system and its costing is opaque.

There has been a rejection of the railway alignment route after apparently a superficial review. It appears this was mainly due to running buses rather than opting for the much narrower

04/11/2019 05/11/2019 127 O Natural England [email](#)

04/11/2019 05/11/2019 128 O Stapleford Parish Council [email](#)

04/11/2019	05/11/2019	129 O	Historic England	email	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about the proposals for the construction of a new level road and transport route to the south east of Cambridge. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Therefore we welcome this opportunity to review the proposed options.</p> <p>We would refer you to previous correspondence regarding these proposals sent in July 2016, and April 2018, the substantive comments of which should be read alongside this letter. With reference to the correspondence of April 2018, please note that this consultation will be provided under the terms of the SLA agreed between the Greater Cambridge Partnership and Historic England.</p> <p>As with previous consultation of this type, we will not be providing a view on which option is preferred, but will instead consider what harm, if any, each option would cause to the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>Advice</p> <p>The consultation identifies three potential options for the provision of park and ride facilities and associated infrastructure to the south east of Cambridge near the village of Babraham, as well as a new off-road transport route from this park and ride site to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and a future Cambridge South Railway Station.</p> <p>Park and Ride Sites</p> <p>Option A</p> <p>The closest designated heritage asset to Option A is the Pamsford Hall Registered Park and Garden (Grade II*), which is separated from the site by the A505 dual carriageway, the former alignment of the Cambridge, Haverhill and Sudbury branch line (now a County Wildlife site), and an area of open farmland. The land is gently sloping to the north, towards the location of the park and ride site. Although the Registered Park and Garden is relatively heavily screened by thick tree cover on its northern boundary, we would note that various openings in boundary have historically permitted borrowed vistas from the open land to the north to contribute to the appearance of the parkland. Hedges along the A505 are also broken in this location to permit these views, although in more recent times trees have been permitted to grow along the boundary. We consider the potential for harm to be low, but nonetheless we would recommend that any landscape and visual impact assessment and heritage impact assessment undertaken as part of the planning process take this into consideration, in order to inform the design of the park and ride facility, to avoid or minimise any harm.</p> <p>Option B</p> <p>Option B is located approximately half a kilometre to the east of Babraham, which is designated as a conservation area, and which contains nine listed buildings (all Grade II). The development of a park and ride site could potentially have an impact on the setting of these heritage assets, owing to the additional infrastructure adjacent to the existing roundabout and, in particular, any additional lighting required. If this option were taken forward, we would suggest that a proportionate visual impact assessment is undertaken, including the effect of any lighting during night time hours.</p> <p>Option C</p> <p>The location of the parking area for Option C is not in the vicinity of any designated heritage assets, and we consider there to be a low likelihood of harm caused by development of a park and ride site in this location. We highlight, however, the presence of the Temple Café and Restaurant (Grade II) adjacent to the route of the Black and Blue routes. We recommend that a proportionate assessment of the significance of this asset is undertaken, with a view to informing how harm to its significance owing to development in its setting can either be avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>Following a meeting with GCP appointed consultants at Mott MacDonald offices on the 17th October and then follow up conversations with Hannah Burgess, we now enclose a consultation response on behalf of St Johns College to the recently published proposals relating to the South East Transport Study. We are aware that the closing deadline for comments was midday yesterday but Hannah confirmed that this deadline could be extended in the event that our comments arrive slightly later.</p> <p>Our response together with a plan showing the College preferred alignment of the route is enclosed and is based on the understanding that the proposed stop is located on the eastern side of Hinton Way at Great Shelford.</p> <p>We look forward to an acknowledgement of receipt of our email and being kept informed of the progress with regards to the project</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Garth Hanlon 5/11</p> <p>Garth Hanlon BSc (Hons) MRTPI Planning Director Planning</p> <p>Response by Savills (UK) Limited on behalf of St Johns College, Cambridge</p> <p>Savills (UK) Limited are instructed by St Johns College, Cambridge to advise on property matters as it relates to land holdings interests. As part of this role, Savills have reviewed the relevant material associated with emerging proposals in the context of the Public Transport Project for South East of Cambridge and have also had a meeting with consultants acting on behalf on the Greater Cambridge Partnership in respect of this project.</p> <p>The College supports transport initiatives in and around the City which enable people to get in and out of the City quickly, safely and reliably. Accessibility and cost are key elements in such a context and it is vital for the College that all staff, students and visitors can move in and out of Cambridge effectively and efficiently and thus the broad objectives of the public transport corridors are supported.</p>
05/11/2019	05/11/2019	130 L	St John's College	email	<p>[plan] St John's land & suggested alternative route</p>

