| Date          | ID    | O, I, L, P    | Name | Form of Delivery | Text   | notes/image |
|---------------|-------|---------------|------|------------------|--|-------------|
| Of            | e.g.  | Organisation, |      | (Twitter, email, |  |             |
| submission to | 1,2,3 | Individual,   |      | letter etc)      |  |             |
| GCP           |       | Landowner,    |      |                  |  |             |
|               |       | Public Figure |      |                  |  |             |
|               |       |               |      |                  | i strongly support the overall lace of bringing in bus traine from bubblanan and oranta rankin this way. |             |

|            |     |                |         | However, I disagree with the route chosen across the North of Stapleford and Shelford, and strongly recommend that you re-examine<br>the case for following the track of the old railway line in to the South of Stapleford and creating a single stop at Shelford station. On<br>environmental grounds, that will avoid the sensitive area around Nine Wells and will make use of the uninteresting land where the old<br>track runs in behind Stapleford. It will also mean that you only need to extend an existing stop, not to build two new ones, which will be<br>better for climate change. It will also enable you to use the existing bridge under the A 1301, where there is an existing arch built for the<br>old railway. Lastly, in terms of the two villages, you will be bringing the new busway through their existing centres, and not creating<br>extensions that will compete on their Northern edges. It will also be politically easier, because of that better integration. |
|------------|-----|----------------|---------|--|
| 19/10/2020 | 1   |                | email   | The costs of widening the track at the point where it joins the existing railway and runs through the station is likely to be less and less intrusive than creating the new route across the North.<br>I act for both Costa Coffee and McDonalds, both of whom are interested in opening drive thru restaurants close to the A1307/A11 roundabout at Four Went Way.  |
|            |     |                |         | With publication of the more detailed drawings showing the proposed travel hub, we note the access is intended to come off the A1307 just west of the roundabout over the A11. Both Costa and McDonalds would like to discuss the opportunity to provide modern new build drive thru outlets adjacent to the new proposed roundabout access in to the travel hub from the A1307. Could you let me know who I need to speak with? It may well be the landowner themselves in which case I'd be grateful if you could forward this email to the relevant person.   |
| 19/10/2020 | 2 0 | MP Real Estate | email   | Many thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.  |
|            |     |                |         | Where can I get all the information and make my voice strong enough to make a difference and STOP this nonsensical development?  |
|            |     |                |         | I have shared the plans with other local residents as well as friends and contacts from other parts of the UK, and they are all of a mind that something odd is happening for this to be the 'best solution' to 'a problem' (that has as yet be defined to my understanding).  |
|            |     |                |         | As this plan will impact the road I live on and apart from some developers engaging the local community some time back with an exhibition at Stapleford Rec promoting a load of unwanted local developments and alluding to the busway being related to their plans, the fact I have not been contacted and proactively given opportunity to comment or see the plans before speaks volumes. To a person, EVERY local I have spoken to is completely against this busway and the related developments. Village communities are the lifeblood of our country and culture, and merging them all into monster concreted conurbations is only to the benefit of the property developers and land owners who for many decades have been hell bent on destroying our green spaces in order to fill their already full pockets. I am not against progress, but I am against stupid decisions promoted for private benefit.  |
|            |     |                |         | SO, WHAT IS THE PROBLEM THAT NEEDS SOLVING EXACTLY?  |
|            |     |                |         | Presuming the busway is intended to provide faster access into Cambridge for scientists and workers at Granta Park, and potentially offering local villages better non-car solutions to get into Cambridge then there are surely better solutions than putting a scar through the middle of our receding local greenbelt.  |
|            |     |                |         | I appreciate that the Gogs Park and Ride is a joke in itself, claiming in neon letters 'a quicker route into Cambridge' where anyone can<br>clearly see that stopping your car there, waiting and getting on a bus only to queue up the same road you would have driven up 15<br>minutes earlier if you had stayed in your car is NOT quicker. So there is a problem, and enabling those buses to get into town without<br>queuing with cars or providing an automated busway that serviced that park would have made some sense. But no, the decision is to run<br>through open countryside over the hill from it, which makes no obvious sense, unless the Park and Ride is to close at some point,<br>replaced elsewhere on the A11. And it is not that long since a load of money and disruption went into creating a cycle path all the way<br>from there to Babraham, that is used by about a dozen bikes per day, along an existing conduit that serves Granta Park to Cambridge.           |
| 23/10/2020 | 3   |                | email   | This busway madness is so very disappointing. Ecologically destructive, shortsighted and just ghastly when there are other alternatives.<br>What a dreadful legacy to leave. @lewis_herbert @cllrbridget Could the route be all about infill development ?@GreaterCambs @  |
| 20/10/2020 | 4   |                | twitter | SCLibDems 🕲 🔊 🕲  |

ages/visuals Attachments 1

Attachments 2

| 20/10/2020               | 4 I          |                                | twitter           | SCLibDems 🕲 🕾 🕲<br>Wow. @Feargal_Sharkey No wonder river groups & residents not involved in @GreaterCambs Landscape & Ecology Group. Nor in GCP   |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 20/10/2020               | 5 I          |                                | twitter           | "Non Motorised Users Group" either. At consultations River Granta ( eastern arm of Cam) was not shown in photos. Have @SouthCambs<br>planners approved this?<br>Park and Ride is just a criminally stupid idea unless it actually serves the heart of the villages between its end points. This clearly doesn't.  |
| 20/10/2020               | 6 I          |                                | twitter           | And all that concrete where a railway could be? Disgusting. @SCLibDems shouldn't support this.  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | This busway, its associated development and the further development that it will encourage will permanently destroy the landscape and<br>environment in this area. The currently remaining green belt with open spaces make the villages in this area the villages that they are<br>and not just suburbs of Cambridge like Cherry Hinton or Trumpington. Assuming the expected associated infill will be as unsatisfactory as<br>the development south of Trumpington, this will be a very sad day for us all.  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | I consider that the Council has not considered the real issues. The need is for transport into the centre of Cambridge and not just<br>between the three Campuses, indeed even if the Council previously perceived a need for travel between the Campuses, is that perceived<br>need still present now that COVID has arrived? Changes to roads such as a bus lane into Cambridge on the A1307, or better still using the<br>old railway line, are clear and obvious alternatives to creating a new and separate busway. The proposed busway does not make more<br>efficient use of existing means of transport and itself is inefficient. Accordingly, the obvious thing to do is to improve transport on the<br>existing roads and to provide improved transport on or adjacent to the existing railway line and to reinstate a railway or tram on the old<br>railway line. Using a tram or railway would be much more efficient than a busway and this would be consistent with the Council's<br>objectives. I believe that ignoring further possible use of the existing railway line is not acceptable especially considering that a new<br>railway station near the hospital is likely to be built. As I have suggested before, moving the platforms at Shelford Station to the other<br>side of the level crossing would provide more space for a parallel train or tram track on the other side of the level crossing which I<br>understand was a major main reason for rejecting the use of the railway line before. |
|                          |              |                                |                   | Travel to and from the Biomedical Campus at Addenbrooke's hospital is restricted by the very poor road layout and operation around<br>and within the hospital campus and I am amazed that this has been allowed to happen. An obvious example of this is the very poor<br>traffic management system at the front of the hospital. I strongly advise that you do not permit any more development on the<br>Addenbrooke's site until you have properly addressed the immediate and long-term traffic needs on and around this site. Frankly you<br>should have done this when the site was first developed, as I was assured many years ago that you would do when the 'New<br>Addenbrooke's' site was first developed.   |
| 27/10/2020               | 7            |                                | email             | The (mis)guided busway, the developments on the Addenbrooke's hospital site, the roads on that site and around the development<br>south of Trumpington, the roads around Cambridge railway station and the changes to Hills Road are clear indications of the Council's<br>Further to my mail yesterday, having considered this further I consider that I must add that:  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | <ol> <li>If the main aim for developing the south east busway is to facilitate transport between the three campuses, the costs involved would<br/>be totally disproportionate.</li> </ol>   |
|                          |              |                                |                   | <ol> <li>Considering the map that you sent, it is clear that the busway will not directly serve the majority of the population in the Abingtons,</li> <li>Babraham, Sawston, Stapleford or Shelford as it largely runs across open countryside.</li> </ol>  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | 3. Although the proposed busway runs into the Cambridge biomedical campus, it does not connect directly to the Granta Park or<br>Babraham Campuses, so if it is used to travel from the the latter campuses to the Cambridge campus, all it will do is encourage more<br>traffic to get to the Babraham 'travel hub'.   |
| 20/40/2022               | 0 1          |                                | ow-1              | The better alternative which answers so many other questions is to provide a train or tram link based on the old Cambridge - Haverhill  |
| 28/10/2020               | 81           |                                | email             | rail line.<br>I am writing to express my concern at the proposals put forward for a new busway cutting across the land near Shelford and Stapleford towards the hospital. It will cut through a great swathe of valuable belt and countryside, destroying the existing landscape and opening the way for further unwanted development infilling the gaps. The proposed bus stop on Hinton way provides no significant benefit to the village and I cannot foresee many locals managing to use it. It will be too far away to walk to easily, and those already travelling by bicycle to Addenbrookes will continue to do so via the DNA path (as it is a more direct route) whilst for those in cars there will be no benefit over driving the extra minute to the existing babraham road park and ride. Adding extra delays to journeys due to a busway crossing down Hinton Way, which is already blocked around 20 minutes out of every hour by the train barriers would also be   |
|                          |              |                                |                   | problematic.<br>A consideration of a rail link utilising the existing track, and potentially running along the old train route towards Haverhill, linking to the  |
| 28/10/2020               | 9 I          |                                | email             | new Cambridge South station at Addenbrookes would seem to be a far more sensible approach. It would be far preferable to a<br>underutilised stop up Hinton Way, improving accessibility from Shelford and Stapleford as well as further afield, whilst avoiding such<br>irreparable damage to the countryside, and so I would urge further consideration of this.   |
| 29/10/2020               | 10           |                                | twitter           | The villages along the a1307 would love to have a railway. People have trouble getting out of there villages. And when there are accidents or roadworks car drivers use villages as a rat run.@RailHaverhill @GreaterCambs  |
| 29/10/2020               | 11 0         | Railfuture Eanglia             | twitter           | Reinstating the Haverhill-Cambridge Railway IS the way forward. The massive rural carpark alongside the A11 will undermine a shift to rail into Cambridge stns from the Bishops Stortford; Bury /Newmarket; Norwich /Thetford directions :all these railways undermined. Silo planning?   |
| 20/10/2020               | 12 0         | Smarter Cambridge<br>Transport | twitter           | The choice of route requires extensive engineering works to cross the River Granta flood zone twice (illustrated above). The rejected alternative route alongside the railway line through Stapleford/Gt Shelford would avoid one crossing, reducing the ecological damage.   |
| 20/10/2020               | 13 0         | Smarter Cambridge<br>Transport | twitter           | Better still, would be to reinstate @RailHaverhill railway all the way to a major town, rather than a bus-only road to a car park in the<br>Green Belt: https://www.smartertransport.uk/response-to-cambridge-south-east-transport-study-a1307-consultation-2018/<br>To deliver the best CSET scheme @GreaterCambs needs to re-examine the route. Instead of needlessly damaging Green Belt and   |
| 03/11/2020               | 14 O         | CambridgeConnect               | twitter           | precious landscape values, including @MagogDown it should reconsider the option of following the former railway route via Great<br>Shelford / Stapleford.   |
| 03/11/2020               | 15           |                                | twitter           | @GreaterCambs should drop the archaic "bikes and buses" just a slight advance from "horses and carts", and go for a light rail network,<br>and ensure that appropriate funding comes from the University Colleges that have benefited from the technology explosion   |
| 04/11/2020               | 16 I         |                                | twitter           | Don't let GCP knock down our homes! They've supplied brochures which neglect to say they would need to DEMOLISH OUR HOMES, and not had the courtesy to contact us at any point. Please sign the petition chng.it/DRp2xQ6yZ9   |
|                          |              |                                |                   | As a resident of Great Shelford I strongly disapprove of the proposed busway.<br>It does not provide a useful service for the people of Shelford and in fact It adds a barrier delaying travel along Hinton Way.<br>The railway gates at Shelford Station already create tailbacks at all times of day and night and to add to them with a new crossing is<br>nonsensical.<br>I would favour the old railway route despite its "pinch points" but surely the simplest and cheapest option is simply to use the existing<br>A1307 and the park and ride at The Gogs roundabout.<br>Widening the road in places between The Gogs and Babraham would be simple, while creating another park and ride site at Babraham<br>Institute and making a congestion charge for cars heading for CAmbridge would provide an excellent and less polluting alternative.  |
| 02/11/2020<br>03/11/2020 | 17 I<br>18 I |                                | email<br>Facebook | It is sheer folly to put a busway through green fields and across the busy roads leading to Shelford and Stapleford.<br>Leave it well alone and leave the ideas and decisions to this it will effect  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | Notice they've given up the pretence that the CSET project is anything other than a direct busway from a rural car park to the Biomedical<br>Campus.  |
| 10/11/2020               | 19           |                                | twitter           | Once it was the "3 campuses" link, now it's down to 1. Expect Granta Park to be running its own private buses for the next 25 years.<br>I wanted to provide some feedback on the above. I think on the whole this is a great idea and better connectivity to this area is long  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | overdue. It has always been embarrassing that it takes an hour by bus from Sawston to Cambridge. Therefore, a quicker route will become most welcomed.  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | I do however have the following questions:  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | Will some trees be planted between the new development in Sawston and the proposed busway? An opportunity to provide needed Greenery would be welcomed on this narrow bit of land left, when both the development and the busway have been built.   |
|                          |              |                                |                   | I don't quite understand why the park and ride aspect is on the Cambridge side of the A11. It makes more sense for it to be implemented as part of the fourwentways development. The infrastructure is already there (excluding the car park) and there is plenty of room at this location of the A1307 to build a roundabout, as a connector (instead of the west side of the large roundabout). This wouldn't require a further Bridge because a shuttle Lane over the A11/A1307 roundabout could be implemented before turning into the proposed busway route. A separate exit with signals could be put in place here as well to allow the busses out just before the roundabout as and when required, before running along a shuttle lane back across the A1307/A11 roundabout and right into fourwentways. This just seems like the best option for this location. It also helps to get a lot of the traffic off the A1307 before the roundabout thus reducing congestion on the roundabout significantly.  |
|                          |              |                                |                   | Am I right in assuming that this transport mode links into the Guided bus at Addenbrooke and continues into Town from here? It's still not clear that there is a link with Cambridge itself? Could this be clarified?   |
|                          |              |                                |                   | In addition to the above, I note the concrete viaducts that will be built to a support the two structures shown in the video. So often these large concrete/brick walls become graffitied which then becomes an eyesore. I would therefore suggest the introduction of green walls which helps with bio diversity but also stops any graffiti by covering up the walls.   |
| 05/11/2020               | 20 I         |                                | email             | I hope the above points can be taken as part of the consultation response. I would also welcome answers to the above if possible.<br>make it go elsewhere than slap bang in the middle of our countryside.<br>It is of topic, but really, park and ride? nobody is going to use it.   |

|            |      |                  |              | make it go eisewhere than slap bang in the middle of our countryside.  |
|------------|------|------------------|--------------|--|
|            |      |                  |              | It is of topic, but really, park and ride? nobody is going to use it.  |
|            |      |                  |              | If you still want to build it, not on the green belt please!   |
| 05/11/2020 | 21 I |                  | email        |  |
|            |      |                  |              | I object to GCP proposal to run busway across Greenbelt surrounding Stapleford.  |
|            |      |                  |              | The obvious route should be along a widened A1307.   |
| 06/11/2020 | 22   |                  | web feedback | ů – Elektrik                              |
| , ,        |      |                  |              | As long as there is FREE ALL-DAY car parking in the residential streets in the Queen Edith area why will commuters park at the proposed      |
|            |      |                  |              | A11 Travel Hub 9kms out of Cambridge???  |
|            |      |                  |              | Surely restricted parking on the southside of the city must be introduced before the Hub is operational.                                     |
|            |      |                  |              | In addition there appears to be no parking provided at the proposed new South Station, which again will further encourage parking in         |
|            |      |                  |              | residential streets without restrictions being introduced.   |
| 10/11/2020 | 23   |                  | email        |  |
| -, ,       | -    |                  |              |  |
|            |      |                  |              |  |
|            |      |                  |              | I believe that wherever possible cycle routes will benefit the cyclists if they can be weather proofed to a certain degree, we all know that |
|            |      |                  |              | cycling is not pleasant in windy and rainy conditions, and we revert to our cars leading to congestion.                                      |
|            |      |                  |              | I would like my idea to be considered of having wide lanes and hedged either side to a specified height and a rain canopy, i realise this    |
|            |      |                  |              | will be inappropriate and impossible in some cases but an ill lit pencil thin cycle way leads to frustration and could be counterproductive. |
| 10/11/2020 | 24   |                  | email        |  |
|            |      |                  |              | Two very ugly bridges to cross River Granta for @GreaterCambs environmentally damaging busway scheme. Who is funding River Granta            |
|            |      |                  |              | biodiversity plans outlined today by @CambsCC at @wre AGM? Landowner talked of Silicon Fen Life Science wanting to do their bit for          |
| 17/11/2020 | 25 I |                  | twitter      | the environment!   |
|            |      |                  |              | Awesome photo- such a special place! Everyone listening please step up to stop the busway @GreaterCambs want to run right across the         |
| 17/11/2020 | 26 O | CambridgeConnect | twitter      | Green Belt below this hill   |
|            |      |                  |              | Two ugly bridges to cross River Granta for @GreaterCambs environmentally damaging Gogs busway scheme. Who is funding Granta                  |
|            |      |                  |              | chalk stream biodiversity project? CLA President at Nat Cambs Workshop told @waterre AGM, Silicon Fen Life Science want to do their          |
| 18/11/2020 | 27   |                  | twitter      | bit for the environment.   |
|            |      |                  |              | @greenarteries agreed, economic growth is trumping everything here in South Cambs. You just have to look at the @GreaterCambs                |
| 18/11/2020 | 28   |                  | twitter      | busway routes and the call for sites. Is #Cambridge ready to sacrifice the Gogs and @SaveTheWFields Who benefits?                            |
|            |      |                  |              | Is this really what the Green Belt is going to look like?  |
|            |      |                  |              |  |
|            |      |                  |              | [image/screenshot from flythroughvideo showing proposed bridge over River Granta in Stapleford]  |
|            |      |                  |              | Why Spend £150Million on the new concret stucture when the existing road is shorter and already in existance?                                |
|            |      |                  |              | [Image/screenshot of interactive map showing whole route]  |
|            |      |                  |              |  |
| 18/11/2020 | 29   |                  | email        |  |
|            |      |                  |              |  |

