

| Date | ID | O, I, L, P | Name | Form of Delivery | Text |
|----------------------|------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Of submission to GCP | e.g. 1,2,3 | Organisation, Individual, Landowner, Public Figure | | (Twitter, email, letter etc) | |
| | | | | | <p>However, I disagree with the route chosen across the North of Stapleford and Shelford, and strongly recommend that you re-examine 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 environmental grounds, that will avoid the sensitive area around Nine Wells and will make use of the uninteresting land where the old 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 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 old railway. Lastly, in terms of the two villages, you will be bringing the new busway through their existing centres, and not creating extensions that will compete on their Northern edges. It will also be politically easier, because of that better integration.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| 19/10/2020 | 1 I | | MP Real Estate | email | <p>Many thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Where can I get all the information and make my voice strong enough to make a difference and STOP this nonsensical development?</p> <p>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 been defined to my understanding).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>SO, WHAT IS THE PROBLEM THAT NEEDS SOLVING EXACTLY?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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 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 queuing with cars or providing an automated busway that serviced that park would have made some sense. But no, the decision is to run through open countryside over the hill from it, which makes no obvious sense, unless the Park and Ride is to close at some point, 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 from there to Babraham, that is used by about a dozen bikes per day, along an existing conduit that serves Granta Park to Cambridge.</p> <p>This busway madness is so very disappointing. Ecologically destructive, shortsighted and just ghastly when there are other alternatives. What a dreadful legacy to leave. @lewis_herbert @cllbridget Could the route be all about infill development ?@GreaterCams @SCLiBems @SCLiBems @SCLiBems</p> <p>Wow. @Feargal_Sharkey No wonder river groups & residents not involved in @GreaterCams Landscape & Ecology Group. Nor in GCP "Not Motorised Users Group" either. At consultations River Granta (eastern arm of Cam) was not shown in photos. Have @SouthCams planners approved this?</p> <p>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. And all that concrete where a railway could be? Disgusting. @SCLiBems shouldn't support this.</p> <p>This busway, its associated development and the further development that it will encourage will permanently destroy the landscape and environment in this area. The currently remaining green belt with open spaces make the villages in this area the villages that they are and not just suburbs of Cambridge like Cherry Hinton or Trumpington. Assuming the expected associated infill will be as unsatisfactory as the development south of Trumpington, this will be a very sad day for us all.</p> <p>I consider that the Council has not considered the real issues. The need is for transport into the centre of Cambridge and not just between the three Campuses, indeed even if the Council previously perceived a need for travel between the Campuses, is that perceived 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 old railway line, are clear and obvious alternatives to creating a new and separate busway. The proposed busway does not make more efficient use of existing means of transport and itself is inefficient. Accordingly, the obvious thing to do is to improve transport on the 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 railway line. Using a tram or railway would be much more efficient than a busway and this would be consistent with the Council's objectives. I believe that ignoring further possible use of the existing railway line is not acceptable especially considering that a new railway station near the hospital is likely to be built. As I have suggested before, moving the platforms at Shelford Station to the other 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 understand was a major main reason for rejecting the use of the railway line before.</p> <p>Travel to and from the Biomedical Campus at Addenbrooke's hospital is restricted by the very poor road layout and operation around 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 traffic management system at the front of the hospital. I strongly advise that you do not permit any more development on the Addenbrooke's site until you have properly addressed the immediate and long-term traffic needs on and around this site. Frankly you should have done this when the site was first developed, as I was assured many years ago that you would do when the 'New Addenbrooke's' site was first developed.</p> <p>The (mis)guided busway, the developments on the Addenbrooke's hospital site, the roads on that site and around the development south of Trumpington, the roads around Cambridge railway station and the changes to Hills Road are clear indications of the Council's Further to my mail yesterday, having considered this further I consider that I must add that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the main aim for developing the south east busway is to facilitate transport between the three campuses, the costs involved would be totally disproportionate. 2. Considering the map that you sent, it is clear that the busway will not directly serve the majority of the population in the Abingtons, Babraham, Sawston, Stapleford or Shelford as it largely runs across open countryside. 3. Although the proposed busway runs into the Cambridge biomedical campus, it does not connect directly to the Granta Park or 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 traffic to get to the Babraham 'travel hub'. <p>The better alternative which answers so many other questions is to provide a train or tram link based on the old Cambridge - Haverhill rail line.