				<p>Cambridge Past, Present & Future is Cambridge's largest civic society. We are a charity run by local people who are passionate about where they live. We operate in the greater Cambridge area and working with our members, supporters and volunteers we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are dedicated to protecting and enhancing the green setting of Cambridge for people and nature. • Care about Cambridge and are an independent voice for quality of life in the strategic planning of Greater Cambridge. • Are working to protect, celebrate and improve the important built heritage of the Cambridge area. • Manage green spaces and historic buildings in and around the city for people and nature, including Wandlebury Country Park, Coton Countryside Reserve, Cambridge Leper Chapel, Bourn Windmill and Hinxton Watermill. <p>Cambridge Past, Present & Future has considered the consultation material and has the following comments to make:</p> <p>1. Overall scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not support this busway due to the likely impact that it will have on the landscape of the Gog Magog Hills – both the direct impact (a significant new road) and the indirect impact (parcels of land severed by the busway adjacent to villages coming forward for future development). • The Gog Magog Hills landscape is a key priority for the greater Cambridge area for biodiversity, heritage and public benefit. As a charity we are working to try and reconnect habitats for people and nature in this landscape. • We are concerned that this busway scheme will be expensive, damaging to the environment and it will also under-deliver unless it is accompanied by traffic demand management and/or tunnelling for public transport (and at the moment there is no immediate prospect of either). • As an alternative, we continue to propose an inbound bus lane on the A1307 from Wandlebury, making use of the dual carriageway outside Wandlebury and the use of Wort's causeway from the Babraham Road Park & Ride in order that in-bound buses could reach the Addenbrooke's roundabout without being held in traffic. In conjunction with improvements to enable better access to the local rail network (Great Chesterford, Whittlesford, Shelford, Cambridge South, Central and North – or even by re-opening the Cambridge-Haverhill line). And by working in partnership with the business community to make better use of the private buses that are servicing the research campuses/business parks. All three can be delivered much more quickly, at a fraction of the cost, with much less harm to the environment – and when combined with traffic demand management will be effective. • We note that you have dismissed the idea of using the former Haverhill Line through Great Shelford and Stapleford but we do not agree with this assessment. No consideration has been given to single-track at pinch-points, for example. We accept this option may require some demolition / relocation of one or two dwellings - the question is whether those costs are acceptable in comparison to the loss of value of the Green Belt and the Gog Magog Landscape. The consultants have made the assumption that the costs of addressing the constraints automatically trump the loss of other values - that assessment is flawed. We would also argue that such a decision is political and should therefore be considered by the GCP Board not a decision made by consultants and officers. This route option would have much greater benefit for the local community and would significantly reduce the impact of the scheme on the landscape. We remain unconvinced of the autonomous busway concept for CAM and a light rail solution may be more deliverable in this location. We would encourage you to do all that you can to take forward this route option rather than the one proposed in the consultation. • We understand that the proposal on which the public is being consulted is a preferred route of the proposed busway without an assessment of the effect of using this route would have on the landscape and that the landscaping of such a route has not been settled. We can only go by the artist's impressions in the consultation document which, we understand, do not allow you the opportunity to respond to the Cambridge South East consultation. The consultation proposals are of interest to West Suffolk which is part of the Cambridge's functional economic area, travel to work area and Housing Market area. <p>As regards the proposals contained within the consultation, West Suffolk supports the project aims to provide better public transport and sustainable options for those who travel in the A1307 area and beyond, including the provision of a new travel hub and delivery of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro. West Suffolk has the following comments on the proposals: Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) – It is understood that the project proposals are part of the first phase of the CAM, with ambitions to extend the CAM to Haverhill in the future. Consideration should be given to extending the CAM to Haverhill in the first phase of the project, given the high number of staff at Cambridge Biomedical Campus who live in the CB9 postcode (as identified in the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review). Potential Locations for the new travel hub site near the A11/A1307/A505</p> <p>West Suffolk welcomes the new public transport route and provision of a new travel hub with the following specific feedback on each of the three options.