|                          |              |                    |                   | Thank you for the layout. I am not against the actual proposal of the busway but I am strongly opposed the distance it is planned to be<br>from [redacted]. The developer advised us that it will be at least 150meters away and to find out it is 35 m is a complete shock.   |  |   |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|
|                          |              |                    |                   | I am strongly opposed to the closeness to [redacted] due to the risk of vibration , the noise impact every seven minutes and also the lighting 24/7 from the [redacted] stop.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | I would like my views represented at the next consultation and a request to increase the distance from residential properties by at least<br>100meters. I would also like to know what environmental proposals are in place to negate the noise, vibration and light what ever route<br>it takes past a residential property like ours.  |  |   |
| 24/11/2020               | 30 I         |                    | email             | Without a doubt , this is the wrong route for a busway. Deliberately trashing 2 village communities in the greenbelt and opening up the  |  |   |
| 24/11/2020               | 31           |                    | twitter           | fields to infill devellopment. @GreaterCambs have no shame. This and the SE busway are nothing other than environmental vandalism<br>@HardwickView<br>We are writing in respect of the above consultation, as the landowner affected by the two alternative options for the route of the   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | busway between the Park & Ride site and Sawston.   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | We confirm that our preference as landowner is for the original route (Southern route) rather than the new proposed route which runs closer to the village of Babraham.  |  |   |
| 25/11/2020               | 32 L         | Cheveley Park Farm | s email           | We should be grateful if you would please ensure that this is taken into account as part of the consultation process.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | I'd love to be able to offer some other "Greener" more cost effective transport ideas that could be an alternative for a more sustainable future proof plan.   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | The site off the M11 is not a bad location for the "park and ride" and the bus links are looking like they are already planned from Sawston<br>to that location. The access sites from Stapleford and Shelford are actually too close to the Hospital. If you are prepared to bike to the<br>guided bus locations you are prepared to cycle to the hospital. There would be no point in me cycling to the Stapleford hop on location<br>and waiting 10 minutes, leaving my bike there and then walking to the location at the hospital. Makes less sense if in Shelford.   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | It is such a short journey along the existing (DNA) cycle path I would still use that rather than cycle to either stop and leave my bike there.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | Long story Short.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | Save the money on the construction of the route through green belt.<br>Spend money on "Park and Charge" at Babraham. Offer the charge facility for future proofing the exist Park and Ride.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | It's greener and it's further income generating from and already good location to park and ride in to Cambridge.   |  |   |
| 25/11/2020               | 33 I         |                    | email             | Worth thinking about.<br>I have an idea.   |  |   |
| 14/11/2020               | 34 I         |                    | Facebook          | You stay away from any decisions, stop spunking taxpayers money on vanity and virtue signalling projects, oh and just disband and let<br>individuals who have been voted in by the public and listen to the public decide how money is spent.<br>[name] quite right. The Histon road project is a farce. You don't listen to what people what, just cause mayhem with badly thought out  |  |   |
| 14/11/2020<br>02/12/2020 | 35 I<br>36 I |                    | Facebook<br>email | decisions.<br>I object very strongly to the proposed route for the guided busway. It will desecrate the view from Magog Down.<br>The Magog Downs is a critically important nature reserve and should be conserved in all ways.   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | Please do not affect it by putting a busway through it.  |  |   |
| 02/42/2020               | 27 -         |                    | 1                 | That, in these days of conservation, would be horrendous and against everything we are trying to achieve   |  |   |
| 02/12/2020               | 37           |                    | email             | <ol> <li>Please select one of the following statements:</li> <li>I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative</li> <li>Cambridge Group, Ramblers</li> </ol>   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | Francis Crick Avenue<br>2. Having read the information provided on proposals for Francis Crick Avenue do you agree with the<br>proposed segregation of the cycling/ pedestrian path along the western side of Francis Crick Avenue?<br>IX] Yes   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | 3. Do you consider it is necessary to have a pedestrian footway along the eastern side of Francis Crick<br>Avenue between Dame Archer Way and the existing guided busway in addition to the footway along<br>the western side?<br>!XI Yes  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | 4. The proposed layout of the interchange between Cambridge South Station/ guided busway / Francis<br>Crick Avenue interchange is shown below. If you have any comments to make, Please write them in the<br>box below and use the numbering to identify the issue you are commenting on where appropriate.<br>LIGHTS ON THE DIAGONAL CROSSING SHOULD ALLOW TIME FOR THE LESS ABLE {Box 3)   |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | 5. Our proposals include a new avenue of trees either side of the public transport corridor and the highway. What is your preference for the planting along Francis Crick Avenue?<br>[X] New avenue of trees either side of the public transport corridor and highway<br>CLEARLY AN AVENUE SHOULD HAVE TREES   |  |   |
|                          |              | Ramblers -         |                   | Nine Wells Area<br>6. If you have visited the Nine Wells local nature reserve how do you normally gain access?   | 2 screenshots/maps,<br>showing footpaths in  |   |
| 03/12/2020               | 38 O         | Cambridge Group    | email             | D Via the DNA path* coming from Great Shelford<br>We note the introductory words from Councillor Roger Hickford, Chair of Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP's) Executive Board:<br>"We are committed to developing schemes that improve biodiversity wherever we can. This consultation is asking for people to look at   | the area                                     | HOBSON'S CONDUIT TRUST<br>SUMMARY   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | the plans to do this and I urge people to share their thoughts on how we can best protect and enhance the environment while delivering this transport project."  |  | The significance and value of Nine Wells and Hobson's Brook, with their tranquil, rural setting are very great, not only to Hobson's Conduit Trust but also to the City of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, within whose   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | We are pleased to have the opportunity to do so. Our comments and our responsibilities are directed towards the protection, health and biodiversity of Hobson's Brook and Conduit, and, as a body, we have for 400 years been concerned with the concomitant protection and enhancement of Nine Wells whose ownership resides with the City of Cambridge and the University and which, as a Local Nature Reserve   |  | jurisdictions they lie. This unique landscape forms an integral and historic part of the fabric of the city and its surroundings. It benefits the lives of both local residents and those who work nearby. The Trust's overall vision is to preserve and enhance the value of Nine Wells, to safeguard the flow of clean                            |
|                          |              |                    |                   | and place of calm and engagement with nature, is also a highly valued and venerable amenity for the local community.<br>We are delighted with this commitment by GCP to protect and enhance the environment and with the evidence, both in our discussions   |  | water from the springs, to protect the setting of Nine Wells and to preserve and enhance public use and enjoyment of the site.  |
|                          |              |                    |                   | with GCP and the Mott MacDonald team, and in the plans and published material, that there will be additional habitat creation around<br>the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, including that achieved by moving the route away from the hedgerow south of Nine Wells.<br>These elements accord with a range of concepts that were brought together in 2004 by a group of interested parties including Hobson's  |  | • Nine Wells is of historical, ecological, geological, archaeological and scenic value. It is designated as a Local Nature Reserve and a Local Geological Site. In the early 17th century an artificial water channel was built to take fresh water from the springs into Cambridge. It has fulfilled this purpose ever since. Within the site is a |
|                          |              |                    |                   | Conduit Trust and the City Council as a vision for a Greater Nine Wells, and these concepts have been the potential recipients of s106 funds drawn together by Cambridge City Council. We have recently combined these ideas and others in our Vision document for Nine  |  | <ul> <li>The land around Nine Wells, its setting, is of significant similar value. Hobson's Brook runs through it. Within</li> </ul>  |
|                          |              |                    |                   | Wells which is attached to this response.<br>In due course we expect to take part in discussions about the landscaping, planting scheme and proposed management and access   |  | it is the site of a Roman Villa (Scheduled Ancient Monument) and evidence for prehistoric settlement. The landscape's generally rural character gives it ecological and scenic importance.  |
|                          |              |                    |                   | arrangements for the proposed new areas of woodland buffer zone around Nine Wells, and landscape woodland between the proposed<br>route and the railway line, and the associated proposed species rich mixed grassland to be created between the route and Nine Wells,<br>through which Hobson's Brook runs.   |  | • The wider rural setting of Nine Wells is an important part of the green infrastructure of the county. It includes other sites of high scenic, historical and ecological value. The Trust would welcome more collaborative, integrated management of the area in the interests of the preservation of its character and                            |
|                          |              |                    |                   | We also expect to be involved directly, as has been the case so far, in any arrangements and designs for surface water, including for Francis Crick Avenue and the proposed drainage basin near to Nine Wells, in order to be satisfied, as the consultation documents   | A showing the existing<br>Trumpington Busway | <ul><li>public benefit.</li><li>Sympathetic management, both of Nine Wells and its setting, is of critical importance in achieving the Trust's</li></ul>  |
|                          |              |                    |                   | confirm, that there will be no deleterious impact on Hobson's Conduit.<br>As we have made clear in our discussions so far, our main preoccupation with the current proposal is with the crossing over Hobson's<br>Brook, and we are alarmed and dismayed by what we now see to be the width of the proposed bridge.  | Conduit                                      | <ul> <li>vision.</li> <li>A comprehensive and coherent management strategy is required for the whole area. This is particularly important in the light of planned infrastructure and building development in close proximity to Nine Wells. In</li> </ul>   |
|                          |              | Hobson's Conduit   |                   | We were given to understand that we would be consulted on the bridge design as this evolved, and were assured that the impact of the bridge would be reduced as far as possible.   | 1 map in attachment                          | order to improve the management of the whole area the Trust would welcome a substantial extension of the Local Nature Reserve.  |
| 04/12/2020               | 39 O         | Trust              | email             | We have now seen pictorial evidence that this bridge will be a far wider structure than we anticipated, and we are concerned that this,<br>RESPONSE<br>First, we wish to thank the Partnership's CSET team for the openness with which this major project has been conducted from its  | and its surroundings                         | 2   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | inception in 2016 to now. This is appreciated.<br>Support  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | The Association strongly supports CSET as the best way to ensure growing numbers of travellers to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus<br>and beyond from south east of Cambridge choose environmentally sustainable public transport rather than the environmentally harmful<br>private car. Traffic on our roads has grown substantially since 2011 and continues to grow apace due in significant part to the growth of  |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP's) target for traffic reduction would have required one in ten car trips to be removed from our of the growth of th |  |   |
|                          |              |                    |                   | roads at the 2011 level, meeting the target now requires one in four. The current traffic level is harmful to our community given the congestion and delay it causes to all road users including bus services, and through its associated air pollution, noise and environmental   |  |   |

|   |      |                           |       | degradation. The CSET traffic model assessments shared with the Local Liaison Forum in 2018 show that significant beneficial peak traffic<br>reductions can be anticipated from the project on the A1301 as well as the A1307.<br>Our support is not uncritical. Some concerns expressed previously have been responded to positively, for example on Nine Wells Local<br>Nature Reserve (NWLNR). Others remain, however, in particular on the public interchange with Cambridge South Station, connection to<br>the existing guided busway, linkage with the Campus's Transport Strategy and 5 Year Implementation Plan and construction impact on<br>NWLNR.  |                        |
|---|------|---------------------------|-------|--|------------------------|
|   |      |                           |       | We welcome the assurance that the CSET public transport service will operate 7 days a week, note that the hours of operation of the existing Guided Busway give an indication of the potential service, and that account is being taken of NHS staff working shifts. [GCP answer to TRA question 8 dated 10.11.2020]<br>Francis Crick Avenue (FCA)   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | Junction of FCA, CSET & existing busway  |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | The need for partnership working between the GCP and Network Rail (NR) is evident from comparison of respective plans for this vital   |                        |
|   |      | Tuunanin atau             |       | intersection. [The "more detailed view" on the ninth page of the CSET consultation document compared with paragraphs 5.2.11, 6.1.13  |                        |
|   |      | Trumpington<br>Residents' |       | & Appendix C of the Cambridge South Station Stakeholder Information Pack] NR's present plan does not make obvious provision for<br>CSET's guided bus only central lanes and stops or for the "diagonal crossing to reduce crossing times and improve pedestrian  |                        |
| D | 40 O | Association               | email | permeability" proposed by CSET. [Ninth page] This junction will be complex with significant numbers of pedestrians, cyclists, guided   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | I am writing with some comments on the proposals for the proposed new public transport route shown in your online consultation   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | documents.   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | My [redacted] at [redacted], Great Shelford, directly overlooks part of the proposed new road. I am [redacted] and my mother is [redacted]. Together we have consulted the available information and would like to share our thoughts on the proposals in the hope that these will be helpful to progressing the designs.  |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | In 2018 and 2019 I had the privilege of working on [redacted]. An aspect of this work was recognising the importance of maintaining the separation of one settlement from another, and of these settlements from Cambridge itself, through the retention of existing landscape and agricultural land. Cambridge and its surrounding villages form a unique and dispersed conurbation. The combination of world class research facilities alongside active farming is remarkable. At Great Shelford, the agricultural land separating the village from Cambridge has a special importance in allowing the village to feel distinct from the city despite its proximity. The continuity of these fields is important, extending towards Babraham Road and the Magog hills. In this relatively flat landscape, the small wooded hill north of |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | Coppice Avenue screens the view of Cambridge from the fields between Granhams Road and Hinton Way, contributing to the rural character and distinctiveness of this village edge.   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | In principle the idea of providing better connections between Cambridge and its surrounding settlements makes much sense, particularly<br>to reduce car use and its impact on the environment. For elderly residents of Great Shelford who don't drive and are not very mobile,<br>like my mother, there are limited options currently. Our comments are more specifically about the chosen route and the potential<br>mitigation of its impact on the setting, with a view to maintaining the remarkable sense of separation between village and city which the<br>landscape north of Great Shelford creates.   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       |  |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | 1. Near Nine Wells nature reserve the proposed route follows the railway line. It would be helpful to understand the reasons for not   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | continuing the route parallel to the railway, which would reduce the impact on the nature reserve further and avoid the need to<br>interrupt the landscape swathe which separates Great Shelford from Cambridge. Perhaps this was part of an earlier consultation of   | photo showing          |
| D | 41 I |                           | email | which we were not aware (my mother speaks limited English) but it would be helpful to know whether this was tested, perhaps with a   | muntjac deer in garden |
|   |      |                           |       | Survey does not include questions on the section between Sawston and Shelford  |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | We are surprised that the survey does not contain questions about the busway route between Sawston and Shelford. This is an<br>important section of the route as it crosses fields in the Green Belt and will be very visible from Magog Down. We look forward to seeing<br>proposals for this aspect of the project   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | Lack of connectivity between South Cambridgeshire villages   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | Cambridge County Council's transport strategy for South Cambridgeshire states a priority is to link villages with public transport.<br>Currently there are very few bus services between villages. However, the proposed SE Transport busway stations are very far outside   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | Sawston, Stapleford and Shelford. Residents of Abington would not use the bus service to get to the Medical Centre in Sawston, or to go  |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | shopping, as it would be a very long walk from the bus stop. Similarly, they would be unlikely to use the bus service to go shopping in  |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | Shelford. The bus stop for Stapleford is also a long way out of the village. The SE Transport scheme fails to deliver a basic public transport   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | service between the villages. Therefore, LAPC supports Shelford and Stapleford Parish Council's proposal that the busway be routed   |                        |
|   |      |                           |       | along the old railway line. Shelford and Stapleford PCs have informed us that they commissioned a transport report from independent consultants who state that routing the husway route along the railway line is fully feasible from a physical and engineering point of view.  |                        |

Improved landscaping of the entrance to the hub from the A1307 The entrance to the hub from the A1307 needs better landscaping e.g. a wide belt of trees to hide the view of the hub from the houses at the top of the High Street in Babraham.

consultants who state that routing the busway route along the railway line is fully feasible from a physical and engineering point of view.

Adding an entrance to the hub from the A11

There is no slip road off the A11 leading directly into the hub. Addition of this access route would allow vehicles to enter the Park and Ride without navigating the Fourwentways roundabout. The northbound A11 slip road is frequently congested in the morning, so addition of an extra entrance to the Park and Ride could help relieve congestion in the morning rush hour.

I believe a reasonable person would want to see the following issues dealt with in the environmental impact report for most sections of the proposed route

1. Water

1.1 The chalk streams to the South of Cambridge are nationally acknowledged as rare, to be preserved, and are extremely environmentally sensitive. Some are kept alive today by pumping water from the aquifer to keep them flowing.

1.2 The aquifer south of Cambridge provides for 97% of Cambridge's water supplies and has been reducing in level over the years. The growth of Cambridge is currently placing severe strains on the supply of potable water and future growth threatens supplies, as well as the flow into the Cam. The Cams Valley Forum research papers have declared that our water situation is becoming critical (ref their website). They have done the science from which this conclusion comes. The local MP Andrew Brown in a letter published on his website says he has been informed independently that growth is placing great strains on this basic

resource.

email

1.3 The impact of global warming is that there will be more transpiration of water before it reaches the aquifer and possibly more run off into the rivers. A small layer of snow this week ran off to cause exceptionally high river levels in the Granta and some field flooding. These higher run offs mean less water flows to the aquifer.

1.4 The provision of infrastructure uses water. Infrastructure facilitates more growth and potential use of water supplies. The GCPs aim is to create and facilitate growth for

Cambridge of which this project is part. Water supplies are critical to that aim. 1.5 The suggested impact does not specifically mention the run off from the hard standing of

the major car park and how this water will be stored to allow it to get to the aquifer rather than flood the river.

1.6 The report should examine this impact both from the amount of water used to build the Robo-tram infrastructure, if the concrete is fabricated locally. The impact should specify how the likely consequences of the infrastructure will be mitigated. It should also place in the

07/12/2020 43 I

04/12/2020

06/12/2020

06/12/2020

42 O

|                   |       | across a bigger network for passenger and freight users, to support economic (housing and productivity) growth, environmental                 |
|-------------------|-------|---|
|                   |       | improvement and better-connected communities. We seek to influence decision makers at local, regional and national levels to                  |
|                   |       | implement pro-rail policies in transport planning.  |
|                   |       | Railfuture has wide membership across East Anglia and particularly in Cambridgeshire.   |
|                   |       | We have generally welcomed previous 'better transport initiatives' put forward by the Greater Cambridge Partnership but we cannot             |
|                   |       | support this proposal that purports to improve public transport in South East Cambridgeshire by building a "busroad", across a nationally     |
|                   |       | sensitive landscape, from the Cambridge Bio Medical Campus to a 2000 space P&R site alongside the (M11)/A11 motorway. The latter              |
|                   |       | involves a large land take within the green belt near Granta Park. Whilst the Macdonald Report (May 2020) gives a detailed assessment         |
|                   |       | of the railway route, the environmental impact report for the chosen route has yet to be commissioned.  |
|                   |       | Costing £130m, this piece of very heavily engineered infrastructure is in response to the daily 2 hour congestion period on the parallel      |
|                   |       | A1307 highway. It aims to intercept car traffic coming into Cambridge from Linton, Haverhill and beyond as well off the M11/A11.              |
|                   |       | A. We object to this proposal as:   |
|                   |       | 1. It will not reduce overall car movement throughout the regional highway network. Rather it will increase it.                               |
|                   |       | 2. It will encourage a move away from public transport.   |
|                   |       | 3. Park & Ride sites should be sited to capture local traffic if needed at all.   |
|                   |       | 4. The emphasis must be on local Travel Hubs that encourage the use of local bus and/or local train services and active travel.               |
|                   |       | 5. P&R sites that can capture long distance car traffic will encourage more of it, which is wrong in the era of climate emergency and will    |
|                   |       | have the unintended consequence of undermining the huge investments being made in new train fleets and services. Long distance car            |
|                   |       | based commuting will be encouraged along the M11/A11 undermining the fast London King's Cross-Cambridge service as well as more               |
|                   |       | local services along the West Anglia Mainline, the Bury and Newmarket, the Norwich to Cambridge railway lines. Local bus services will        |
|                   |       | be further undermined as will the GCP planned Travel Hub at nearby Whittlesford Parkway.  |
|                   |       | Railfuture East Anglia response to the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambridge South East Transport consultation                            |
|                   |       | 6. The scheme has not learnt lessons from the Cambridge Busway – the scheme does not appear coordinated with other public                     |
|                   |       | transport. The busway had plans for feeder buses into the core network, but these have never operated.  |
|                   |       | 7. The busway and associated P&R sites – caused existing bus services to be undermined. For example villages like Hemingford Grey lost        |
|                   |       | commercially run hourly bus services to Cambridge and Huntingdon and now has just 2 CCC supported buses per week! This is a result of         |
| Railfuture Anglia | email | many previous bus passengers driving to the P&R sites. The proposed 2000 space P&R site will repeat this for villages SE of Cambridge.        |
|                   |       | Dear GCP  |
|                   |       | I write to object to the proposed profile of the planned route from Hinton Way/Haverhill Road to Sawston that will extremely adversely        |
|                   |       | affect the views from Magog Down towards the route. Although the plan makes a commitment to landscaping to minimise visual impact,            |
|                   |       | it is not clear at all whether the intention goes far enough to protect this ancient environment. Specific in-character screening using a mix |
|                   |       | of appropriate trees and bushes will be needed to eliminate the proposed adverse impact, with respect to the current route profile and        |
|                   |       | elevation, but will itself contribute an undesirable new component due to the conflict between the straighter path of the CSET extension      |
|                   |       | and the natural gradients, elevations and profiles. The Plan should be extended to include consideration of a sunken path for the             |
|                   |       | extension on the section visible from Magog Down.   |
|                   | email |   |

08/12/2020 45 I

07/12/2020

44 O

Stapleford Parish Council wishes to respond to the Environmental Impact Assessment consultation provided on the GCP website. Process

GCP has put the cart before the horse in leaving an environment assessment until after it has chosen a route. GCP has not undertaken an EIA as part of its assessment of route options and therefore cannot be inviting comments on it as part of this consultation. GCP has thus placed itself in a situation where, having spent a great deal of money on developing one option, it will be unviable if the environmental assessment is negative to the extent that GCP is forced to abandon this single option. In this circumstance, GCP has no incentive to undertake the environment assessment with the diligence and independence of mind that the importance of the subject deserves. Respondents are being asked to comment on the minutiae of how GCP plans to mitigate 'possible impacts on the environment'. This consultation has very little reference to the massive impact on Stapleford and Great Shelford and the Green Belt and indeed the route through Stapleford is not identified in the questions.