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A consideration of a rail link utilising the existing track, and potentially running along the old train route towards Haverhill, linking to the new Cambridge South station at Addenbrookes would seem to be a far more sensible approach. It would be far preferable to a underutilised stop up Hinton Way, improving accessibility from Shelford and Stapleford as well as further afield, whilst avoiding such irreparable damage to the countryside, and so I would urge further consideration of this.</p> <p>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 @GreaterCams</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Green Belt: https://www.smartertransport.uk/response-to-cambridge-south-east-transport-study-a1307-consultation-2018/</p> <p>To deliver the best CSET scheme @GreaterCams needs to re-examine the route. Instead of needlessly damaging Green Belt and precious landscape values, including @MaggDown it should reconsider the option of following the former railway route via Great Shelford / Stapleford.</p> <p>@GreaterCams should drop the archaic "bikes and buses" just a slight advance from "horses and carts", and go for a light rail network, and ensure that appropriate funding comes from the University Colleges that have benefited from the technology explosion. 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 chnp1/DRp2xQ6y29</p> <p>As a resident of Great Shelford I strongly disapprove of the proposed busway. It does not provide a useful service for the people of Shelford and in fact it adds a barrier delaying travel along Hinton Way. 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 nonsensical. I would favour the old railway route despite its "pinch points" but surely the simplest and cheapest option is simply to use the existing A1307 and the park and ride at The Gogs roundabout.</p> <p>Widening the road in places between The Gogs and Babraham would be simple, while creating another park and ride site at Babraham Institute and making a congestion charge for cars heading for Cambridge would provide an excellent and less polluting alternative. It is sheer folly to put a busway through green fields and across the busy roads leading to Shelford and Stapleford.</p> <p>Leave it well alone and leave the ideas and decisions to this it will effect</p> <p>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 Campus.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Sawton to Cambridge. Therefore, a quicker route will become most welcomed.</p> <p>I do however have the following questions:</p> <p>Will some trees be planted between the new development in Sawton 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.</p> <p>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 fourteways 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 fourteways. 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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>In addition to the above, I note the concrete viaducts that will be built to 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.</p> <p>I hope the above points can be taken as part of the consultation response. I would also welcome answers to the above if possible. make it go elsewhere 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!</p> <p>I object to GCP proposal to run busway across Greenbelt surrounding Stapleford. The obvious route should be along a widened A1307.</p> <p>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???</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Two very ugly bridges to cross River Granta for @GreaterCams environmentally damaging busway scheme. Who is funding River Granta biodiversity plans outlined today by @CamsCC at @wvre AGM? Landowner talked of Silicon Fen Life Science wanting to do their bit for the environment! Awesome photo- such a special place! Everyone listening please step up to stop the busway @GreaterCams want to run right across the Green Belt below this hill</p> <p>Two ugly bridges to cross River Granta for @GreaterCams environmentally damaging busway scheme. Who is funding Granta chalk stream biodiversity project? CLA President at Nat Cams Workshop told @waterne AGM, Silicon Fen Life Science want to do their bit for the environment.</p> <p>@greenarteries agreed, economic growth is trumping everything here in South Cams. You just have to look at the @GreaterCams busway routes and the call for sites. Is Cambridge ready to sacrifice the Gogs and @SaveTheFields. Who benefits? Is this really what the Green Belt is going to look like?</p> <p>[image/screenshot from flythroughvideo showing proposed bridge over River Granta in Stapleford]</p> <p>Why Spend £150Million on the new concret structure when the existing road is shorter and already in existence?</p> <p>[image/screenshot of interactive map showing whole route]</p> |
| 19/10/2020 | 2 O | | MP Real Estate | email | |
| 23/10/2020 | 3 I | | | email | |
| 20/10/2020 | 4 I | | | twitter | |
| 20/10/2020 | 5 I | | | twitter | |
| 20/10/2020 | 6 I | | | twitter | |
| 27/10/2020 | 7 I | | | email | |
| 28/10/2020 | 8 I | | | email | |
| 28/10/2020 | 9 I | | | email | |
| 29/10/2020 | 10 I | | | twitter | |
| 29/10/2020 | 11 O | | Railfuture Eastgla | twitter | |
| 20/10/2020 | 12 O | | Smarter Cambridge Transport | twitter | |
| 20/10/2020 | 13 O | | Smarter Cambridge Transport | twitter | |
| 03/11/2020 | 14 O | | CambridgeConnect | twitter | |
| 03/11/2020 | 15 I | | | twitter | |
| 04/11/2020 | 16 I | | | twitter | |
| 02/11/2020 | 17 I | | | email | |
| 03/11/2020 | 18 I | | | Facebook | |
| 10/11/2020 | 19 I | | | twitter | |
| 05/11/2020 | 20 I | | | email | |
| 05/11/2020 | 21 I | | | email | |
| 06/11/2020 | 22 I | | | web feedback | |
| 10/11/2020 | 23 I | | | email | |
| 10/11/2020 | 24 I | | | email | |
| 17/11/2020 | 25 I | | | twitter | |
| 17/11/2020 | 26 O | | CambridgeConnect | twitter | |
| 18/11/2020 | 27 I | | | twitter | |
| 18/11/2020 | 28 I | | | twitter | |
| 18/11/2020 | 29 I | | | email | |

notes/images/visuals Attachments 1

Attachments 2

| | | | | | |
|------------|------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>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 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I would like my views represented at the next consultation and a request to increase the distance from residential properties by at least 100meters. I would also like to know what environmental proposals are in place to negate the noise , vibration and light what ever route it takes past a residential property like ours.</p> | |