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Travel Hub site A – feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Traffic from the A1307 would have to divert onto the A11/A505 to reach the site. b) Gas line and greenbelt constraints may mean it is difficult to expand the Park and Ride if necessary. c) Potential increased traffic on the A505. d) Out of the way/desire line for A1307 traffic from Haverhill direction. <p>Travel Hub site B – feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) On the direct route into Cambridge from the A1307 and A11 – welcome alignment, consideration should be given to a northern off-slip off the A11 directly into the park and ride. b) Concerns regarding additional traffic at A11 Fourwentways, and maintaining connection to the strategic road network at the A11 for residents and businesses east of the A11 including Haverhill. c) Site constraints (gas line) and River Granta make future expansion of this park and ride site difficult. d) Good location midway between Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park. <p>Travel Hub site C – feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The new off-road public transport route is welcome. However, West Suffolk is concerned regarding the impact of 2,000 additional cars on the Fourwentways roundabout. b) The location and access arrangements of the park and ride at site C should be modelled and assessed with regard to how 2,000 additional cars on the Fourwentways roundabout and the proposed new roundabout at the entrance to the park and ride could negatively impact the connection of residents and businesses to the east of the A11 including Haverhill to the Strategic Road Network at the A11. c) Consideration should be given to a park and ride site in this location located close enough to the A11 to provide a southbound A11 off slip directly into the park and ride. d) Site is not located in the green belt and offers the best opportunity for future expansion if needed. <p>At this stage of project development site and with the information provided, site C</p>	<p>[map] Farmland at risk of becoming unviable and potentially threatened with future development are highlighted in green.</p>
05/11/2019	05/11/2019	131 O	Cambridge Past, Present & Future email		
05/11/2019	07/11/2019	132 O	West Suffolk Council email		

				<p>I write with reference to the proposals being put to public consultation for the development of public transport infrastructure from the A 11 to Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The proposed infrastructure crosses land within the ownership of my clients, the Pemberton Trustees, both within and south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. They will also affect adjoining land owned by them.</p> <p>My clients are broadly supportive of these and other proposals the GCP has to enhance public transport infrastructure into the City where they have been stakeholders for many generations. They have some initial concerns, however, over these proposals and would like to highlight the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The route will have a visual impact on White Hill Farm, a valuable residential property. They are supportive of your undertaking a study to assess visual impact at an early stage and would want to see developed appropriate measures - planting, bundling etc - to minimise that impact. To arrange access for this study please contact Jeremy Pemberton. 2. My clients will want to be appropriately compensated for the impacts of the scheme, in terms of land loss and impact on retained property. This will need to take account of the impact on the value of White Hill Farm and the loss of valuable land adjoining Nine Wells south of CBC. 3. They will want to be reimbursed for the cost of professional advice concerning this scheme, from this stage on. 4. The use of the route should be restricted to public transport only. 5. There are a number of stakeholders with long leasehold interests at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus who have made significant investments into a site where world leading research is undertaken. Whilst it is expected that stakeholders will be supportive of improved sustainable transport options, there is a risk that widening the infrastructure corridor will impact on both the operation and setting of the Campus given the proximity of building lines to the infrastructure corridor and the number of services that run under it. If a widening to the infrastructure corridor is being suggested, then you will need to consult with Cambridge Medipark Ltd and the wider Campus stakeholder group around these proposals. The road is also a "blue-route" for ambulances accessing the hospitals and priority will need to be maintained for this. 6. The Francis Crick Avenue infrastructure corridor has been designed and delivered to provide a highquality Campus environment with a focus on "greening" what is the neighbouring harder and more urban campus. Removal of trees and landscaping and sustainable drainage features will impact on the environmental quality of the setting. Cambridge Medipark Ltd and CBC Estate Management Ltd (Management Company at CBC) will have to be consulted on and approve any design proposals to ensure that the Campus environment is not adversely affected. 7. We have recently been made aware of a separate public consultation that you have currently underway with respect to the 'Sawston Greenway'. We and the other campus stakeholders will be submitting representations to this consultation. The proposal is suggesting that a new 3m wide, two-way shared-use path is installed along Francis Crick Avenue replacing the existing on carriageway cycle lane. Any proposals to Francis Crick Avenue need to be agreed with the long leaseholder Cambridge Medipark Ltd who advise us that they have not been contacted to date regarding these proposals. We would also question whether/ how this proposal is co-ordinated with the South East Cambridge Transport Corridor proposals? <p>Yours faithfully John Sommerville</p>