It is recognised that the GCP have regularly announced their plans but have never consulted on a choice of offroad route. Consultation such as it has been has been carried out without recognition of the valid concerns raised and in particular that a less environmentally damaging route is available and fully feasible.

The alternative railway alignment route. Stapleford and Gt Shelford Parish Councils have commissioned an independent report from transport consultant iTransport. This concludes that the Shelford railway alignment route 'is a technically feasible alternative to the preferred route' and demonstrates that the criteria for the chosen route are invalid and demonstrates a failure of process. Sustainability and multi modal transport

In undertaking the assessment, GCP's modelling should be informed by the strategic principles that GCP claims inform its policies and their decisions. These principles include sustainability, reduction of congestion and pollution and the offer of multimodal travel. The concept of CSET involves building a 2,000 space car park which will act like a magnet drawing people into their cars from the

| 08/12/2020 | 46 O | Stapleford Parish<br>Council | email | surrounding villages and towns and thus reducing the viability of local public transport. Instead of enhancing sustainability a 20th Century<br>Park & Ride scheme is being developed which offers a more regular system of travel when compared to the existing services. Rather than<br>reducing car travel it increases car travel and carbon.<br>In reality, GCP's chosen route will also transfer much of the congestion and pollution on the largely rural A1307 to the residential villages<br>of Stapleford and Great Shelford, with a significant detrimental impact on air quality, congestion, ease of vehicular movement, noise,<br>parking, and the local street scene. This detrimental impact will be caused by two factors, firstly with fly parking around the bus stops on<br>country lanes: commuters will want to drive from the surrounding villages to as near to Cambridge as possible to pick up the bus, and  |
|------------|------|------------------------------|-------|--|
|            |      |                              |       | Thank you for providing Natural England with the opportunity to comment on the above in your email of 19 October 2020.<br>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved,<br>enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.<br>Our comments below reflect those provided in response to the Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit's Environmental Impact<br>Assessment (EIA) Scoping consultation in our letter dated 30 October 2020 (ref. 331107).<br>As indicated in our response to the statutory consultation the proposed scheme appears unlikely to pose any direct risk to statutorily<br>designated sites or landscapes. However, the EIA will need to have regard to Natural England's advice on bat survey work and<br>assessment, provided in our letter dated 13 July 2020 (ref. DAS/14298/320123). Consideration will need to be given to any habitat that<br>may be important to the maintenance of the barbastelle bat population of Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation<br>(SAC). Impacts to habitat that is functionally linked to the SAC will require consideration within the context of the requirements of the<br>Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). On this basis Natural England welcomes that a Habitats<br>Regulations Assessment (HRA) report is<br>being produced in parallel to the EIA process.   |
| 09/12/2020 | 47 O | Natural England              | email | We support proposals to implement mitigation measures, including buffer zones, to protect locally designated wildlife sites such as Nine<br>Wells Local Nature Reserve (LNR), the River Granta County Wildlife Site (CWS) and protected species. We support GCP in working with<br>the City Council and other stakeholders to identify significant opportunities to help with delivery of certain elements of the management<br>plan for the Nine Wells LNR including woodland buffer planting, scrub and grassland planting and measures to benefit groundwater<br>supply to the site and public access enhancements. Proposed measures elsewhere within the scheme, for example to maintain and<br>enhance biodiversity and public access, are supported. Our advice is that landscape and visual screen planting, for example at bus stops<br>and around the Travel Hub, should aim to deliver biodiversity enhancements through the use of native local provenance species, with<br>consideration given to connecting hedgerows, tree belts and grassland planting to existing habitat.<br>Natural England welcomes proposals for appropriate environmental mitigation and landscaping along the route with an aspiration to<br>deliver 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) which will make a useful contribution towards Cambridgeshire's Doubling Nature target. Our<br>advice is that consideration should be given to buffering, enhancing and connecting existing sites such as Nine Wells Nature Reserve and<br>delivering benefits for priority chalk grassland and woodland habitats and farmland birds.<br>We support the inclusion of an Active Travel Path alongside most of the CSET Scheme suitable for all types of user including pedestrians,<br>cyclists and equestrians and connected to the wider network. This is likely to provide a range of recreation, health and access benefits as |
|            |      |                              |       | On Saturday December following a flurry of snow and a day of light rain and drizzle the Granta normally a quiet river swelled to worrying<br>heights.<br>On Clerks piece just below Stapleford Bridge, the weir was completely submerged and the water level was continuous either side,. The<br>reading on the measuring stick was 11, which was the highest reading possible.  |
|            |      |                              |       | Under Stapleford Bridge, The water was high up the rounded arches. If the water was higher the excess water would have less chance of getting through as the rounding of the arch would restrict it.   |
|            |      |                              |       | That could cause flooding. There is not much margin of safety here. London Road and Bury road junction has been previously flooded. As has Clerks Pieces and the bank opposite.  |
|            |      |                              |       | Upstream, on Saturday, by the wooden Bridleway bridge there was flooding some 20 yards into the field on the Sawston side. The path beside the wood to the second upstream bridge on the public footpath was impassable with flooding. From the second bridge, the fields on the A1307 side were flooded up to 30 yards. Further upstream where the path winds back along the river, the water was only a couple of inches below the Sawston bank.   |
|            |      |                              |       | Global warning will result in more short and heavy deluges in winter (and dry summers) resulting in more water trying to get down the river. It would not have taken much more flow for a real problem to occur on Saturday.   |
|            |      |                              |       | The worry is that a large car park in Babraham will lead to some run off into the river and this will create flooding. If it stayed unbuilt land there is a prospect the water rush will be delayed.   |
|            |      |                              |       | Please ensure the designers take this into account and stop immediate, and even slightly delayed run off into the river. Also please ensure the public are assured that this has been done.  |
| 09/12/2020 | 48 I |                              | email |  |

09/12/2020 48 I

|                          |              |                                     |                            | It won't be the same after @GreaterCambs are done with imposing their swath of tarmac busway below @MagogDown support  |  |   |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| 06/12/2020               | 49 O         | CambridgeConnect                    | twitter                    | @MagogDown, @cppf_pc, local Parishes, @RailfutureEA @SmarterCam & @CBG_Connect in resisting their scheme. Public comments<br>open to 14 Dec.   |  |   |
| 06/12/2020               | 50 I         |                                     | twitter                    | I wonder how much damage was done to the Gog Magogs when the a604 was originally built in the 1960s  |  |   |
| 07/12/2020               | E1 I         |                                     | twitter                    | Can someone explain what South-East bus route is meant to do? Doesnt even connect to Babraham village let alone anywhere helpful like Babraham Institute. Soweten, Stapleford or Shelford? You might as well drive or take the train as welk to the bus stop.  |  |   |
| 07/12/2020               | 51           |                                     | twitter                    | like Babraham Institute, Sawston, Stapleford or Shelford? You might as well drive or take the train as walk to the bus stop.   |  |   |
| 09/12/2020<br>09/12/2020 | 52 I<br>53 I |                                     | twitter<br>twitter         | Given how many problems the A14 has daily and how many queues there on other roads at rush hour Cambridge needs a rail link.After<br>all you cant solve road traffic issues by building more roads.@RailHaverhill @GreaterCambs @RailfutureEA<br>A rail link to Haverhill is an absolute no-brainer  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Secondly the River Granta, current overall environmental health "Moderate" Reasons for not reaching 'Good' status attached. (2/3)  |  |   |
| 09/12/2020               | 54           |                                     | twitter                    | Obviously I'm curious how you can grade a river as 'Moderate' in 2019 when there was actually little if any water in?<br>Regarding @CambsCC chalk stream project for improving River Granta biodiversity? @GreaterCambs PROPOSED CAMBRIDGE SOUTH<br>EAST TRANSPORT (PHASE 2) SCHEME https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/CSET-Phase-2-Environmental-scoping-opinion-  |  |   |
| 09/12/2020<br>08/12/2020 | 55 I<br>56 I |                                     | twitter<br><u>Facebook</u> | DfT.pdf  |  |   |
| 00, 11, 2020             |              |                                     |                            | You mean the final week of your virtue signalling and pretending you care what the public think  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Please note that we are awaiting the 'Historic Environment Record' for the 59 recorded archaeological 'events' within 500m of [redacted], which will be provided on receipt.   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Cambridge South East Transport consultation  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | We are instructed by [redacted] of [redacted], Babraham on the consultation<br>for the design of the above scheme proposals, including mitigating impacts on landscape and   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | the environment. This letter provides a summary of [redacted] position and greater detail is   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | provided in his detailed consultation response appended to this letter. We also refer to the<br>independent Heritage Impact Assessment ('the HIA') (dated November 2020), which forms  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | part of our client's representations.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | In short, the GCP had previously consulted on detailed route sections and because of that<br>process, had endorsed route ('the brown route'). The current consultation includes a  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | significant change in the proposed route, ('the alternative route'), for reasons which are   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | unclear1. The suggested alternative route passes metres away from our client's property, a nationally important Grade II listed heritage asset and significantly closer than the approved  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | brown route2.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Should the alternative route be retained, it will have a detrimental impact on the significance  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | of a nationally important heritage asset, as explained in the appended HIA. Furthermore, the<br>1 The GCP has been reporting the change was to reduce the impact on farm operations and to minimise  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | the impact of field severance. However, the landowner and farm operator have actively opposed the alteration.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | 2 As set out in the HIA, the endorsed brown route passed approximately 290m from the south boundary of our client's garden, compared to the 36m distance of the alternative route.   | a number of images   |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | 2<br>proposals of bunding to reduce the impacts on amenity and heritage are likely to cause  | supplied and<br>referenced within the  | Attachment - Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record supplied to project |
| 09/12/2020               | 57 I         |                                     | email                      | greater impact to the heritage sites rather than reduce the harm3.   | submission Attachment - Heritage Imapct assesment - supplied to project team | team  |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | where they live. We operate in the greater Cambridge area and working with our members, supporters and volunteers we: • 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  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Cambridge Past, Present & Future has considered the consultation material and has the following comments to make:  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | 1. GCP Transport Strategy - Busways<br>We understand the justifications for the CSET and other busway projects are that:   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | <ul> <li>Demand to travel into Cambridge will continue to grow as more houses and jobs come to the region.</li> <li>Roads into Cambridge will, for the foreseeable future, continue to be congested with private, mostly solo-occupancy, cars at peak</li> </ul>   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | times.   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | • Building new bus-only roads into the city, and bus lanes within the city, are the only measures available to the GCP to give buses a time advantage relative to private cars stuck in congestion.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | However we challenge those justifications because:<br>1. Demand management measures, which are part of GCP's City Access programme, are an alternative way to shift incentives in favour of  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | public and active transport. With only a small reduction in the number of peak-time trips by private vehicles into Cambridge, there would  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | be little congestion. In that case, existing roads would have sufficient capacity to carry all public, private and commercial vehicles.<br>The covid pandemic has demonstrated that when car use is reduced there is a fast and reliable bus service.  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Cambridge Past, Present & Future   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Wandlebury Country Park<br>Cambridge CB22 3AE  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            |  |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | Phone 01223 - 243830   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | www.cambridgeppf.org   |  |   |
|                          |              |                                     |                            | www.cambridgeppf.org<br>Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No<br>204121.  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | Cambridge Past,<br>Present & Future | email                      | www.cambridgeppf.org<br>Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No<br>204121.<br>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | www.cambridgeppf.org<br>Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No<br>204121.  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | www.cambridgeppf.org<br>Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No<br>204121.<br>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the<br>County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | www.cambridgeppf.org<br>Cambridge Past, Present & Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No<br>204121.<br>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the<br>County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.<br>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.   |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I</li> </ul>   |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> </ul>  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> </ul>   |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> </ul>  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport</li> <li>Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted] Introduction</li> <li>I am writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public</li> </ul>   |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted] Introduction</li> </ul>   |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgepf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport</li> <li>Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted]</li> <li>Introduction</li> <li>I am writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public</li> <li>Consultation 2020. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granham's Road, Great Shelford.</li> <li>For the last nine years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine</li> </ul>  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport</li> <li>Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted]</li> <li>Introduction</li> <li>I an writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public</li> <li>Consultation 2020. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granham's Road, Great Shelford.</li> <li>For the last nine years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine</li> <li>Wells Local Nature Reserve, which includes the fields that would be impacted by the busway. I use a combination of methodologies from the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) Breeding Bird Survey, the</li> </ul>  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport</li> <li>Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted]</li> <li>Introduction</li> <li>I an writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public</li> <li>Consultation 2020. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that</li> <li>runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granham's Road, Great Shelford.</li> <li>For the last nine years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine</li> <li>Wells Local Nature Reserve, which includes the fields that would be impacted by the busway. I use a</li> <li>combination of methodologies from the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) Breeding Bird Survey, the</li> <li>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Volunteer and Farmer Alliance and, more recently, the</li> </ul>  |  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport</li> <li>Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted]</li> <li>Introduction</li> <li>I an writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public</li> <li>Consultation 2020. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granham's Road, Great Shelford.</li> <li>For the last nine years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine</li> <li>Wells Local Nature Reserve, which includes the fields that would be impacted by the busway. I use a combination of methodologies from the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) Breeding Bird Survey, the</li> <li>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Volunteer and Farmer Alliance and, more recently, the</li> <li>UK Butterfly Monitoring Scheme (UKBMS). My submissions to the BTO and UKBMS also record mammal and dragonfly populations.</li> </ul>                     | submission contains  |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgepf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport</li> <li>Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted]</li> <li>Introduction</li> <li>I am writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public</li> <li>Consultation 2020. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granham's Road, Great Shelford.</li> <li>For the last nine years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine</li> <li>Wells Local Nature Reserve, which includes the fields that 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 marmal and dragonfly populations.</li> <li>The fields I survey support im</li></ul> | images showing   |   |
|                          |              | <b>e</b> .                          | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgeppf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport</li> <li>Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted]</li> <li>Introduction</li> <li>I am writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public Consultation 2020. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granham's Road, Great Shelford.</li> <li>For the last nine years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine</li> <li>Wells Local Nature Reserve, which includes the fields that 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 marmal and dragonfly populations.</li> <li>The fields I survey support important</li></ul>  | images showing<br>animals and a map,<br>both as described                    |   |
| 10/12/2020               | 58 O         | Present & Future                    | email                      | <ul> <li>www.cambridgepf.org</li> <li>Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future — The local charity that cares about Cambridge and its green landscapes Registered Charity No 204121.</li> <li>2. Since the Bus Services Act 2018 was passed, the Combined Authority can exercise much greater control over bus services than the County Council could when the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was adopted.</li> <li>between the biomedical campus and Granham's Road.</li> <li>As I commented during the recent webinar, while I would obviously have prefered a route that would lead to less habitat fragmentation and disruption for the area I study, the new proposed route is a significant improvement over that proposed last year and does offer some potential benefits to wildlife.</li> <li>I also attach an interim draft of my surveys for this year. In practice I don't think this will change in any significant way by the time I produce the final draft in January.</li> <li>Do contact me if I can provide any further information.</li> <li>GCP Cambridge South East Transport Response to 2020 consultation from [redacted] Introduction</li> <li>I am writing in response to the Cambridge South East Transport - Better Public Transport Project Public Consultation 2020. My response is principally concerned with the section of the proposed busway that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Granham's Road, Great Shelford.</li> <li>For the last nine years I have been conducting ecological surveys of the arable fields around the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, which includes the fields that would be impacted by the busway. Luse a combination of methodologies from the British Trus for Ornithology (BD) 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.</li> <li>The Fields 1 survey support important breeding populations of threate</li></ul> | images showing<br>animals and a map,   |   |

|                             | As the County Access & Bridleways Officer for Cambridgeshire, I represent the riders and owners of the approximately 25,500 horses (excluding the racing industry) in Cambridgeshire on behalf of the British Horse Society. This response is therefore a Stakeholder        |
|-----------------------------|--|
|                             | Response from a specific user group.   |
|                             | This response is provided with the benefit of a recent Stakeholder Engagement meeting with the GCP CSETS Team.   |
|                             | We very much support the principle of an Active Travel route for all NMU users alongside the new transport corridor.   |
|                             | Major Concerns:  |
|                             | Location of Active Travel Path within the route  |
|                             | Having reviewed the consultation documents, our view is that the Active Travel route should be located on the eastern side of the path –   |
|                             | for clarification we mean the side nearest to the A1307.   |
|                             | The reasons for this option:   |
|                             | • The current design of the stops takes the Active Travel route through the stop between the passengers alighting / disembarking from the bus and the car parking / drop off area. This is not good design and could result in accidents – particularly between cyclists and |
|                             | pedestrians. If the Active Travel path were on the opposite of the busway route, cyclists, horse riders, dogs, walkers, other active travel  |
|                             | modes would not become embroiled in the path of the passengers.  |
|                             | <ul> <li>Commuter cyclists would have a less interrupted journey although we do not wish this to be seen as an opportunity for increased cycle<br/>speed.</li> </ul>   |
|                             | <ul> <li>Security for properties adjacent to the busway – we suspect that having people passing close to their property could be seen as a disadvantage for householders.</li> </ul>   |
|                             | • A more pleasant and rural feel to the route for leisure active travellers with open views towards the Magog Hills not marred by passing high speed buses.  |
|                             | <ul> <li>At Sawston, there would be a direct link on to the roadside Active Travel route without the need to cross the busway.</li> </ul>  |
|                             | • At Stapleford a direct link on to the existing Active travel route up to Magog Down with its proposed new extension in the Haverhill   |
|                             | Road crossing project giving access to Wandlebury.   |
|                             | • At Nine Wells, a crossing is already proposed to link with the existing permissive path network which would mean those wanting to  |
|                             | stay on the rural routes would not need to cross the busway. Those needing to cross from Cambridge South already have a crossing   |
| British Horse Society email | proposed. The DNA path to Shelford would serve those wanting to travel in that direction.  |
|                             | I live in Babraham and I've just looked at the proposed transport development. Frankly I'm shocked that so much green field would be   |
|                             | torn up and ruined by this proposed development. I chose to live in Babraham as it's a quiet village near Cambridge but you propose to   |
|                             | violate many of my local villages with flyovers, large bus stops and this scenery changing eyesore. It simply isn't appropriate in quiet little  |
|                             | villages like we have around me.   |
|                             | These areas have good transport links anyway. Cambridge isn't just about it's economy, it's about people. Try considering us.  |
| email                       | Like many others, I'll be sat in front of the earthmovers if they come.  |
| <u>ernan</u>                | consultation on the Cambridge South East Transport scheme, we would like to submit the letter below, which we sent to the Departmen for Transport last month.  |
|                             | Regards  |
|                             | Nick Sample  |
|                             | Subject: EIA scoping for GCP's proposed CSET busway  |
|                             | I refer to Fergus O'Dowd's letter to South Cambs District Council of 16th October. We are writing as the district councillors for one of the wards most affected to set out relevant factors in relation to the EIA for this as an Annex II project.                         |
|                             | We would submit that   |
|                             | 1. The current proposed route would carve a tarmac busway and associated NMU route some 13 metres wide across the edge of the<br>Magog Down, one of the most sensitive landscapes in South Cambridgeshire;   |
|                             | 2. There are alternative routes which would serve the existing communities better, in particular Great Shelford and Sawston and allow  |
|                             | scope for onward extension to Haverhill, where many of the people working on the CBC site are likely to be living in the future:   |

11/12/2020 60 O

11/12/2020 61 |

scope for onward extension to Haverhill, where many of the people working on the CBC site are likely to be living in the future; 3. These viable alternatives would result in much reduced damage to the landscape and countryside in the green belt and reduced disturbance from noise and other relevant factors since they would be located next to existing transport infrastructure or along an existing route of a former railway line.