| 24/11/2020 | 30 I | | email | <p>Without a doubt ,this is the wrong route for a busway. Deliberately trashing 2 village communities in the greenbelt and opening up the fields to infill development. @GreaterCams have no shame. This and the SE busway are nothing other than environmental vandalism @HardwickView</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We should be grateful if you would please ensure that this is taken into account as part of the consultation process.</p> | |
| 24/11/2020 | 31 I | | twitter | <p>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.</p> <p>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 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 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 and waiting 10 minutes, leaving my bike there and then walking to the location at the hospital. Makes less sense if in Shelford.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Save the money on the construction of the route through green belt. Spend money on "Park and Charge" at Babraham. Offer the charge facility for future proofing the exist Park and Ride.</p> <p>It's greener and it's further income generating from and already good location to park and ride in to Cambridge.</p> | |
| 25/11/2020 | 32 L | | Cheveley Park Farms email | <p>Worth thinking about.</p> <p>I have an idea.</p> <p>You stay away from any decisions, stop spunking taxpayers money on vanity and virtue signalling projects, oh and just disband and let individuals who have been voted in by the public and listen to the public decide how money is spent.</p> <p>[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 decisions.</p> <p>I object very strongly to the proposed route for the guided busway. It will desecrate the view from Magog Down.</p> <p>The Magog Downs is a critically important nature reserve and should be conserved in all ways.</p> <p>Please do not affect it by putting a busway through it.</p> <p>That, in these days of conservation, would be horrendous and against everything we are trying to achieve</p> <p>1. Please select one of the following statements: [X] I am responding on behalf of a group or business, or as an elected representative Cambridge Group, Ramblers</p> <p>Francis Crick Avenue</p> <p>2. Having read the information provided on proposals for Francis Crick Avenue do you agree with the proposed segregation of the cycling/ pedestrian path along the western side of Francis Crick Avenue? [X] Yes</p> <p>3. Do you consider it is necessary to have a pedestrian footway along the eastern side of Francis Crick Avenue between Dame Archer Way and the existing guided busway in addition to the footway along the western side? [X] Yes</p> <p>4. The proposed layout of the interchange between Cambridge South Station/ guided busway / Francis Crick Avenue interchange is shown below. If you have any comments to make, please write them in the box below and use the numbering to identify the issue you are commenting on where appropriate. LIGHTS ON THE DIAGONAL CROSSING SHOULD ALLOW TIME FOR THE LESS ABLE (Box 3)</p> <p>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? [X] New avenue of trees either side of the public transport corridor and highway CLEARLY AN AVENUE SHOULD HAVE TREES</p> <p>Nine Wells Area</p> <p>6. If you have visited the Nine Wells local nature reserve how do you normally gain access? D Via the DNA path* coming from Great Shelford</p> <p>We note the introductory words from Councillor Roger Hickford, Chair of Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP's) Executive Board: "We are committed to developing schemes that improve biodiversity wherever we can. This consultation is asking for people to look at 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."</p> <p>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 and place of calm and engagement with nature, is also a highly valued and venerable amenity for the local community.</p> <p>We are delighted with this commitment by GCP to protect and enhance the environment and with the evidence, both in our discussions with GCP and the Mott MacDonald team, and in the plans and published material, that there will be additional habitat creation around the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, including that achieved by moving the route away from the hedgerow south of Nine Wells. These elements accord with a range of concepts that were brought together in 2004 by a group of interested parties including Hobson's Conduit Trust and the City Council as a vision for a Greater Nine Wells, and these concepts have been the potential recipients of £106 funds drawn together by Cambridge City Council. We have recently combined these ideas and others in our Vision document for Nine Wells which is attached to this response.</p> <p>In due course we expect to take part in discussions about the landscaping, planting scheme and proposed management and access arrangements for the proposed new areas of woodland buffer zone around Nine Wells, and landscape woodland between the proposed route and the railway line, and the associated proposed species rich mixed grassland to be created between the route and Nine Wells, through which Hobson's Brook runs.</p> <p>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 confirm, that there will be no deleterious impact on Hobson's Conduit.</p> <p>As we have made clear in our discussions so far, our main preoccupation with the current proposal is with the crossing over Hobson's Brook, and we are alarmed and dismayed by what we now see to be the width of the proposed bridge.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We have now seen pictorial evidence that this bridge will be a far wider structure than we anticipated, and we are concerned that this, RESPONSE</p> <p>First, we wish to thank the Partnership's CSET team for the openness with which this major project has been conducted from its inception in 2016 to now. This is appreciated.