06/11/2019	07/11/2019	133 L	Pemberton Trustees email and post	<p>For and on behalf of the Pemberton Trustees</p> <p>The University welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) consultation, Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project (CSET project). We understand that the purpose of the consultation is to seek opinion on the proposed locations of the new travel hubs, the public transport route, including stops and facilities, as well as new walking, cycling and horse-riding connections.</p> <p>The University welcomes the focus along the south east corridor and acknowledges the work undertaken to progress this project since the previous consultation in 2018. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of measures along the A1307 for bus priority, and improvements for walking, cycling and road safety; • The delivery of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) Transport Study, in which the GCP and the CBC partners have worked together to identify opportunities to further enhance the public transport improvements on offer through the development of this CSET project; and • The work undertaken to ensure that the proposals are integrated in to the proposed Cambridge South Station, and local communities through the development of walking and cycling links. <p>As you will be aware, the University is a major employer in the Cambridge region and around 50% of our 12,500 staff commute to the city from outlying areas. This has resulted in door-to-door journey times that, for many, are in excess of 1.5 hours due to congestion on the highway, poor connectivity/services on public transport and/or inadequate links to suitable cycling and walking routes.</p> <p>Peak-time congestion and poor connectivity, therefore, has an impact on the productivity, health and well-being of our staff, and the environmental quality of our operational sites. This is particularly evident at the CBC where, within the past 12 months, we have opened two new buildings dedicated to healthcare research.</p> <p>The University recognises that changes to the way people travel are dependent upon the provision of realistic opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport, and improvements to the use of technology. Transport networks surrounding Cambridge are often at capacity during peak times so solutions will need to be far-reaching and avoid simply shifting the issues to the periphery of the city and/or to more localised hotspots in the outlying towns and villages.</p> <p>The 'Cambridge Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Study' published in March 2019 predicts that by 2031 there will be an expected 67,500 daily trips to the Campus with over half of these made by car if no interventions are made. Sustainable access to the CBC and other employment sites across the city is a key factor, alongside affordable housing, to ensure that the University can continue to attract and retain the best staff. With the further predicted growth in and around Cambridge as well as the predicted growth at the CBC, improved connectivity proposed by the CSET project is essential. The University would welcome assurances of timely delivery of this project.</p> <p>The University supports the proposals presented as part of this consultation and further feedback is provided below.</p> <p>The Proposed Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University recognises that the proposed scheme will have an impact on the environment and, therefore, welcomes the work that has been undertaken to ensure that the impact on our greenspace and wildlife is limited by avoiding key conservation sites such as Wandlebury, the Gog Magog Hills and Nine Wells Nature Reserve. Accordingly, from an environmental standpoint, we endorse the proposed route alignment. • Assurance that the final scheme will be integrated, as much as possible, into the exiting landscape to minimise impact and support improvements to biodiversity is welcomed - as is the commitment to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain with an ever-higher target of 20%. • The University also welcomes that the proposals for river crossings would be sympathetically designed and that impact on flooding has already been studied with nil effect. <p>I left a message at the consultation evening in Abington on Monday.</p> <p>In case you did not get it, my question is what the impact will be on traffic going along Hinton Way, I was told that such information is available.</p>
08/11/2019	11/11/2019	134 O	University of Cambridge email	<p>I attended the recent consultation meeting at Stapleford, and have very serious concerns about this proposed project. In order to be able to consider the matter more thoroughly, I need the information set out below.</p> <p>I am concerned about the road safety implications of the stop along Hinton Way, Great Shelford, which is near the brow of a hill. Request: a copy of the road safety report which I understand has been prepared for Hinton Way.</p> <p>I am concerned about the implications for traffic and parking along Hinton Way. Request: a copy of the traffic report which I understand has been prepared for Hinton Way.</p> <p>I am concerned that the proposed scheme will lead to development on green belt and farmland, and understand from the consultation meeting that discussions have already taken place between GCP representatives and the landowners and/or their agents and/or potential developers. Request: a copy of the notes of all such discussions and meetings that have taken place.</p> <p>I am concerned that alternatives to the proposed route have not been properly considered, including running it in or alongside the existing A1307 corridor, and the reopening of the former Haverhill-Shelford railway line (for heavy or light rail use). Request: a copy of the assessments carried out on these and any other alternative routes.</p> <p>I am concerned that, based on previous experience including the existing Cambridge Guided Busway and other major transport and infrastructure projects, the costings of the project and the estimated passenger numbers on which the benefits depend are both too optimistic. Request: a copy of the current costings and usage estimates for the proposed scheme, including the assumptions underlying those numbers.</p> <p>Finally, I am concerned that the proposed Siemens optical guidance technology is not in use on transport projects anywhere in the UK. I understand that GCP has investigated its use in other European countries. Request: a copy of the assessment of the reliability of this technology, including any site visit reports.</p>
24/10/2019	11/11/2019	135 I	email	<p>I look forward to receiving the requested information within the period specified in the Freedom of Information Act. It can be sent to me by regular mail or by email to [email].</p>
21/10/2019	11/11/2019	136 I	email	