The submission from GCP (Greater Cambridge Partnership) states inter alia at 2.1:

• Congestion on the route means that current public transport services are unable to offer an attractive alternative to a private car.

|            |      |                     |         | • The A1307 corridor to Haverhill is detached from the rail network as it does not have easy access to a train service into Cambridge.   |  |
|------------|------|---------------------|---------|--|--|
|            |      | Cllr Nick Sample    |         | Alternative option 1 – use of the existing A1307 corridor:   |  |
| 11/12/2020 | 62 P | and Cllr Peter Fane | email   | As you are no doubt aware, there is in fact space for dedicated bus lanes either side of the A1307 for most of its length from   |  |
|            |      |                     |         | Numbering corresponds with the consultation question numbering   |  |
| 11/12/2020 | 63 O | Haverhill Town Cour | ncemail | <ol> <li>Please find set out below the response from Haverhill Town Council (HTC) in respect of elements of the SE Cambridge CAMS proposal.</li> <li>HTC agrees with the proposed segregation of the cycling / pedestrian path along the western side of Francis Crick Avenue</li> <li>HTC expresses no opinion on the need for a pedestrian footway along the eastern side of Francis Crick Avenue between Dame Mary<br/>Archer Way and the existing guided busway in addition to the footway along the western side.</li> <li>HTC expresses no opinion in respect of the proposed layout of the interchange between the planned Cambridge South Station / guided<br/>busway / Francis Crick Avenue interchange</li> <li>HTC would encourage tree planting using species natural to the location</li> <li>We have no opinion on matters in respect of Nine Wells</li> <li>We strongly oppose the section of route between Sawston and Babraham, considering that it cuts unnecessarily across the River<br/>Granta and that the Babraham travel hub is in the worng location.</li> <li>HTC would support the views of local wildlife trusts and ecologists in deciding the best type of planting – it should not be left to a<br/>vote.</li> <li>HTC would support the views of local wildlife trusts and ecologists in deciding the best type of planting – it should not be left to a<br/>vote.</li> <li>HTC would supports the provision of seating to encourage less-fit people to undertake longer walking routes. Any picnic area needs to be<br/>able to be easily serviced and rubbish cleared.</li> <li>HTC would support the views of local wildlife trusts and ecologists in deciding the best type of planting – it should not be left to a<br/>vote.</li> <li>HTC would support the planting of an avenue of trees along sections of the route, this should be done judiciously and under<br/>able to be easily serviced and rubbish cleared.</li> <li>HTC would proports a path alongside the transport route to disappear – it could prompt pedestrians and others to use the main<br/>carriag</li></ol>   |  |
|            |      | Axis                |         | retirement care village. The land in question would be directly affected by the preferred route of the CSET<br>Project between Stapleford and Great Shelford.<br>Axis Land is also promoting land at Hinton Way for residential development. A site location plan showing the<br>extent of this land is also enclosed. The proposed Hinton Way bus stop would conflict with the promoted use<br>of this land.<br>Axis Land is supportive of the principle of the CSET Project and the principle of a better public transport and<br>active travel route between Granta Park and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. However, Axis Land<br>strongly objects to the specific elements of the detailed scheme that conflict with their proposals for a<br>retirement care village at Stapleford.<br>With minor alteration to the design to the CSET Project this conflict can be avoided without detrimental<br>impact upon the CSET Project itself.<br>Background<br>Axis Land has previously promoted two parcels of land at Stapleford through the 'Call for Sites' process of<br>the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The details of these land parcels are as follows:<br>• land south of Hinton Way in Stapleford (JDI Ref. 40246) - promoted for residential development (up<br>to 100 units) including affordable housing or a retirement/care village.<br>• land west of Haverhill Road in Stapleford (JDI Ref. 51758) - promoted for a retirement/care village or<br>residential development (up to 90 units) including affordable housing. As set out below, a planning<br>application has been submitted for a retirement care village on the Haverhill Road site.<br>Both parcels are located within the Green Belt. It is considered that exceptional circumstances exist to justify<br>the release of the sites from the Green Belt as part of the local plan process. These relate to the need for  | ocation plans<br>eferenced within the<br>ubmission:<br>Nternative Alignment<br><sup>1</sup> an<br>and East of Hinton<br>Way<br>Site Location Plan<br>Axis Stapleford<br>Ilustrative Masterplan<br>and Use & Heights<br>Parameter   |
| 11/12/2020 | 64 O | Landpartnership     | email   | housing, affordable housing, and retirement/care dwellings in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. It is  |  |
|            |      |                     |         | <ul> <li>I object to the planned travel route cutting across the Granta as proposed the planned travel route (the bus route) from the Park and Ride (that is planned to cross the Granta at the ford on the way to Sawston cuts across the Granta to near to the village, it will ruin the landscape which has historic value of open fields from the High Street and Village that is fundamental to the character of Babraham (an historic farm estate village).</li> <li>I strongly suggesting that the current route is changed to exit the Park and Ride on the east side of the reservoir, which will position it alongside the A11 to start with, aligning it with an existing man-made structure in the landscape, reducing the landscape fragmentation, and positioning it further away from the village to maintain and preserve the vista and open fields.</li> <li>Please consider this option because once it is all in place we have to live with it and it will be there forever and it is not exactly attractive, which at the moment our village is!! We must protect our villages for the future generations we will all become Cambridge and Cambridge will twinned with Brussels!</li> </ul>  |  |
| 12/12/2020 | 65 1 |                     | email   | [name redacted]<br>Babraham Parish Council<br>GCP's proposed route for the Cambridge South-East Busway with particular reference to the environmental damage caused to the<br>villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford and to the adjacent Green Belt landscape. My response is in the form of a paper as I do not<br>consider that the questionnaire developed by GCP allows the kind of response that is demanded if serious comment is to be made<br>concerning the Environment Impact of the proposed route.<br>I should be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this email and the enclosed attachment which is being sent to GCP on 12<br>December 2020.<br>I am copying this paper to the following:<br>The Chair of the Magog Down Trust<br>The CEO of Cambridge Past, Present and Future<br>The MP for South Cambridgeshire<br>The Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority<br>Counncillor Roger Hickford<br>Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer<br>Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer<br>Councillor Lewis Herbert<br>The Department of Transport  |  |
| 12/12/2020 |      |                     | email   | Consultation 2020.<br>This letter is a response to the revised proposals for this new public transport route and the associated Park and Ride site.<br>Our response is primarily concerned with the details of the active travel elements, in particular the new shared-use path for cyclists and<br>walkers alongside this new public transport route.<br>We strongly support a new shared-use path for cyclists and walkers alongside this new public transport route. We consider this path to<br>be the most valuable part of the proposal and it will be welcomed by people cycling to work, to school, to the shops or for leisure. But<br>we are disappointed by the substandard path design that is proposed in the latest plans. We think this new path should be designed for<br>higher levels of use and this requires the path to be wider than currently proposed.<br>As a general statement, we argue that all the new paths should be designed to meet or exceed the relevant widths specified in LTN 1/20<br>[Cycle Infrastructure Design: Local Transport Note 1/20 – July 2020]. We think this is needed to promote and support the growth in<br>active travel as part of your stated objective to reduce congestion in Cambridge. This letter recommends a series of changes to rectify<br>the substandard elements that currently fail to meet the minimum standards specified in LTN 1/20. We also identify how the cycle<br>and walking proposals also fail to meet your own Non Motorised User Working Group design principles as listed in the consultation<br>documents.<br>We find it hard to understand the rationale for proposing substandard active travel<br>elements given the high cost of this scheme. We argue that the economic case is<br>stronger if the active travel elements are designed to comply with the published<br>standards for the complete route. It would be a false economy to continue with a<br>design with so many substandard elements.<br>It is hugely disappointing to see the plans proposing a very expensive busway with<br>substandard cycling and walking elements. The modal shares of Cambridge trav | <ul> <li>S. A new path to provide a better connection to Granta Park</li> <li>We are disappointed that the plans fail to provide a good and attractive cycle and walking route to Granta Park. This is a missed opportunity to make a significant improvement to the cycling and walking network in this area.</li> <li>We strongly recommend that a new path is added to provide a better connection between the P&amp;R site and Granta Park. A new path would be better than the proposed Route A to Granta Park kare use it would avoid the footbridge and the busy Newmarket Road on the eastern side of the footbridge. Two possible route options are illustrated below.</li> <li>[image showing access to travel Hub]</li> <li>Both of these route options connect to the existing ASOS cycle path which connects to Granta Park wia the ASOS underpass and A11 overbridge as shown with dashed red lines.</li> <li>Option 1 diverges from the busway path west of the new Granta river bridge and then follows a direct line to join the existing ASOS cycle path close to the ASOS underpass. This option is shown in red above (solid red is new path, dashed red is existing path).</li> <li>Option 2 creates a new path from the southern end of the P&amp;R site which runs parallel to the A11 and the A11 silp road to join the existing ASOS cycle path close to the ASOS underpass as for Option 1. This option is shown in orange above (solid orange is new path, dashed red is existing path).</li> <li>Option 2 creates a new path, forth the southern end of the P&amp;R site which runs parallel to the A11 and the A11 silp road to join the existing ASOS cycle path close to the ASOS underpass as for Option 1. This option is shown in orange above (solid orange is new path, dashed red is existing path). The first part of this Option 2 route can be combined with the proposed new equestrian route.</li> <li>Wa want to emphasise the importance of creating these new connections to Granta Park to many different groups of people:</li> <li>Wa want to emphasise the importance of creating these n</li></ul> |
| 12/12/2020 | 67 0 | CTC Cambridge       | email   | congestion in Cambridge unless they are combined with effective measures to  | olan showing access to (desire-line) cycle route for commuters between residential areas   |
| 12/12/2020 | 67 O | CTC Cambridge       | email   | discourage the use of private motor vehicles and combined with substantial extra<br>Regarding the consultation, I wish to register my opposition to this scheme.   | ravel hub (Cambridge/ Shelford/ Sawston) and Granta Park. This group favours   |
|            |      |                     |         |  |  |

This route does not properly serve the villages of Great Shelford or Stapleford at all given the position of the proposed stations. It is very clear that they are far too on the periphery of the villages for many people to choose to walk there. Added to this, the village already has

| clear that they are far too on the periphery of the whages for many people to choose to wark there. Ad | ded to this, the vinage alleady has |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| a central station, much closer for most people, which goes to exactly the same destination.            |                                     |

When I brought this up at a previous consultation I was told that this would still serve those nearby. However this is a very small number compared to those who are nearer the current station and I'm aware several people living nearby are not pleased with this as they would prefer to go to the current station than to have a transport hub so close.

This will also block traffic coming up and down these roads, very likely causing more congestion / pollution.

It does seem as though this has become a tick box exercise, whereby these villages will on paper show the scheme as a 'success' as it goes by as many villages as possible, but in reality there are no real benefits to the villages, but rather downsides and destruction of the environment.

The route along the old railway line should considered, however even if this is not feasible, for the reasons noted above, the scheme is still not needed/appropriate. Better would be an improvement of the bus services to the city, or an off-road route running alongside the Babraham Road into Cambridge.

Please acknowledge this email and ensure that these views are put forward against moving the scheme forward.

12/12/2020 68 I

email

|            |      |       | Trains are vastly superior in this respect, as you can use a bicycle at both ends of the journey.<br>As a general principle, I would prefer new transport infrastructure to be train-based, or at least some kind of bus/tram/light-rail on which<br>bicycles can somehow be carried safely, as a 'plus bike' combination allows vastly more flexibility.<br>The proposed CSET scheme is essentially a Park and Ride between the A11 Granta Park area and Addenbrookes site. I have strong<br>reservations about the cost-benefit of this scheme, particularly the justification for building a whole new roadway (largely parallel to the<br>existing A1307), the capacity and cost-effectiveness of the bus system and carpark. If the traffic congestion on the A1307 could be  | consultation materials<br>Francis Crick Avenue<br>DNA path<br>Shelford Stop |
|------------|------|-------|--|---|
| 12/12/2020 | 69 I | email |  | River Granta Bridge<br>near Stapleford                                      |
|            |      |       |  |   |
|            |      |       | Dear Sir/Madam,<br>As a resident of South Cambridgeshire, I have a keen interest in transport infrastructure planning within the Cambridge area.   |   |
|            |      |       | I am concerned that plans for the region south east of the city include building a large car park on farm land, just 5 miles from the biomedical campus adjacent to Addenbrookes Hospital, with a dedicated bus route also to be built over farm land. This seems to me to imply a continuing reliance on private transport as the primary means of commuting to the campus, rather than a coherent vision for a transport infrastructure which will create joined up public transport links that will allow people to commute from home to work without using their cars.   |   |
|            |      |       | In my experience, most people will not choose to leave their cars to park 5 miles from their workplace and complete the last leg of their journey by bus. A better scheme would provide more joined up transport solutions for the whole area, rather than just dedicated routes for people commuting to a particular site. Until buses are provided at attractive cost and with frequent and reliable services that are well connected, they will not change people's dependence on private car use.  |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 70 I | omoil | In my opinion, busways and large car parks are not the answer because they do not serve a range of local communities and continue dependence on private transport. Funds would be better invested in creating better cycle networks and a bus network that is publicly owned and funded, rather than motivated by the need to make profits for private companies.  |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 701  | email | We feel that the money would be better spent on improving cycling infrastructure, bus services and travel hubs, not building huge car<br>parks and new roads in the Green Belt.  |   |
|            |      |       | We are supposed to be providing better alternatives to cars, not encouraging their use for the privileged few.   |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 71 I | email | https://www.smartertransport.uk/travel-hubs/?utm_source=General+contacts&utm_campaign=7b7d4f8437-<br>EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2020_12_13_12_26&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_df1204f23f-7b7d4f8437-240086049   |   |
|            |      |       | Comment on the South East Transport consultation   |   |
|            |      |       | We have seen the response of Smarter Cambridge Transport to this consultation, and find it entirely in line with our views.  |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 72   | email | Therefore, our comment is that all of the points made by Smarter Cambridge Transport are echoed by us, and we ask that you take them into consideration before making any decisions.   |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 721  | eman  | <ul> <li>May I take the opportunity to endorse Smarter Cambridge's response</li> <li>Smarter Cambridge Transport's response</li> </ul>   |   |
|            |      |       | to the consultation for a 20 hectare car park to SE of Cambridge. In order to reduce carbon emissions, transport by private vehicle has to be reduced SOON to near zero, not encouraged by providing car parks.  |   |
|            |      |       | "Smarter Cambridge Transport remains opposed to the proposed busway and car park on the grounds that it is entirely incompatible<br>with the future we now need to build for. The objectives of the City Deal can be achieved in other ways more cheaply, with lower<br>environmental cost and wider social benefit."  |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 73 I | email | I oppose this proposal.  |   |
|            |      |       | It is an expensive short-term solution which will damage the environment. More consideration should be given to using the existing, former and proposed railway/CAM line from Cambridge to Haverhill which would have the additional advantage of serving villages between the two, thus reducing the necessity of driving.  |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 74 I | email | In the short-term, improved pedestrian, cycling facilities and bus services would be a better option.  |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 741  |       | I would like to express my opposition to the proposal to build a 20-hectare car park southeast of Cambridge at high cost and causing much environmental damage in the Green Belt. The money should be spent on better cycling infrastructure, bus services and travel hubs.  |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 75 I | email | Thank you for considering my opinion.  |   |
|            |      |       | We have received the views of Smarter Cambridge Transport on your consultation, and consider them to be very pertinent. Your plans propose a great deal of expenditure leading, in our view, to considerable environmental damage when other less intrusive options appeal more to us. We do not need to asphalt and concrete over what little is left of our natural environment.   |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 76 I | email | Please do not make a decision without carefully considering all of the points made by Smarter Cambridge Transport.   |   |
|            |      |       | I am responding to the Consultation on South East Transport Access.  |   |
|            |      |       | This is an excellent opportunity to consider the wider implications for Haverhill, a town of 27000 population which has in many ways been forgotten because of its isolation on the public transport network since the railway links were severed in 1967. Reinstating the railway as either heavy rail or light rail to link into the main network at Shelford and hence to Cambridge South would also provide for Sawston, Granta Park, a new 'village' of 7000 at Linton as well as Haverhill. This would bring huge economic benefits to this area on the Suffolk/ Cambridgeshire border. It would be far more sustainable that the proposed car dependant solutions involving mass park and ride schemes. Branch lines are already being earmarked for innovative propulsion systems using battery or hydrogen. The longer term benefits far outweigh those of the proposed bus based capital scheme and at lower capital cost. |   |
|            |      |       | As with any former railway route there are inevitably some practical issues where the original route has been subject to encroachment.<br>The 2015 survey for Cambridgeshire Council did not identify any 'deal breakers'. There is the opportunity to carry out a more detailed<br>assessment using the Government's current 75% grant for restoring former railway lines. It is important that GCP join together with<br>West Suffolk and support the initiative sponsored by Railfuture to explore this option further before it is too late.   |   |
| 13/12/2020 | 77   | email |  |   |
|            |      |       | I am very disappointed and concerned that this project is going ahead. I strongly voice my opinion against the planned works for the following reasons:  |   |
|            |      |       | <ol> <li>The environmental impact assessment should have been undertaken prior to choosing a single option for the route to ensure that<br/>independent assessment is not biased now a great deal of money has been spent on only one option.</li> <li>The Magog down is a local wildlife site that is a precious and unique source of green space and tranquility for local and wider<br/>Cambridge residents that will be heavily impacted by this development.</li> </ol>   |   |

| 13/12/2020   | 78 I | email | <ol> <li>The Magog down is a local wildlife site that is a precious and unique source of green space and tranquility for local and wider<br/>Cambridge residents that will be heavily impacted by this development.</li> <li>Alternatives to the route are very viable e.g. the existing train line route which would serve the community of Shelford and Stapleford<br/>much better without increasing light, noise and pollution to more residents of these communities. The majority of residents in Shelford<br/>and Staplefor would not use the proposed bus stops at the periphery of the village.</li> <li>Home working and reduced travel has significantly changed the need for this development. An impact assessment of this change is<br/>required</li> <li>The impact of fly by parking for the roads serving the bus stops needs to assess the congestion and pollution to the local area.</li> <li>This is essentially a glorified park and ride. Why not analyse the option of using green-powered public transport buses on existing<br/>roads.</li> </ol> |   |  |  |
|--------------|------|-------|---|---|--|--|
| 13/12/2020   | 79 I |       | Having read the Smarter Cambridge Transport response to this proposal, I find myself in complete agreement with their views. The proposed car park and new bus link are the wrong solution for our times.   |   |  |  |
| 13, 12, 2020 | 751  |       |   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | We would like to submit this document for consideration. It focuses primarily on autoroute alignment around<br>Babraham. In compiling the document, we sought the advice of Richard Buxton Solicitors, local villagers,<br>Babraham Parish Council, Babraham Neighbourhood Plan Committee and Cheveley Farms (the landowner).<br>The document also draws on an Independent Heritage Report compiled by Spurstone Heritage. |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | Heritage   |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | A statue of Jonas Webb stands in Babraham village as a reminder of his contribution to the life and economy  |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | of the village during the 19th Century. The statue was originally commissioned soon after his death following a<br>call for Cambridge residents and the international farming community to recognise his enormous contribution   |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | to farming. His statue stood for over 100 years in the Cambridge Corn Exchange before being relocated to its   |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | current position at the request of Babraham villagers in 1975.   |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | The NPPF defines significance as:  |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may   |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's  |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | physical presence, but also from its setting. (NPPF 2019; Annex 2)   |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | The Independent Heritage Report states, regarding the heritage significance of [redacted] :  |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | (Jonas) Webb played a significant part in the long agricultural revolution that transformed British farming in   |  |
|              |      |       |   |   | the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He occupied [redacted] as a tenant of the Babraham Estate from  |  |
|              |      |       |   | a number of images, photographs and     | 1844 until his death in 1862, during which time it assumed international importance as a centre for sheep breeding and husbandry: Webb's rams were used to improve sheep strains throughout Britain, continental   |  |
|              |      |       |   | diagrams were                           | Europe, the Americas and Australia. These connections give the Site great historic interest, at a local, national  |  |
|              |      |       |   | supplied and                            | and international level.   |  |
|              |      |       | outlined in the attached document.  | referenced within the                   |  |  |
| 13/12/2020   | 80 1 | email | ,   | attachment                              | It concludes:  |  |
|              |      |       | Camcycle is a volunteer-led charity with over 1,550 members that works for more, better and safer   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | cycling for all ages and abilities in the Cambridge region. We are responding to the Cambridge South<br>East Transport Better Public Transport and Active Travel project consultation.  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | We have a neutral stance with regard to the principle of this scheme for a public transport route,  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | however we will o er comments on the detailed items that have been presented with regard to cycling   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | and active travel. We are very supportive of the principle of creating a safe, convenient, attractive,  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | comfortable and direct network of active travel routes (ATRs) in the region, and we concur with the   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | consultation response of Smarter Cambridge Transport on this point.<br>We expect that such ATRs will be used by cyclists, pedestrians, mobility scooter riders, equestrians   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | and any other legally allowed user as de ned by central government. The routes should be designed   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | to meet the standards of Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20, which is guidance from the Department for   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | Transport for inclusive cycling infrastructure, in addition to the standards needed for other modes. LTN  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | 1/20 covers the design of cycleways that are also used by other modes, such as the proposed ATR, and it integrates well with guidance from other technical documents for other modes.   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | The active travel route (ATR)   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | The geometry of the ATR should follow the guidance of Chapter 5 of LTN 1/20 in order to ensure that   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | it is suitable for cycling. We are glad to note that the project team has committed to keeping a minimum berizontal separation between the ATP and the public transport route (PTP), and that minimum   |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | horizontal separation between the ATR and the public transport route (PTR), and that minimum separation should comply with Table 6-1. Where the active travel route is implemented as a shared-use  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | pathway the design should be in accordance with Section 6.5 and Table 6-3 of LTN 1/20.  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | The consultation has not raised the question of whether the ATR should be on the south side or the  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | north side of the PTR, instead assuming that it should be largely on the south side. However, we don't  |   |  |  |
|              |      |       | believe the choice is obvious. Both sides have pros and cons, and these should be discussed in further  | • · · · • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |  |  |
|              |      |       | stakeholder meetings before making a decision.<br>ATR on the north side of the PTR  | two images were<br>supplied and         |  |  |
|              |      |       | Pros – Avoids PTR station facilities reducing conject between passengers and users of the ATR   | supplied and<br>referenced within the   |  |  |

|              |      |                |       |  | supplied and          |
|--------------|------|----------------|-------|--|-----------------------|
|              |      |                |       | Pros – Avoids PTR station facilities, reducing con ict between passengers and users of the ATR.  | referenced within the |
| 13/12/2020   | 81 O | Camcycle       | email | - Integrates much more cleanly with the Babraham Road / Sawston Road section of the ATR.   | text                  |
| 10, 12, 2020 | 01 0 | carrieyere     | ernan |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | We, the Babraham Neighbourhood Plan Committee, submit the following document in response to consultation on the planned Travel   |                       |
|              |      |                |       | Route, the Park and Ride Hub and the Active Travel Paths leading to and around Babraham village.   |                       |
|              |      |                |       |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | The Babraham Neighbourhood Plan Committee, designated by Babraham Parish Council and recognised by SCDC, represents the  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | parishioners of Babraham. Babraham wants to exercise its right to develop a shared vision for our neighbourhood and shape the  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | development and growth of our Parish as described in neighbourhood plan guidance https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | planning2.   |                       |
|              |      |                |       |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | We accept the need to support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the local plan but in doing so, we have the right to shape that  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | development in a way that minimises the long-term detrimental impact of an infrastructure project that will dominate the open  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | farmland setting of Babraham and act as a catalyst for future housing developments that, if not considered carefully, could engulf   |                       |
|              |      |                |       |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | Babraham entirely.   |                       |
|              |      |                |       | The existence of the transmission and the transmission of the transmis |                       |
|              |      |                |       | The original consultation process set out numerous routes and hubs options across South East Cambridge. It is only now that Babraham   |                       |
|              |      |                |       | villagers can truly understand the high impact of the infrastructure development proposal. The P&R Hub will cover over 30 acres of   |                       |
|              |      |                |       | greenbelt farmland just 350 metres from the Babraham Conservation Area. The Travel Route will cut an arc through open farmland from  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | the P&R Hub, which is situated north east of Babraham, travelling south of the village and to the west between Babraham and Sawston  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | to the new Sawston station.  |                       |
|              |      |                |       |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | The submitted independent Heritage Report (Spurstone Heritage, 2020) states that the Babraham Estate and surrounding farmland is of  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | "great historic interest, at a local, national and international level" because of the significant role that Jonas Webb played "in the long  | a number of images,   |
|              |      |                |       | agricultural revolution that transformed British farming in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries".  | photographs and       |
|              |      |                |       |  | diagrams were         |
|              |      | Babraham       |       | "The designed progression from Babraham Hall through formal gardens and the canalised River Granta to parkland with trees and thence   | supplied and          |
|              |      | Neighbourhood  |       | to open treeless fields contributes to our understanding of the Hall as the centre of the Adeane Estate (figure 1). The open farmland  | referenced within the |
| 13/12/2020   | 82 O | Plan Committee | email | setting contributes to our understanding of Church Farm as the centre of a historically important sheep-farming operation: it is part of   | text                  |
| ,,           |      |                |       |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | I strongly oppose the current routing of the busway to the East of Shelford and Stapleford. The proposed stops bring no benefit to either  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | village as they are too far away and there is no parking. Why would we use them when existing and more convenient bus routes exist.  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | The route also crosses environmentally sensitive chalk greenbelt which should not be permitted.  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | The fould also crosses environmentally sensitive chaik greenbeit which should not be permitted.  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | An alternative must be found and the old Haverbill reilway routing must be a more accentable alternative that could actually benefit   |                       |
|              |      |                |       | An alternative must be found and the old Haverhill railway routing must be a more acceptable alternative that could actually benefit   |                       |
|              |      |                |       | local residents. It may be more technically challenging as it reaches Shelford, but I know this route and have not seen an independent   |                       |
|              |      |                |       | technical analysis showing why it is not possible to do this.  |                       |
|              |      |                |       |  |                       |
|              |      |                |       | The part of the routing must be changed.   |                       |
| 13/12/2020   | 83 I |                | email |  |                       |

|       | Babraham.  |  |
|-------|--|--|
|       | Thank you for your response to our objections to the change of route from the recommended route to the new so called 'preferred route' and for your apology around the change being proposed without any consultation. Your acknowledgment that the change in route was indeed significant and the fact that you have amended the recent environmental impact consultation to add in the change in the route is helpful.   |  |
|       | I would still suggest that, whilst you have been clear that no decision had/has been made, this recent consultation has been hurried and there has been little information provided directly as to why the route was changed to the preferred route in the first place. My FOIA request asking for the minutes of the meeting at which the preferred route was changed and an outline for the reason for those changes has not been met - you merely supplied an agenda for a meeting when it was apparently discussed plus a c1,000 page report for that meeting where the plan is outlined, but no minutes of that meeting. This is clearly not transparent.   |  |
|       | Your justification for the change in route was apparently made as a result of feedback to the original consultation as outlined in emails from [GCP officer name redacted] and which were repeated in the public exhibition. These have been shown, and now accepted by GCP, as not being valid or true. It is subsequently noted that, sadly, the comments have not been withdrawn from, or corrected within, the consultation exhibition - this could lead to respondents who have not been party to our discussions remaining misinformed. [GCP officer name redacted] has also informed us that the so called 'preferred route' had not been sanctioned by the GCP Board with the only route being sanctioned being the original brown route. This continues to be neither open nor transparent.   | a number of images,  |
|       | In a recent meeting with the village, [GCP officer name redacted] accepted the facts above and that the consultation was not completed satisfactorily.   | photographs and<br>diagrams were<br>supplied and   |
| email | Putting the change in routes to one side and considering the environmental impact, I believe it is only now that the village has been able to see the full impact of the proposed routes around the water meadow. Previously they were merely lines on a map and there was no real understanding by GCP, and therefore the consultees to the original consultation, of the difference between the brown and the pink routes in terms of environmental damage. I personally, at the time, did not have a view as to the impact of the potential route options. Southeast Transport Phase 2.   | referenced within the<br>text [see also<br>Babraham<br>Neighbourhood Plan<br>Committee images] |
|       | They are as follows:   |  |
|       | 1) We object to the planned travel route cutting across the Granta as proposed - the planned travel route (the bus route) from the Park<br>and Ride (that is planned to cross the Granta at the ford on the way to Abington, see pink arrow below on map) cuts across the Granta<br>unnecessarily, which will fragment the landscape and river course, as well as break up the wildlife corridor of trees along the river. We<br>feel it is too close to Babraham Village itself, which will ruin the landscape vista out across open fields from the High Street and Village<br>that is fundamental to the character of Babraham (an historic farm estate village).   |  |
|       | As such, I, and others, are strongly suggesting that the route is changed (see pink line on map) to exit the Park and Ride on the east side<br>of the reservoir, which will position it alongside the A11 to start with, thus aligning it with an existing man-made structure in the<br>landscape, reducing the landscape fragmentation, and positioning it further away from the village to maintain and preserve the vista and<br>open fields.   |  |
|       | 2) We object to the planned course of the travel route - the proposed travel route (green route on the map below) cuts through multiple fields and runs too close to the avenue of trees in Babraham, which we feel is an unnecessary fragmentation of the open fields and would damage the heritage aspect of Babraham (i.e. historically, Jonas Webb designed the estate and tree avenue to provide a sweeping vista across the open fields, which would be curtailed by the route).   | number of  |
|       | We propose that the bus route follows a route further away from Babraham, coming out of the Park and Ride on the east of the reservoir (see point 1) and then skirts the open fields as much as possible, running closer to the A11 and the disused railway, and as far away from the avenue of trees as possible (see pink route and arrow on map).   | images/screenshots<br>from consultation<br>materials<br>Please note, this                      |
| email | 3) We object to the proposed Active Travel Route Options B and C - Route B is an existing public Right Of Way, so makes good sense to be improved for the scheme. However, there is a diversion away from the farm lane where it meets the High Street (see pink arrow on map) which passes the route directly through the middle of one of the last remaining remnants of the historic Babraham water meadow  | response was received<br>twice   |
|       | I am writing to respond to the public consultation for the proposed Travel Hub that runs between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and<br>Babraham. I am a Babraham resident and am also a member of the Babraham Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Parish Council. I<br>have submitted my views within the survey you have provided, but I am keen that my specific views are read and am therefore writing<br>directly to you.<br>I have very grave concerns and objections to three key parts of the Travel Hub and the proposed route between Babraham and Sawston.<br>I do not feel that GCP or its subcontractors have undertaken sufficient ecological and landscape surveys to understand the combined   |  |
|       | wildlife, historical and landscape value of the land surrounding Babraham and how it contributes to the character of the village and the well-being of its residents. My specific objections are as follows:   |  |
|       | 1) Travel Hub Itself - I strongly object to the planned bus route from the Park and Ride cutting across the Granta south of Babraham as proposed. The planned travel route (the bus route) cuts across the Granta unnecessarily, which will fragment the landscape and river course, as well as break up the wildlife corridor of trees along the river. Putting a bus route here is too close to Babraham Village itself, and will ruin the landscape vista out across open fields from the High Street and Village that is fundamental to the character of Babraham (an historic farm estate village).   |  |
|       | Moreover, that area of farmland and woodland either side of the Granta from the High Street down to Abington is the site of Baraham's water meadow, constructed in the 1650's by Thomas Bennet of the Babraham Estate. This water meadow is part of the fabric of Babraham's rich farming history and culture. The little of the water meadows that remains reaches the ford over the Granta (where the travel hub bridge is proposed), and is exceptionally important for Babraham to retain, as it preserves the historic farming culture, as well as the open aspect seen from the High Street. The water meadows, Mill Hole Wood, and riparian forest along the Granta all form a connected corridor that is also important for supporting wildlife populations around Babraham - in particular sparrowhawk, kingfisher, otter, badger, fox, at least 8 species of bat, tawny and barn owl, pheasant, partridge, muntjac, roe deer, buzzard, and red kite.         |  |
| email | I strongly oppose the proposed route and suggest that it is changed to exit the Park and Ride on the east side of the reservoir. This will position it alongside the A11, thus aligning it with an existing man-made structure in the landscape, reducing the landscape fragmentation, and positioning it further away from the village to maintain and preserve the vista of open fields and protect the integrity  |  |
|       | I have read the proposal information with interest and concern, from the perspective as a Babraham resident, owning a house on<br>[redacted], in the centre of the village; and [redacted].  |  |
|       | To date, CSET scheme, specifically in communicating its need and the location of a SE 'travel hub' park and ride, has been vague and I believe disingenuous. I have completed the multi-choice questionnaire and endeavoured to communicate my concerns, however on reflection I wish also to highlight by email the following concerns.   |  |
|       | I have very serious concerns and objections to three key parts of the Travel Hub and the proposed route between Babraham and<br>Sawston. I do not feel that GCP or its subcontractors have undertaken sufficient ecological and landscape surveys to understand the<br>combined wildlife, historical and landscape value of the land surrounding Babraham and how it contributes to the character of the village<br>and the well-being of its residents. My specific objections are as follows:  |  |
|       | 1) Travel Hub - I strongly object to the planned bus route from the Park and Ride cutting across the Granta river, south of Babraham as proposed - the planned travel route (the bus route) cuts across the Granta unnecessarily, which will fragment the landscape and river course, as well as break up the wildlife corridor of trees along the river. Putting a bus route here is too close to Babraham Village, and will significantly diminish the landscape vista across the open fields from the High Street and Village that is fundamental to the character of Babraham, a historic farm estate village.   |  |
|       | Moreover, the proposed affected area of farmland and woodland either side of the Granta from the High Street to Abington is the site of Babraham's water meadow, constructed in the 1650s by Thomas Bennet of the Babraham Estate. This water meadow is part of the fabric of Babraham's rich farming history and culture. The little of the water meadow that remains reaches the ford over the Granta (where the travel hub bridge is proposed), and is exceptionally important for Babraham to retain, as it preserves the historic farming culture, as well as the open aspect seen from the High Street. The water meadows, Mill Hole Wood, and riparian forest along the Granta all form a connected corridor that is also important for supporting wildlife populations around Babraham - in particular sparrowhawk, kingfisher, otter, badger, fox, at least eight species of bat (personally surveyed by myself and family using a bat detector, during Covid |  |
| email | lockdown throughout 2020), Tawny and Barn owls, partridge, muntjac, roe deer, buzzard, and red kites.  |  |
| '1    | I'm writing to say that I totally oppose the proposed busway which will cost millions, and feel that what we need instead are more<br>frequent buses using the roads that we have got. The current proposed route does not serve the villages of great Shelford and Stapleford<br>at all as it is too far out of the villages. The proposed route will have massive consequences for the Green Belt. This will be further under<br>threat as the busway will open up accessibility to green fields for development for residential infill. We are threatened with losing more<br>and more of our green belt around the villages for something that is deemed unnecessary. Again, please consider the fact of putting<br>more frequent buses along the roads that we have got   |  |
| email | more frequent buses along the roads that we have got.<br>I would like to register my complete objection to the current Cambridge South East Transport proposals. It seems to me that they are<br>poorly integrated with other infrastructure in the area, will do little to reduce private car use, and come with significant and unjustifiable<br>ecological and environmental cost. I am happy to support Smarter Cambridge Transport's views on this matter as expressed in their   |  |

| 13/12/2020 84 | I |
|---------------|---|
|---------------|---|

14/12/2020 86 I

13/12/2020 85 I

14/12/2020 87 I

|            |      |                   |       | For your records, I'm retired, a Sawston resident and a frequent utility cyclist.   |                             |
|------------|------|-------------------|-------|---|-----------------------------|
| 14/12/2020 | 89   |                   | email |   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | I am opposed to the proposed busway and car park.<br>For public transport, busways are hugely expensive but all they do is cut a few minutes off a particular journey, which is not a powerful  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | enough incentive to people to leave their cars behind and get on a bus. Instead, we need to increase coverage and integration of public   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | transport, as well as quality.  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | Overall, We need to reduce vehicle miles and encourage active transport, primarily cycling and walking. To that end, we need to improve   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | cycle ways: more of them, providing convenient and safe routes, for pedestrians as well as cyclists. I understand this would be cheaper   |                             |
| 14/12/2020 | 90   |                   | email | and quicker to produce results.   |                             |
| 14/12/2020 | 501  |                   | eman  | Study.(CSET) – December 2020  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | Savills (UK) Ltd are instructed by St John's College, Cambridge to make the necessary representations to the current consultation exercise  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | being undertaken in respect of the Cambridge South East Transport Study (CSET).   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | These representations are made on behalf of the College as both a landowner in that area between Addenbrookes Hospital and Great  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | Shelford where the new route is proposed and as one of the largest Colleges in the University where accessibility is very important to  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | staff, students and visitors.   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | The College has responded to all of the relevant consultation stages in respect of the CSET project and has attended face-to-face   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | meetings and virtual meetings with GCP and their project team.  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | The CSET project seeks to provide a proposed new public transport route linking the Cambridge Biomedical Campus via Great Shelford,   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | Stapleford and Sawston and then onwards to new travel hub near the A11/A1307 together with the connections to Babraham, the   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park. In principle, 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 | the response includes       |
|            |      |                   |       | of the public transport corridors are supported.  | screenshots from the        |
|            |      |                   |       |   | consultation materials      |
|            |      |                   |       | Clearly as a landowner and where the proposed route runs through College owned land, it is entirely appropriate to raise comments and certainly in the circumstances where the detail of the route is becoming more refined.  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | certainly in the circumstances where the detail of the route is becoming more reinied.  | are:<br>Great Shelford stop |
|            |      |                   |       | Land At Hinton Way, Great Shelford  | visualisation               |
|            |      |                   |       |   | route in Hinton Way         |
|            |      |                   |       |   | area<br>route in Granham's  |
| 14/12/2020 | 91 L | St John's College | email |   | Road area                   |
|            |      |                   |       | I am replying to this consultation by email as I wish to comment in broad terms and not in the specifics in the form.   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | I am completely opposed to this project. It seems to be trying to deal with the problems of the 21st century with the solutions of the  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | 20th century.   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | In case you had not noticed, we are in the middle of a climate crisis. More roads, even if busways, are never going to be the solution;   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | covering fields with car parks likewise. We cannot build our way out of the mess into which misguided post-war transport policy has   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | placed us.  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | The solution needs to concentrate on de-carbonising private transport entirely and removing as many vehicles from the centre of   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | Cambridge by improving public transport.  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | I support totally the approach taken by Smarter Cambridge Transport which text does not seem to be hidebound by old, outdated   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | thinking. Rather than repeat their response here, I would add my name to the objectors with my objections detailed exactly in their   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | consultation response:  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | https://hes32-  |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.smartertransport.uk%2fresponse%2dto%2dcambridge%2dso<br>uth%2deast%2dtransport%2dconsultation%2d2020%2f&umid=7e5fbfd4-8859-47d9-89d8-   |                             |
| 14/12/2020 | 92   |                   | email | 3f75b72b35af&auth=df9d20fa411d87c1803ee3b11535af83ce4c7acf-98c33a8b9f976053a49a06cc83fb9dddddbbb7cf   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | Smarter Cambridge Transport is a volunteer-run think tank and campaign group. It was formed   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | in 2015 to advance sustainable, integrated and equitable transport for the Cambridge region. It   |                             |
|            |      |                   |       | is run by a team of around 20 people, with a wide range of expertice and interacts, and led by  |                             |

response to your consultation.

| is run by a team of around 30 people, with a wide range of expertise and interests, and led by                     |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| Edward Leigh, a qualified transport economist.   |                       |
| We believe that transport policies should offer car-independent travel options for as many                         |                       |
| people as possible as quickly as possible with the aim meeting these urgent objectives:                            |                       |
| <ul> <li>Decarbonise transport by reducing vehicle miles.</li> </ul>   |                       |
| <ul> <li>Halt and reverse ecological damage from roads and road transport.</li> </ul>                              |                       |
| <ul> <li>Improve public health by minimising toxic air pollution and promoting physical activity.</li> </ul>       |                       |
| <ul> <li>Promote social justice by enabling people of all ages, abilities and wealth to lead fulfilling</li> </ul> |                       |
| lives without requiring a car.   |                       |
| Until the entire energy supply is zero-carbon (which will not happen before the 2030s),                            |                       |
| replacing petrol/diesel engine vehicles with battery-electric does not significantly reduce                        |                       |
| carbon emissions. The only ways to significantly reduce carbon emissions from transport are to                     |                       |
| reduce car ownership and usage, and increase the efficiency of freight movements.                                  |                       |
| Position statement   |                       |
| Smarter Cambridge Transport remains opposed to the proposed busway and car park on the                             | a number of images,   |
| grounds that it is entirely incompatible with the future we now need to build for. The objectives                  | photographs and       |
| of the City Deal can be achieved in other ways more cheaply, with lower environmental cost                         | diagrams were         |
| and wider social benefit.  | supplied and          |
| It is our understanding that the justifications for the CSET and other busway projects are                         | referenced within the |
| principally that:  | text                  |
| 1. Demand to travel into Cambridge will continue to grow as more houses and jobs come to                           | https://www.smartertr |
| the region.  | ansport.uk/response-  |
| 2. Roads into Cambridge will, for the foreseeable future, continue to be congested with                            | to-cambridge-south-   |
| Smarter Cambridge private, mostly solo-occupancy, cars at peak times.  | east-transport-       |
| Transport email Page 2 of 7  | consultation-2020/    |

14/12/2020 93 O Transport

I am strongly opposed to the Cambridge South East transport project. I fully support the statement from Smarter Transport https://www.smartertransport.uk/response-to-cambridge-south-east-transport-consultation-2020/

This project is completely out of alignment with the climate emergency declarations and commitments for the reasons given by Smarter Transport. Please stop proposing these busways until demand management has been implemented. You have to accept that the number of cars has to quickly reduce to stay within carbon budgets (even with the uptake of EVs). As such, building an enormous car park that caters to, and encourages, a doomed mode of transport is nonsensical. It's unbelievable that the environmental information you've supplied has no details of the carbon impact of your proposals. As such it is meaningless and misleading. There is also no mention of the continuing air pollution that park and ride encourages due to all the private vehicle trips to the car parks.

In terms of the details of the active transport plans, I fully support that part of the statement from Camcycle https://www.camcycle.org.uk/images/blog/2020dec\_cset.pdf. I would add that lighting needs to be considered very carefully. I have used the DNA and busway paths daily for years so have some experience here. The lighting on the DNA path is insufficient. Shared paths, where there will be pedestrians wearing dark colours, need lighting such that unlit users are visible at some distance. Ironically, the council is on record as saying that lighting on the DNA path could not be increased because of the impact on the Ninewells nature reserve (apparently a busway is fine). The other problem is being blinded by the buses as happens on the busway path. There the lighting is brighter than the DNA path but the difference between the brightness of the overhead lights and the bus headlights is huge. Path users are blinded by oncoming headlights and still vulnerable for some seconds afterwards until their vision returns to normal. This is particularly bad for disabled users on handcycles as they are closer to the ground where the headlamp beams are stronger. The only appropriate solution is a barrier that completely blocks the bus headlights. On sections lit to a lower level than the busway path, as I expect the sections between villages will be, the blinding problem is even worse. The blinding is bad enough with dipped headlights but often buses drive along with full beam.

Clearly this scheme will increase bus traffic on the existing busway between Addenbrookes and Cambridge main station. The shared path alongside that section of the busway is provably dangerous (see the tragic death of Steve Moir). This path must be upgraded to LTN 1/20 standards before any additional bus traffic is allowed.

email

email

To ensure that my view have been received I am therefore submitting the attachment in this email as my response to the CSET EIA consultation. The attachment sets out my final views, and as such there are some slight changes between the contents of today's attachment and the survey form I completed yesterday. The slight changes are in my responses to questions 4, 17 and 18.

Question 1 I am responding as an individual

Question 2 yes

acknowledgement.

Question 3 yes

Question 4 The bi-directional cycle track on the South Eastern side ends just marginally past the vehicle exit from Cambridge South Station. Immediately to the north of this position, two cycle routes, the northern continuation of this path and an east – west route meet. This could be the cause of conflict and any queuing back on the bi-directional path will impact on the vehicle entrance and exit to Cambridge South station. Therefore, in my view, the design as shown needs further work to address these potential conflicts and there might need to be some degree of prioritization.

Question 5 a mix of trees and hedges

14/12/2020 95 I

14/12/2020

94 I

Question 6 via the DNA path coming from Great Shelford

Re your consultations, to confirm I concur with the observations made by the Smarter Cambridge Transport response at https://www.smartertransport.uk/response-to-cambridge-south-east-transport-consultation-2020/ and also note and agree with the concerns of Cambridge Past Present and Future on the Gog Magog Hills. https://www.cambridgeppf.org/south-east-cambridge-busway. The longer term priority should be to support walking and cycling, in particular separate, segregated paths from the road. Furthermore

| 14/12/2020 | 96 I  | email                    | plans should support in the longer term the re-opening of the Cambridge-Haverhill line, possibly aligning it with a further extension to<br>East West Rail.  |   |
|------------|-------|--------------------------|--|---|
|            |       |                          | I started to attempt to fill in the form, but felt it was biased in only giving me choices none of which I could possibly support, and with no opportunity to express an alternative opinion.  |   |
|            |       |                          | I worked for 25 years in research on either transport or the environment. Early on I had a boss who was an excellent innovator and<br>worked on mini-roundabouts and early simulation programs for r'abouts and major minor junctions.<br>He had a set of 'RULES' one of which was:  |   |
|            |       |                          | "The chances of a WRONG question was higher than the chance of a WRONG question"   |   |
|            |       |                          | This consultation asks the wrong questions.  |   |
|            |       |                          | To reduce both CO2 and congestion issues we need to start early on the easy task of reducing private car travel. We could have started years ago!  |   |
|            |       |                          | Were this scheme to capture significant numbers of drivers of private cars then it would prove to be a waste of money and time. Buses would then be able to travel with little delay on the existing alternatives of the A1307 and A1301, when compared with some 5 miles of a new bus road thorough the Green Belt.   |   |
|            |       |                          | For any improved public transport system in and around Cambridge to be effective in creating a modal shift without other measures it<br>NEEDS to solve those in the City Centre. Do that either by effective congestion and pollution charging, or by a new public transport<br>facility 'within'<br>the City {say a short 2 mile tunnel under the historic core with surface connections to PR sites being terminators for express buses, using<br>existing roads from local towns and villages}  |   |
|            |       |                          | We must do that first before any consideration of any schemes that build new roads over our Green Belt.  |   |
| 14/12/2020 | 97 I  | email                    | I would like to offer my comments on the above and I object to this proposal in the strongest possible terms.  |   |
|            |       |                          | A single busway route has been proposed by the GCP without any other viable options being suggested or indeed investigated and,  |   |
|            |       |                          | crucially, before an Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out.<br>Our Parish Councils have commissioned an independent report which shows that the route along the railway in these villages is an   |   |
|            |       |                          | entirely feasible option.  |   |
|            |       |                          | The environmental impact of this proposal will be significant. The local greenbelt land will be carved up by the busway, of particular note is the Gog Magog Down, an ancient and preserved chalk grassland site, which is used extensively by the local populations for recreation and contains myriad wildlife species. Once the greenbelt has been carved up it will become ripe for developmental infill since the land will no longer be viable for agriculture. The alternative railway route avoids the greenbelt and will pass through the village on an already established route thus servicing the local population rather than busway 'stations' which are far outside the village core and will require the majority of passengers to drive to them. Therefore, the proposed route also discriminates against anyone with a disability which means they cannot drive since all the proposed bus stops are far from the village centre.  |   |
|            |       |                          | The busway will create greater congestion and emissions pollution on all roads but particularly on those where additional crossings are<br>proposed. There will also be significant noise and light pollution for residents close to the crossings and for wildlife. The use of the<br>existing railway will generate much less pollution on every count.  |   |
| 14/12/2020 | 98 I  | email                    | With changes in working patterns since the onset of the Covid pandemic it has been shown that staff working from home is a viable option for many businesses and we should await an assessment on post-pandemic traffic levels before embarking upon any major plans to address such.  |   |
| 14/12/2020 | 99 O  | Cambridge Connect email  | <ul> <li>possible in due course, for example to Haverhill and Cambourne.</li> <li>This approach would provide a transformational long-term solution for Cambridge that is both scalable in terms of capacity and extendible to key destinations as demand and finances allow. Cambridge Connect is coordinating with Railfuture and UK Tram in developing these proposals and engaging with local organisations (e.g. CPPF, local parishes and Rail Haverhill) and residents.</li> <li>Cambridge Connect understands that the Greater Cambridge Partnership has presently excluded light rail from consideration. However, we believe this decision should be reconsidered and light rail should form part of the strategic long-term approach to meeting transport needs in Cambridgeshire.</li> <li>Reconsideration of light rail is needed because it is clear from Steer (2019) that the costs for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) will be comparable to Cambridge Light Rail. The original conclusion that CAM could be delivered for one-third of the cost of light rail has been shown to be wrong (Steer 2019). The business case for CAM was 'compelling' and would be stronger with light rail, which is able to deliver greater modal shift than buses. It is therefore essential that the strategy for metro deliver y in Cambridgeshire is thoroughly reviewed to include light rail.</li> <li>Notwithstanding the above views regarding light rail, we recognise the Greater Cambridge matrneship (GCP) has presently committed itself to bus-based solutions. In the context of this response to the public consultation therefore, our focus is on the selection of route rather than the mode of vehicle that would travel on that route. We have therefore made our evaluation of a public transport route from Granta Park to Addenbrookes that broadly follows the Shelford Rail Alignment (Figure 2). This evaluation was commissioned by the On behalf of the Pemberton Trustees (The Trustees), freehold owners of land in and adjacent to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC). I set out b</li></ul> | a number of immages<br>were supplied within<br>the text<br>map showing Issac<br>Newton Line and CSET<br>route<br>aerial map showing<br>the railway route and<br>proposed CSET route<br>photo of former rail<br>embankment<br>photo of Croydon<br>Tramlink alignment<br>immediately west of<br>Beckenham Junction<br>station with light rail<br>line at far left, while<br>the remaining three<br>lines are heavy rail |
| 14/12/2020 | 100 L | Pemberton Trustees email | Finally the Trustees expect their reasonable professional fees to be met in dealing with the scheme.   |   |
|            |       |                          | We believe that the green belt should be left alone and not used for a new carpark, flyovers or houses. These proposals are just not acceptable.   |   |
|            |       |                          | The Haverhill to Cambridge train track could be considered to be a valid busway If the aim to keep cars off the road then do not build carparks for 2000 cars but instead put on frequent electric buses from villages to places of work (i.e. biomedical campus).   |   |
| 14/12/2020 | 101 I | email                    | CPRE's comments are as follows.<br>Integrated Transport Strategy<br>1 CPRE is very concerned by the apparent lack of any integrated transport strategy for the area around Cambridge and for the County as   |   |
|            |       |                          | <ul> <li>a whole.</li> <li>2 There is no evidence that any proper evaluation of transport volume or potential ridership has been carried out or that alternative modes of transport have been properly considered. Furthermore there appears to have been no proper evaluation of the potential for small less costly (financially and environmentally) improvements to existing infrastructure have been evaluated. It is unclear what the long term effects of Covid-19 and post-Brexit will be on travel patterns and volumes. With significant numbers of City centre offices now likely to be closed and converted into dwellings and shopping increasingly changing to on-line, this is likely to have a major effect on daily travel volumes.</li> <li>3 The basis for this proposal arises from the flawed and out-dated concept of the infinite expandability of Cambridge.</li> <li>4 CPRE understands that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, CAPCA, is the body claiming responsibility for transport policy in the County. CAPCA are promoting the autonomous metro and are also seeking to gain funding for upgrading the A10 which was originally going to be funded by the City Deal now the GCP. Two separate organisations, Network Rail and East-West Rail, are</li> </ul>   |   |

is running this and other consultations on busways, which CAPCA publicly oppose. Meanwhile it is the County Council who remain responsible for constructing and maintaining highways, the existing busway, bridleways and footpaths. It is quite clear to CPRE that this situation is totally impractical and a grievous waste of public money. None of these bodies appear to be working together strategically or tactically to ensure that the most sustainable transport modes and routes required for Cambridge, Peterborough, county towns or other communities are realistically achieved in a timely and most cost-effective manner. CPRE believes this project should be halted until there is a proper strategic transport study for the the County, including the Cambridge area and the bodies involved are rationalised and control returned to properly elected representatives who can be held accountable by the public. 5 Furthermore, in its response to the East-West Rail consultation, National CPRE made the point that with northerly routing and the use of modern, in-vehicle signalling systems which allow the safe operation of light and heavy rail vehicles on the same track, the railway around Cambridge and to main outlying settlements could be made the core of a modern metro service, as has been achieved in other cities. National CPRE also supported the proposal made in our branch's previous response in 2018 to this local proposal, that the reopening of the Colne Valley railway line to Haverhill and Sudbury would not only negate the need for this bus way but would also be far

responsible for different ongoing railway projects around Cambridge. CAPCA have been running a consultation on bus routes while GCP

I attach my 45 page response which seeks that the GCP assess the Shelford Railway Alignment in the alternative options required to be considered under the EIA Regulations.

|   |                     | Conduit supply of water to Cambridge since 1610 & its green spaces. Its Vision was to safeguard the character  | 0-1 POOR  |
|---|---------------------|--|---|
| 1. Introduction.  |                     | of the area to maximise this resource for the future benefit of Cambridge people "from pressures for use as    | 1-1.5 LOW   |
| 2. The Apt Planning Ltd response to the EIA Public Consultation.                |                     | 'rapid-transit transport corridors & cycle corridors."   | 1.5-2 MEDIUM  |
| 2.1 The EIA Regs. requirement to consider reasonable alternatives.              |                     | Section 3.3.3 states that the Chalklands are also a 'Defining Character of Cambridge'. Its characteristics of  | 2-4 HIGH  |
| 2.2 The reasons why the Shelford Railway Alignment is a reasonable alternative. |                     | views, & open higher rolling landscape near Cambridge, were subject to pressures from nearby development.      | The proposed option has a Poor Value for Money rating, based on a Benefit to        |
| Table 1. A Comparison of Sustainability Effects.                                |                     | The Vision was "to secure the area from inappropriate development, & conserve & where possible, enhance        | Cost Ratio of 0.8. So public sector funding from the City Deal or the Department of |
| 2.3 A suggested package of measures that should also be included.               |                     | landscape features & biodiversity to improve amenity, while seeking opportunities for access & informal        | Transport is unlikely to meet Value for Money requirements of the:                  |
| Appendix 1. A Comparison of Environmental Effects.                              |                     | recreation opportunities."   | i) The Guide to Transport & Works Act Procedures, which requires the promoter       |
| Map 1. Map of Shelford Railway Alignment.                                       |                     | 3.6.3 2008 Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan.   | to have the capability to attract the necessary funding, paragraph 1.31 of the      |
| 1. Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017.                        |                     | The scale of development released from the Green Belt at the Cambridge Biomedical Centre adjoining             | Guide.  |
| 2. The requirements of the EIA process.   |                     | Addenbrookes Hospital under the 2003 Cambridge Structure Plan has required "extensive" mitigation              | ii) Local Frameworks for Funding Major Transport Schemes, which requires that all   |
| 3. The description of potentially significant effects.                          |                     | measures of Countryside Enhancement to the south of the City boundary. The 2008 Cambridgeshire Southern        | bodies have the responsibility for ensuring value for money is achieved, paragraph  |
| 3.1 Natural Resources.  |                     | Fringe Area Action Plan Policies CSF/1 & 5 identified the need for Countryside Enhancement measures            | 21 of the Guidance.   |
| 3.2 Pollution & Nuisance, Noise, severance & light pollution.                   |                     | between the City boundary, the A1307, & Haverhill Road, Stapleford, as compensation for the release of         | iii) Transport Analysis Guidance, WebTAG, Dept. for Transport, May 2018, which      |
| 3.3 Population & Health.  |                     | Green Belt to enable the construction of the Cambridge Biomedical Centre. (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP       | requires an Indicative Benefit to Cost ratio,                                       |
| 3.4 Water Resources.  |                     | paragraph C3.1).   | iv) Value for Money Framework, Dept. for Transport, 2015, which provides            |
| 3.5 Biodiversity.   |                     | The chalkland character of the area between the City Boundary and the  | guidance on how decision-makers ensure value for money in the use of public         |
| 3.6 Landscape & Visual Impact.  |                     | Gog Magog Hills comprises rolling countryside rising towards a spur of high ground at the Gog Magog Hills. The | e funds.  |
| 3.7 Cultural Heritage.  |                     | landscape is broad in scale & offers uninterrupted views from Magog Down across large arable fields with       | v) Transport Business Cases, Dept. for Transport, Jan. 2013, which allows for       |
| 3.8 Conclusions of Comparison of Environmental Effects.                         | a number of maps    | occasional hedges & copses to the city in the north west, to Great Shelford/Stapleford west, & to Sawston in   | adjustments to account for qualitative & quantitative impacts which are not         |
| Map 2. Map of Landscape Constraints.  | have been supplied  | the south, (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP paragraph C3.4).   | monetised. The social, economic & environmental impacts are all assessed to         |
| Table 2. A Comparison of Environmental Effects.                                 | and are referenced  | This rolling chalkland landscape & these important uninterrupted public views are therefore protected under    | determine the extent to which the benefits outweigh its costs.                      |
| Appendix 2. Reasonable Alternatives Studied by the Developer.                   | within the text and | Policies CSF/1 & CSF/5 (2a-h) of the 2018 South Cambridge Local Plan & the 2008 Cambridge Southern Fringe      | In June 2020, the Greater Cambridge Partnership requested further work on the       |
| 1. Rail Viability Technical Note, 2015.   | attachments         | Area Action Plan.  | Business Case to provide a Medium Value for Money Rating with a Benefit to Cost     |

east of the City."

The Department of Transport has defined categories of Value for Money.

Section 2.3.6 refers to: "important views into Cambridge from ... the high ground of the chalk hills to the south- 9. The Economic Case, May 2020.

Section 3.1.5 stated that the Hobson's Brook Corridor was a 'Defining Character of Cambridge' from Hobson's BENEFIT TO COST RATIO VALUE FOR MONEY

14/12/2020 103 O

14/12/2020

102 O

APT Planning Ltd email

CPRE

email

Please make absolutely sure that all existing residential roads off the main routes, to the North/East of and the South Station in Queen Edith's are protected from both parking and traffic rat run's through them. Many people are horrified by the lack of attention shown to the majority of these roads. The traffic issue will be appalling in terms of air pollution and congestion if something is not done very quickly and well in advance of work starting. Many drivers will not choose to use a car park if they can park on a residential road, as already evidenced in the area with the park and ride. All the roads referred to have been used for cycle/walking ways throughout the pandemic. Providing a big car park at some distance requires detailed and significant accompanying measures over a wide area to be any sort of solution to a significant increase of cars and demand for access to the South Station. These residential roads must to be safeguarded against the detrimental effects of a significant influx of cars related to the development of the south Station, for the health of the population.

need for this. The train car park at whittlesford is empty every day. It doesn't go near enough for people working at Granta Park to use it. It doesn't go near the Babraham Campus or the genome Campus. It doesn't address the problems of students going to the various schools and colleges on Hills Road. It does drive a swath of concrete through our beautiful south Cambridgeshire countryside. And it rips through the wildlife. Never have a seen such an ill thought out scheme. The pollution that Abington will suffer as a result of cars stacked up at the four went ways roundabout has probably not been measured but will be massive. This is rushed because your site wasn't working on Sunday or Monday morning, but I hope you understand my feeling.

14/12/2020 105 I

104 I

14/12/2020

the community and therefore the process is invalid. The alternative railway route presents a much less intrusive route that offers much better connectivity for the villages it passes through compared to the bypass route across the fields adjacent to the Magog Down that is the GCP's chosen route.

## Damage to Landscape

email

email

email

Above all else this route will destroy a unique landscape and that offers unique views of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire and offers amenity space which is vital for recreation and relaxation and public health including mental health.

This special landscape is currently being surveyed for evidence for the Local Plan and the results of this survey will be known very shortly and it is anticipated that the Local Plan will offer protection.

This environmental survey should have been conducted before any decisions were made. It is now too late to take environmental issues into account and I question the validity of this exercise. Conducting this exercise after the decision means that there is no incentive whatsoever for a change of mind.

It would appear that the exercise is merely to mitigate the disastrous effect of this decision: for example the choice of hedges as opposed to tree-lines is quite ridiculous, as is the offer of picnic sites. How can these issues mitigate? And putting part of the route into a cutting just gouges through and damages the overall landscape.

I'm also intrigued that the online questionnaire has lots of questions on the remainder of the route but studiously avoids questions on the route around Stapleford. One would question why that is the case.

Biodiversity and light pollution This proposed 14 m strip of tarmacadam also significantly impacts the biodiversity of the area and there will be lighting pollution as well which will adversely impact on natural habitats.

## 14/12/2020 106 I

NMU Ely Diocesan Board of Finance. I have enclosed site location plans for the two EDBF sites in Stapleford.

We are instructed by Ely Diocesan Board of Finance (EDBF) to respond to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultation for the Cambridge South East Transport Project (CSET Project). EDBF owns two parcels of land in Stapleford; land east of Hinton Way and land west of Haverhill Road in Stapleford. A site location plan for each site is enclosed. The land east of Hinton Way site would be located in close proximity of the preferred route of the CSET Project between Stapleford and Great Shelford. Summary of EDBF Position In summary, the EDBF response to the EIA consultation for CSET Project is as follows:

EDBF does not see the merit in advancing proposals for CSET ahead of the joint local plan process.
It is essential that the CSET Project includes meaningful and comprehensive measures to ensure that any impacts of the project are properly mitigated.

|            |       |                    | any impacts of the project are properly mitigated.  |                        |
|------------|-------|--------------------|---|------------------------|
|            |       |                    | EDBF Promoted Developments and the Greater Cambridge Joint Local Plan   |                        |
|            |       |                    | EDBF has previously promoted two parcels of land at Stapleford through the call for sites process of the  |                        |
|            |       |                    | Greater Cambridge Local Plan process, and the details are as follows: land east of Hinton Way in Stapleford   |                        |
|            |       |                    | (JDI Ref. 40369) promoted for residential development for approximately 500 dwellings including affordable  |                        |
|            |       |                    | housing and open space; and, land west of Haverhill Road in Stapleford (JDI Ref. 40368) was promoted for  |                        |
|            |       |                    | residential development for approximately 58 dwellings including affordable housing with the existing   |                        |
|            |       |                    | allotments re-provided on land owned by EDBF elsewhere in the village.  | two mans have have     |
|            |       |                    | It is noted that a number of additional sites have also been promoted on the north eastern edge of Stapleford<br>(off Hinton Way and off Haverhill Road) through the Greater Cambridge Local Plan call for sites process. If it | two maps have been     |
|            |       |                    |   | attached               |
|            |       |                    | is decided by the Greater Cambridge Partnership that the route for the CSET Project should be located to  | Land east of Hinton    |
|            |       |                    | the north east of Stapleford, then it is considered that the route could be delivered in conjunction with a comprehensive and coordinated development at these sites, with a route and stations that are connected to           | Way - Site Location    |
|            |       |                    | comprehensive and coordinated development at these sites, with a route and stations that are connected to   | Plan                   |
|            |       | Ely Diagona Poard  | One Station Square  | Land west of Haverhill |
| 14/12/2020 | 107 1 | Ely Diocesan Board | Cambridge   | Road – Site Location   |
| 14/12/2020 | 107 L | of Finance email   | CB1 2GA   | Plan                   |
|            |       |                    | additional crossing point (and works) at the Sawston Rd/High Street junction. Preference is for the red route referred to below, failing  |                        |
|            |       |                    | which the original brown route.   |                        |
|            |       |                    | Dear Sirs   |                        |
|            |       |                    | This is a response to the current environmental consultation as well as the added consultation around the changed route around  |                        |
|            |       |                    | Babraham.   |                        |
|            |       |                    | Thank you for your response to our objections to the change of route from the recommended route to the new so called 'preferred   |                        |
|            |       |                    | route' and for your apology around the change being proposed without any consultation. Your acknowledgment that the change in   |                        |
|            |       |                    | route was indeed significant and the fact that you have amended the recent environmental impact consultation to add in the change in  |                        |
|            |       |                    | the route is helpful.   |                        |
|            |       |                    |   |                        |
|            |       |                    | I would still suggest that, whilst you have been clear that no decision had/has been made, this recent consultation has been hurried and  |                        |
|            |       |                    | there has been little information provided directly as to why the route was changed to the preferred route in the first place. My FOIA  |                        |
|            |       |                    | request asking for the minutes of the meeting at which the preferred route was changed and an outline for the reason for those changes  |                        |
|            |       |                    | has not been met - you merely supplied an agenda for a meeting when it was apparently discussed plus a c1,000 page report for that  |                        |
|            |       |                    | meeting where the plan is outlined, but no minutes of that meeting. This is clearly not transparent.  |                        |
|            |       |                    | Your justification for the change in route was apparently made as a result of feedback to the original consultation as outlined in emails   |                        |
|            |       |                    | from [GCP officer name redacted] and which were repeated in the public exhibition. These have been shown, and now accepted by   |                        |
|            |       |                    | GCP, as not being valid or true. It is subsequently noted that, sadly, the comments have not been withdrawn from, or corrected within,  |                        |
|            |       |                    | the consultation exhibition - this could lead to respondents who have not been party to our discussions remaining misinformed. [GCP   |                        |
|            |       |                    | officer name redacted] has also informed us that the so called 'preferred route' had not been sanctioned by the GCP Board with the only   |                        |
|            |       |                    | route being sanctioned being the original brown route. This continues to be neither open nor transparent.   |                        |
| 14/12/2020 | 108 I | email              | In a recent meeting with the village, [GCP officer name redacted] accepted the facts above and that the consultation was not completed  |                        |
| , ,        |       |                    |   |                        |
|            |       |                    | General Question 1. Individual  |                        |
|            |       |                    | 1. Individual<br>Francis Crick Avenue   |                        |
|            |       |                    | 2. Yes  |                        |
|            |       |                    |   |                        |
|            |       |                    | 3. Yes  |                        |
|            |       |                    | <ol> <li>No comment</li> <li>New avenue of trees either side of the public transport corridor and highway.</li> </ol>   |                        |
|            |       |                    | 5. New avenue of trees either side of the public transport corridor and highway<br>Nine Wells Area  |                        |
|            |       |                    |   |                        |
|            |       |                    | 6. Via the DNA path coming from Great Shelford<br>Via the public feetpath and permissive path from the porth (porth east connected to Granham's Road  |                        |
|            |       |                    | Via the public footpath and permissive path from the north/north east connected to Granham's Road<br>7. The track alongside Hebson's Brook Conduit to be retained   |                        |
|            |       |                    | 7. The track alongside Hobson's Brook Conduit to be retained  |                        |
|            |       |                    | 8. Bicycle<br>On foot   |                        |
|            |       |                    |   |                        |
|            |       |                    | Complete protection of the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and the ecology of Hobson's Conduit is essential. There must be no derogation from this principle.   |                        |
|            |       |                    |   |                        |
|            |       |                    | 9. Support<br>Sawston to Babraham area  |                        |
|            |       |                    | 10. No opinion  |                        |
|            |       |                    | Stops and Crossings   |                        |
|            |       |                    | 11. Open grass with a belt of scrub or mixed species bedge (unmaintained) along boundaries to residences  |                        |

| 14/12/2020               | 109          |               | email | <ul> <li>11. Open grass with a belt of scrub or mixed species hedge (unmaintained) along boundaries to residences</li> <li>Woodland planting between stops and residential properties</li> <li>It is dangerous if passengers have to cross the Active Travel Path to reach the platforms.</li> <li>Bridge Crossings</li> <li>12. Woodland planting along field boundaries and the River Granta</li> <li>Hedgerow planting along field boundaries and grassland</li> <li>The bridges are a visual encroachment on the landscape. The necessary height of the bridges may cause noise problems.</li> <li>Active Travel Path</li> </ul>                         |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|--|
|                          |              |               |       | I formally object that your Environmental Impact Assessment questionnaire excludes consultation on all the Nine Wells to Sawston Road sections of the route, where the environmental impact is disastrous.   |
|                          |              |               |       | I also formally object that you have rejected the more southerly alternative route based on the old Cambridge-Haverhill railway line<br>before any comparison of or consultation on the respective environmental impacts. As discussed below your chosen route in the Nine<br>Wells to Sawston Road sections does not even benefit the villages.   |
|                          |              |               |       | My objections to your chosen route are:  |
|                          |              |               |       | <ol> <li>The route crosses grade 2 agricultural land. You address the Community and Health issue by saying, "Alignments and land take<br/>reduced where practical, avoiding taking small areas of land from fields where this can be avoided." In the Hinton Way to Haverhill Road,<br/>Haverhill Road to Sawston Road and Sawston Road to High Street sections of the consultation you mention the environmental issue,<br/>Severance of land parcels impacting existing use of land. This issue applies equally to the CBC to Hinton Way and Hinton Way to Haverhill<br/>Road sections but is not mentioned in those pages of the consultation.</li> </ol> |
|                          |              |               |       | You take no account of the knock on effect of dividing up fields, which reduces the existing and productive use of farm land and could reduce future food security.  |
|                          |              |               |       | 2. This route across open country is an open invitation to infill building, degrading green belt land even further.  |
|                          |              |               |       | 3. The intermediate stops at the villages are a significant visual intrusion on an open, green belt landscape.   |
|                          |              |               |       | 4. You claim that the proposals have been developed to ensure stops are as close to villages as possible None of the intermediate<br>stops serve their respective villages. Although we live in the centre of Great Shelford and are therefore closer than many others, both<br>Park & Ride sites, the Citi 7 bus and even the train are much more convenient for us than your Hinton Way stop.  |
| 14/12/2020<br>14/12/2020 | 110  <br>111 |               | email | I completely endorse the Smarter Cambridge Transport response: https://hes32-<br>ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.smartertransport.uk%2fresponse%2dto%2dcambridge%2dso<br>uth%2deast%2dtransport%2dconsultation%2d2020%2f%3futm%5fsource%3dGeneral%2bcontacts%26utm%5fcampaign%3d7b7d4f8437<br>%2dEMAIL%5fCAMPAIGN%5f2020%5f12%5f13%5f12%5f26%26utm%5fmedium%3demail%26utm%5fterm%3d0%5fdf1204f23f%2d7b7d<br>4f8437%2d249601941&umid=f9779760-6c20-4c2a-b606-c9582256eafc&auth=df9d20fa411d87c1803ee3b11535af83ce4c7acf-<br>646a2b5b550360275e7f7d33e63e3b66b2691a8e  |
|                          |              |               |       | We are residents of [redactred], who would be greatly affected by the proposed busway, bypassing the A1307.  |
|                          |              |               |       | For all the residents of Stapleford and Shelford, this scheme would cause enormous environmental damage and confer no benefits.<br>Furthermore, we question the manner in which public transport will expand when commuting resumes after the Covid-19 pandemic.<br>We strongly believe that there is a need to revisit the original options for transport into Cambridge from the South-East, since better<br>cycling facilities and a dedicated bus lane on the Babraham Road may now be preferable: more direct, less damaging to the environment<br>and less expensive.  |
|                          |              |               |       | Your consultation forms presume acceptance of your scheme and any response implies support for a proposal to which we are strongly opposed. I suspect that many of your respondents will have faced similar difficulties and would have voiced fundamental opposition, had the opportunity.  |
|                          |              |               |       | The attached .pdf explains my concerns and we would be grateful if they could be considered during the forthcoming enquiry.  |
|                          |              |               |       | I have read this "consultation" and have attempted to complete the on-line and .pdf consultation<br>forms; however, I find that they both presume agreement with this damaging scheme.<br>As I cannot accept that this busway is desirable, I am submitting this objection to the scheme and I<br>would be grateful if my thoughts could be presented during the consultation. If desired, I am happy<br>to present them in person.  |
|                          |              |               |       | Is a bus route distinct from the A1307 (Babraham Road) needed?<br>The Covid-19 pandemic has prompted everyone to reconsider their use of public transport and we<br>question how rapidly it will expand when commuting recovers.<br>Many will adopt the use of bicycles (with or without electric assistance),   |
|                          |              |               |       | This is a moment to revisit the original scheme, since better cycling facilities and a dedicated bus lane on the Babraham Road (A1307) may now be sufficient, dramatically reducing the cost of the  |
| 14/12/2020               | 112          |               | email | project.<br>on behalf of Anglian Water as sewerage undertaker for the location of the proposed access and public transport improvements.<br>I would be grateful if you could confirm that you have received this response.<br>Should you have any queries relating to this response please let me know.  |
|                          |              |               |       | Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals for the Cambridge South<br>East Transport Consultation. The following response is submitted on behalf of Anglian<br>Water as sewerage undertaker for the location of proposed access and public transport<br>improvements.<br>General comments   |
|                          |              |               |       | At this stage the final alignment relating to the proposed dedicated public transport<br>route and related Active Travel path has yet to be confirmed and further consultation is<br>anticipated.  |
|                          |              |               |       | Anglian Water would wish to assist the Greater Cambridge Partnership in relation to the location of our existing sewerage infrastructure and how this could be safeguarded or relocated if required so that we can continue to serve our customers.<br>The location of our existing infrastructure and assets (including both underground  |
|                          |              |               |       | infrastructure and aboveground assets such as pumping stations and water recycling<br>centres) is available on request to view at the following address from digdat Utilities:<br>https://www.digdat.co.uk/digdatUtilities<br>Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Francis Crick Avenue   |
|                          |              |               |       | It is noted that it is proposed to develop a new dedicated public transport route on<br>Francis Crick Avenue which will continue south and follow a similar route to the existing<br>cycle route.  |
| 14/12/2020               | 113 0        | Anglian Water | email | The route as proposed crosses existing rising mains (pressurised sewers) which are<br>located to the south of the Francis Crick Avenue/Dame Mary Archer Way roundabout.<br>Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve to Granham's Road<br>There is an existing rising main which runs in parallel to the railline and the existing DNA   |
|                          |              |               |       |  |

## Dear Sirs,

email

email

email

I am writing to express my concern about proposals to build a large car park to the south east of Cambridge, at the cost of £148 million, and a single road for busses into the Cambridge biomedical science site.

I consider this a great waste of money, and I am very concerned about the environmental impact. Surely there must be other ways of approaching the problem of access into Cambridge, and I strongly urge you to support the alternatives developed by Smarter Cambridge Transport. These include providing better access for buses and bicycles and alternative routes.

We have seen all the open areas around Cambridge slowly transformed by continued building and unplanned infrastructure changes. There is still time to explore other alternatives provided by the highly experienced people of Smarter Cambridge Transport. We can all have a chance to stop or at least slow the degradation of our built environment over the last 10 years by trying harder to provide more carefully thought out environmentally friendly plans in future. Please help - You may even find it I just listen expensive!

## 114 I

I am a resident of Pampisford, address below. The section of this proposal I am concerned about is from Cambridge South Rail Station to the A11 Hub.

I note that the environmental consultation for this project closed on the day of writing, but I was not able to access this in time. These are my observations and concerns regarding this project.

I observe that all the bus stops are well outside the villages of Great Shelford, Stapleford, Sawston etc. At each bus stop I observed 5 parking places for the cars of the disabled and a bike rack and a turning circle.

I notice there is no specific provision in the design of these bus stop layouts for a taxi or a family car to wait; for instance, to drop off or pick-up passengers who cannot walk or cycle long distances yet do not classify as disabled. The bike racks may be insufficient unless passengers are allowed to take cycles onto the buses.

Are you considering electric car charging points at the large carpark on A11 Hub, as you appear to have solar panels in the adjoining field? The plan does not fully provide safe well-lit cycle or walking paths to the bus stops from the villages' centres from what I could see. My observation is that this project is an expensive way to provide Park and Ride facilities for workers at the Biotech Campus Centres. Building a lot of infrastructure in the form of busway and bridges to provide this service, across valuable arable countryside. It is difficult to see how this is justified by the possible reduction of traffic on other local roads. Cambridge is already accessed by Park & Rides at

Babraham and Trumpington, so the provision of yet another Park & Ride at such great expense is questionable. The general transport links from Sawston/Pampisford have been deteriorating during the last 2 decades. For instance, the Citi 7 bus was originally useful for access to Waitrose at Trumpington and airport buses but has since been rerouted via the new Biotech Addenbrooks

complex. As another example: It does not help me and other local residents of Pampisford, Babraham and Sawston etc. to get to Whittlesford Parkway Railway Station – which is useful for getting to London, airports and/or Cambridge. Public bus access to Whittlesford Parkway Rail Station has been a long-standing problem.

Links to airports and London will not be substantially improved by this project as far as I can see, except for those living in Cambridge city.

The thinking and design seems to be very Cambridge-centric and orientated towards commercial interests, and the local residents are definitely secondary. The environmental credentials are being used as a selling point for the project, but a lot of the infrastructure is being built on our local arable countryside.

14/12/2020 115 I

14/12/2020

I looked at the online survey and as far as I could see teh questions all made teh presumption that teh busway is going to happen and concerned the detail of the construction.

I live in Stapleford and object very strongly to this proposed scheme on the following grounds:

- The cost benefit is (by your own analysis) poor

- The destruction of the local greenbelt - and particularly through such a beautiful landscape is unacceptable - it can never be recovered. - There is already an (under-utilised) bus service which could be extended using hydrogen powered buses to reduce the number of cars on the existing route

- The requirement to commute out to the Babraham bio-medical site will have reduced significantly due to home-working - IF a new route is deemed necessary then following the route of the old Haverhill railway with a light rail system is a much preferred solution with less impact on the environment. no green belt destruction, and light rail being much more acceptable by the public as a means of transport.

I hope you will listen to the local parish councils and local residents who support the alternative rail route and will give it a proper evaluation and viability study. To push ahead without doing that seems to me to be very reckless. I hope you will take these views into account.

Although I am in support of the project of an autoroute, the unilateral change, without consultation, to the route agreed in July does not appear to have considered the impact this will have to the heritage, environment and ecology as outlined by [redacted].

I would like you therefore to reconsider the route to run alongside the old railway liner the reasons stated, namely:

1. Aligning the autoroute alongside and NOT along the Old Railway Line (enclosed figure) brings two man-made structures adjacent to each other. This will reduce the visual impact of the autoroute

2. Offer the opportunity to create a widened linear landscape between these two structures which will further enhance biodiversity by protecting and enlarging the wildlife corridor. The Old Railway Line is largely lined by trees and hedging. Expanding this area to include species rich grassland would offer a varied habitat corridor running a considerable distance from Sawston station to the Babraham High Street to the South of the autoroute, a distance of 1095m.

3. Make the route more pleasant for bus passengers looking to the South over linear landscaping towards the Old Railway Line and enhance the view of the distant Gog Magog Hills to the North because of its route distant from visual obstructions so enhancing the open

aspect.

4. Enable passengers to view the historic Babraham Hall avenue of trees at its best.

5. The Active Travel Path running within this linear landscape and adjacent to the Old Railway Line would enhance the walking and cycling environment immeasurably. It would open the Old Railway Line for the enjoyment of Sawston residents. 6. This minor change of alignment would add 8s to autoroute journey time.

7. This route lies entirely within Cheveley Farm land and so has no impact on other farms.

Realigning the autoroute to run East of the reservoir and alongside the A11 would once again bring 2 man-made structures together to maintain the open aspect of the farming countryside and protect the largely untouched wildlife habitat that has developed in and around Mill Hole Wood. The realignment would then enable GCP purchase and preservation of a continuous stretch of the Babraham Water Meadow heading out from the A11 towards Babraham. The current route divides the Babraham Water Meadow in two. The GCP have suggested protecting that part of the Babraham Water Meadow between the autoroute and the A11 which gives no visual advantage to the residents of Babraham.

15/12/2020 117 I 15/12/2020 118 I

16/12/2020

10/12/2020

10/12/2020

119 O

120 I

email Facebook Why not just have a tram line running roughly along the old rail route from cb to Haverhill? responding to the consultation as Chair of the Combined Authority's Transport & Infrastructure Committee. The Combined Authority welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the GCP on the development of this scheme that form a fundamental component to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) project. Economic growth across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough has over recent decades not been matched by the provision of the appropriate transport infrastructure. Evidence shows that to sustain future growth in the region, new infrastructure is essential to support the delivery of new jobs and new homes. CAM will connect key regional centres of employment, existing settlements, key railway stations, new homes and planned growth, to create a platform for sustainable and inclusive growth. It will support the delivery of much needed new housing underpinned with world class infrastructure and built on sustainable principles. CAM will transform people's day-to-day lives, by connecting communities and creating new jobs and widening access to opportunities across the region. Several of the proposed interchange points outlined in the CSET consultation are considerable distance from local communities and/or the destination. In line with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's Local Transport Plan's (LTP) Accessibility objective and policies CAM-E11 and CAM-E13 of the CAM: LTP sub-strategy, these interchanges should ideally be located at either major attractors or generators of passengers and within 10 to 15 minutes' walk to key locations ensuring ease of access to major attractors. Establishing stops at the optimal locations helps to reinforce the sustainable transport message. It is imperative that these connections are safe, well-maintained and integrated into the fabric of the urban environment and associated transport network. In addition, the use of private car may increase due to Cambridgeshire and the parking available at the proposed park and ride site. Peterborough Further clarification is required around the access arrangements to Babraham and Combined Authority email Granta Park. If the scheme is to provide an attractive and viable alternative to the The trains are currently empty, there not going to open one that was closed over 50 years ago because it was underused then 🖄 twitter Haverhill, Cambridge and most of the villages have grown since the line closed in 1967. The A1307 is a busy road, having around 30,000

Two accidents on the A1307 today, one at Linton, the other at Horseheath. If only there was an alternative to cars using the

121 I twitter users a day. 10/12/2020 1221 twitto

| : | 10/12/2020      | 122   |                          | twitter  | A1307.@RailHaverhill @RailfutureEA @GreaterCambs   |
|---|-----------------|-------|--------------------------|----------|--|
|   |                 |       |                          |          | I guess you've not seen the A1307 at morning and evening peak times and with an additional 3500 homes being built in the town, if  |
| : | 11/12/2020      | 123   |                          | twitter  | ever there was a time for a train link to Cambridge - it's now!  |
|   | 11/12/2020      | 124   |                          | twitter  | We do not need more roads.We need to protect the Green Belt and the River Granta, as it is a rare chalk stream.@RailHaverhill  |
|   | 4 /4 2 /2 0 2 0 | 425 1 |                          |          | My, that needed more than a cuppa. The survey isn't much more than a bunch of leading questions which are unlikely to elicit useful or   |
|   | 11/12/2020      | 125   |                          | twitter  | actionable responses.  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | I note you state 'final design' surely the final design will be after consideration of the consultation responses you are asking for? If not   |
|   | 11/12/2020      | 126 I |                          | twitter  | please can you make it clear to all contributing. Is the consultation a participatory exercise or just an informative one? Thanks.   |
|   | 13/12/2020      | 127 O | Harston Residents'       | twittor  | Please: no more (mis)guided busways. The world has changed but @GreaterCambs is stuck on outdated models. Respond now!   |
|   | 13/12/2020      | 127 0 | Group                    | twitter  | We've submitted our objections to the CSET busway as the district councillors for Shelford ward. See m.facebook.com/ShelfordWardSC   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | GCP would carve a tarmac busway across the edge of the Magog Down; alternative routes would serve the existing communities better,   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | & cause less damage.   |
|   |                 |       | Course iller Dotor       |          | There may be situations where it is necessary to carve a new busway through open countryside, even through sensitive and valued  |
|   | 13/12/2020      | 128 P | Councillor Peter<br>Fane | twitter  | countryside in the green belt in order to improve sustainable transport. This is not one of them. Alternative and less damaging options<br>are available.  |
|   | 13/12/2020      | 120 1 | Talle                    | twitter  | You made a mistake, you wrote 'preferred public transport route'. In the last poll organized, 90% of the respondents (local residents and  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | residents Cambridgeshire) were against this route. The main reason being that GCP decided in favour of an environmentally damaging   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | option rather than less damaging alternatives. This is the GCP's preferred route, not the citizens' preferred route. I apologize for   |
|   | Nov 20          | 120 1 |                          | Linkodin | commenting as I was already once reminded that the people of Cambridgeshire don't have a say in this matter but I thought it be  |
|   | Nov-20          | 129 I |                          | LinkedIn | important to clarify the typo.   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | scheme's proximity to existing Network Rail infrastructure and consideration of cumulative impacts with the proposed Cambridge South<br>Infrastructure Enhancements (CSIE) scheme being developed by Network Rail.   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Matters relating to Network Rail managed infrastructure  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Please note that Network Rail has a statutory obligation to procure the availability of safe train paths and as such we are required to take   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | an active interest in any construction/demolition activity adjacent to our property that potentially could affect the safe operation of the  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | railway.<br>On specific matters, clearly our key interest is to protect the physical railway infrastructure. As part of the development bounds the West  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Anglia Main Line south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus the CSET route should demonstrate that the railway infrastructure will not   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | be compromised and be adequately protected.  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Part of this will be to demonstrate that the CSET route will not interfere with the existing railway drainage and that all surface and foul  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | water arising from the proposed works will be collected and diverted away from our property.   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Sustainable drainage proposals should take into account the impacts upon adjacent railway infrastructure, i.e. proposals must not import<br>a risk of flooding, pollution, soil slippage onto the existing operational railway. Sustainable drainage systems within the area should be |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | directed away from the railway and should not use soakaways within 30m of the railway boundary. Attenuation ponds/basins on sites  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | adjacent to or near to the railway boundary should only be included in proposals with the agreement of Network Rail and should not be  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | included in proposals that are adjacent to a railway cutting.  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Security of the railway boundary will require to be maintained at all times. If the works require temporary or permanent alterations to any mutual boundary the applicant must contact the Network Rail Asset Protection Team prior to any works.                                      |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Consideration should be given to ensure that the construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out to the CSET route without  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | adversely affecting the safety of or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land. Therefore, any alignment should be situated at least   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | 2m from Network Rail's boundary. This will allow construction and future maintenance to be carried out from the applicant's land, thus   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | avoiding provision and costs of railway look-out protection, supervision and other facilities necessary when working from or on railway<br>land.   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Should any maintenance access rights to the railway for which Network Rail has access rights, including pedestrian ones, be identified in  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | the area, these will need to be taken into consideration in any new scheme. In addition, the CSET route should consider how the  |
|   | 0/42/2020       | 120.0 | Notice de Doll           | 1        | maintenance of the future CSIE scheme will not be prejudiced by the  |
|   | 18/12/2020      | 130 O | Network Rail             | email    | development.   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | surrounding region, representing a collective workforce of over 40,000 people. We welcome this opportunity to respond to the second phase of consultation on a scheme that is an immediate   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | priority for the city region, and urge that improvements are made so that this scheme provides a   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | more attractive option than the car for travel within this corridor.   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Providing a high-quality public and active transport route in this corridor is a priority for enabling the   |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | sustainable long-term growth potential of the Cambridge economy. This route forms an integral part<br>of what the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) outlined as  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | the "package of transport and other infrastructure projects to alleviate the growing pains of Greater  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | Cambridge [that] should be considered the single biggest infrastructure priority."1 Indeed, since the  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | publication of the CPIER in 2018 the CSET project could be the first Local Authority infrastructure  |
|   |                 |       |                          |          | scheme to be delivered as part of that priority package.   |

scheme to be delivered as part of that priority package.

This route is of particular strategic value in enabling the future growth of the world-leading life sciences cluster that exists across Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Babraham Research Campus, and Granta Park. The connectivity between these major hubs of employment, the communities along this corridor, and the onward travel of those arriving at the new Cambridge South station, is of the utmost long-term value to the ability of the Cambridge economy to grow dynamically and sustainably. This CSET route is expected to form one of the first phases of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), and therefore has major strategic value as part of a transformational transport system that will enable significant growth of the Cambridge economy and delivery of the ambitious growth targets set in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Deal. Cambridge Ahead therefore supports this route being delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership as a priority and urges the following considerations: 1. Where practical, improvements are made to the proposed route so that it better serves the employment centres of Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park. Given the long-term strategic value of this scheme in providing connectivity to these two business parks, the proposed scheme is at risk of not taking proper advantage of this aim. In order to achieve full

22/12/2020 131 O Cambridge Ahead email

|                                    | ge Partnerships scheme to improved public transport and active travel hub (A11) at Babraham and on to Cambridge.   |
|------------------------------------|--|
|                                    | ne progress made to reach this stage of consultation, and is excited by the opportunities the new route, will bring to the                                       |
| accessibility of th                | •  |
|                                    | idge Biomedical Campus   |
| -                                  | iomedical Campus (CBC) is located at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city                                       |
| of Cambridge. Th<br>patient care.  | e CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and   |
| Cambridge Unive                    | rsity Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CUH) is situated at the heart of the Campus and has over 1,000 beds, 11,000  |
| members of staf                    | and is one of the largest and best known acute hospital Trusts in the country. The 'local' hospital for our community,   |
| delivering care tl                 | rough Addenbrooke's hospital and the Rosie maternity hospital, CUH is also a leading regional and national centre for  |
| specialist treatm                  | ent; a government designated comprehensive biomedical research centre; a partner in one of six academic health   |
| science centres i                  | n the UK – Cambridge University Health Partners (CUHP); and a university teaching hospital with a worldwide reputation   |
| CUH with its hea                   | th system partners have recently secured funding from Government to develop a new specialist children's hospital   |
| serving the easte                  | rn region and following a further public announcement of additional significant funding CUH now has the opportunity to   |
| plan a new hosp<br>and Peterboroug | tal, including specialist cancer care facilities, on the CBC as part of an integrated healthcare system for Cambridgeshire<br>h.                                 |
| Other Cambridge                    | Biomedical Campus (CBC) partners include The Royal Papworth Hospital, one of the largest specialist cardiothoracic   |
| hospitals in Euro                  | be and the UK's main heart and lung transplant centre which treats 24,000 in-patients and day-case patients, and 73,600 ear supported by 1,800 members of staff. |
| • • •                              | ear, University of Cambridge have opened two buildings dedicated to healthcare research on the Campus and Abcam, a   |
| -                                  | ness supplying clinical sources for research work, have occupied their building. The three developments bring an   |
| additional 1200 of staff.          | nembers of staff to site. AstraZeneca will occupy their new building in 2021, bringing with them a further 2800 member   |
| Why this consult                   | ation is important to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge University Hospitals   |
| With world-lead                    | ng academic and industry scientists on the same site as the teaching hospitals of the University of Cambridge, the   |
| Campus is the op                   | timum environment for the rapid and effective translation of research into routine clinical practice.  |
| With the cost of                   | nealthcare set to increase as the demand from an aging population soars, we are set to develop the treatments of the   |
| Greater Cambrid                    | ge Partnerships scheme to improved public transport and active travel hub (A11) at Babraham and on to Cambridge. The   |
|                                    | ed the progress made to reach this stage of consultation, and is excited by the opportunities the new route, will bring to                                       |
| the accessibility                  |  |
|                                    | idge Biomedical Campus   |
|                                    | iomedical Campus (CBC) is located at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city                                       |
| -                                  | e CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and   |
| patient care.                      |  |

The site has grown considerably in recent years and the organisations on the site reflect the strength of healthcare and life sciences in Cambridge:

I Healthcare and the NHS: Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Royal Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust

I Education: The Deakin Centre and Cambridge Academy for Science and Technology

Duniversity of Cambridge School of Clinical Meddicine is housed in multiple buildings across the CBC and comprising twelve Academic Departments, five Research Institutes and five Medical Research Council (MRC) units. In 2022 the School will open the new Heart and Lung Research Institute.

2 • Research Institutes: The Medical Research Council Laboratory of Molecular Biology (MRC LMB)Industry & Expansion: AstraZeneca Strategic R&D Centre, GlaxoSmithKline's (GSK) Experimental Medicine and Clinical Pharmacology Unit, Abcam PLC Headquarters and ideaSpace – a co-working community of start-ups

As the largest employment site in Cambridge – the CBC is focused on ensuring patients benefit from the Campus' world-leading research. The international nature of the collaborations cut across traditional boundaries to allow us to work together on care, research and training. Our success is based on everyone's

willingness to unite to exert a powerful global influence as the Campus attracts world class companies, investment and talent to Cambridge with the aim of improving healthcare and knowledge.

Why this consultation is important to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus

With world-leading academic and industry scientists on the same site as the teaching hospitals of the University of Cambridge, the

Cambridge 17/12/2020 133 O Biomedical Campus email

Cambridge

University Hospitals email

17/12/2020 132 0

Campus is the optimum environment for the rapid and effective translation of research into routine clinical practice. 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 DOCO's are specialist crime prevention officers, we review the risk of crime within the built environment and offer designing out crime advice, making recommendations to reduce the risk. In addition to physical security, we will consider other measures including defensible space, access, crime and movement generators all of which can contribute to a reduction in crime and disorder. The role is vital to identify as early as possible, any future development vulnerable to crime, disorder or counter terrorism. This should ensure that

. ... .. . . . . . . . . South Cambridge City Busway Problem Profile INTRODUCTION Analysis was requested to establish the type and quantity of crimes and incidents that have been reported on the Guided Busway to the South of Cambridge City, Public consultation had shown that there was a fear of

| 26/02/2021 | 134 0                             | Cambridgeshire         Constabulary       email | <ul> <li>In the Distrity is a sarry spice of the second se</li></ul> | appendices contain<br>tables, maps, graphs,<br>footnotes and social<br>media screenshots | The bolase disavely to the solution particular, that there may be a violent gang in the area targeting pedestrians and cyclists using the route.<br>METHODOLOGY<br>Crime reports, incidents and Stop Search records were analysed for the period 01/06/2017 to 31/05/18 for two locations:<br>• Route 1 Cambridge Railway Station and Trumpington Park and Ride<br>• Route 2 Trumpington Community College and Addenbrookes Hospital.<br>Both data extractions were given a 40 m buffer zone either side of the bus lane to include incidents that may have occurred dose to the routes.1.<br>CONCUSION<br>In the twelve month period requested there were multiple crime types reported but analysis reveals two<br>predominant crime series; Cycle theft and Violence offences2.<br>Reports are concentrated at the Cambridge Railway Station and the immediate area (2673) followed by<br>Trumpington Park & Ride (46).<br>Theft of pedal cycles' accounted for the highest proportion of recorded crime (78, 54%), 4 of these crimes<br>have suspects who are also suspected of violent crime. Some of the pedal cycles stolen may be being used as<br>transport for suspects committing further offences. Violent crime reports represented 16% (23 crimes) of all<br>crime within the parameters3.<br>Analysis of all the suspects and offenders recorded indicate two groups linked to theft of pedal cycles; one<br>larger group and a smaller group, this group had a similar M/O to the first in that they were found with bolt<br>croppers in the area of the railway station. Two crimes recorded showed two separate lone individuals<br>arrested for theft of cycles.<br>RECOMMENDATIONS |  |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
|            |                                   | Cambridgeshire Fire                             | <ul> <li>Are there any areas identified as being predisposed to dense fog?</li> <li>What will be the gritting/ snow clearing policy for the route?</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |
| 04/03/2021 | 135 O                             | & Rescue email                                  |  |  |  |  |
|            | 136  <br>137<br>138<br>139<br>140 | letter  | Following the public transport consultation to explore the construction of a new travel hub near Four Went Ways (Little Abington),<br>Babraham (Little/Great Abington) and Granta Park (Great Abington/Hildersham) - I am still against all these options - as before.<br>Also the proposed route goes nowhere near Sawston, Stapleford or Great Shelford with the projected cost of £155million for five years<br>time or does this mean £200million for up to ten years time?<br>The entire project could link into the new Cambridge South railway station which may cost around £200million including £50million now<br>from the Greater Cambridge Partnership?  |  |  |  |

- 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173