</p> <p>Support</p> <p>The Association strongly supports CSET as the best way to ensure growing numbers of travellers to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and beyond from south east of Cambridge choose environmentally sustainable public transport rather than the environmentally harmful 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 Campus, with staff numbers alone due to increase from 17,250 now to 26,000 by 2031 and up to 30,000 beyond that year. Whereas the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP's) target for traffic reduction would have required one in ten car trips to be removed from our 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 reductions can be anticipated from the project on the A1301 as well as the A1307.</p> <p>Our support is not unconditional. Some concerns expressed previously have been responded to positively, for example on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve (NWLNR). Others remain, however, in particular on the public interchange with Cambridge South Station, connection to the existing guided busway, linkage with the Campus's Transport Strategy and 5 Year Implementation Plan and construction impact on NWLNR.</p> <p>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] Francis Crick Avenue (FCA) Junction of FCA, CSET & existing busway</p> <p>The need for partnership working between the GCP and Network Rail (NR) is evident from comparison of respective plans for this vital intersection. [The "more detailed view" on the ninth page of the CSET consultation document compared with paragraphs 5.2.11, 6.1.13 & Appendix C of the Cambridge South Station Stakeholder Information Pack] NHS's present plan does not make obvious provision for CSET's guided bus only central lanes and stops or for the "diagonal crossing to reduce crossing times and improve pedestrian permeability" proposed by CSET. [Ninth page] This junction will be complex with significant numbers of pedestrians, cyclists, guided</p> | |
| 02/12/2020 | 37 I | | email | <p>I am writing with some comments on the proposals for the proposed new public transport route shown in your online consultation documents.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In principle the idea of providing better connections between Cambridge and its surrounding settlements makes much sense, particularly 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, like my mother, there are limited options currently. Our comments are more specifically about the chosen route and the potential mitigation of its impact on the setting, with a view to maintaining the remarkable sense of separation between village and city which the landscape north of Great Shelford creates.</p> <p>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 interrupt the landscape swathe which separates Great Shelford from Cambridge. Perhaps this was part of an earlier consultation of which we were not aware (my mother speaks limited English) but it would be helpful to know whether this was tested, perhaps with a</p> <p>Survey does not include questions on the section between Sawston and Shelford</p> <p>We are surprised that the survey does not contain questions about the busway route between Sawston and Shelford. This is an 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 proposals for this aspect of the project</p> <p>Lack of connectivity between South Cambridgeshire villages</p> <p>Cambridge County Council's transport strategy for South Cambridgeshire states a priority is to link villages with public transport. 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, LAFS 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 busway route along the railway line is fully feasible from a physical and engineering point of view.</p> <p>2. Design of the Park and Ride – A11 Travel Hub</p> <p>Improved landscaping of the entrance to the hub from the A1307</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Adding an entrance to the hub from the A11</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>1. Water</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | |
| 03/12/2020 | 38 O | | Ramblers - Cambridge Group email | <p>2 screenshots/maps, showing footpaths in the area</p> <p>HOBSON'S CONDUIT TRUST SUMMARY</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>The Trust's overall vision is to preserve and enhance the value of Nine Wells, to safeguard the flow of clean water from the springs, to protect the setting of Nine Wells and to preserve and enhance public use and enjoyment of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 monument (Listed Building, Grade II) to Thomas Hobson and other benefactors of the scheme. • The land around Nine Wells, its setting, is of significant similar value. Hobson's Brook runs through it. Within 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. • 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 public benefit. • Sympathetic management, both of Nine Wells and its setting, is of critical importance in achieving the Trust's vision. • 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 order to improve the management of the whole area the Trust would welcome a substantial extension of the Local Nature Reserve. <p>2</p> | |
| 04/12/2020 | 39 O | | Hobson's Conduit Trust email | <p>2 photos in appendix A showing the existing Trumpington Busway bridge over Hobson's Conduit</p> <p>1 map in attachment showing Nine Wells and its surroundings</p> <p>2</p> | |
| 04/12/2020 | 40 O | | Trumpington Residents' Association email | <p>I am writing with some comments on the proposals for the proposed new public transport route shown in your online consultation documents.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In principle the idea of providing better connections between Cambridge and its surrounding settlements makes much sense, particularly 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, like my mother, there are limited options currently. Our comments are more specifically about the chosen route and the potential mitigation of its impact on the setting, with a view to maintaining the remarkable sense of separation between village and city which the landscape north of Great Shelford creates.</p> <p>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 interrupt the landscape swathe which separates Great Shelford from Cambridge. Perhaps this was part of an earlier consultation of which we were not aware (my mother speaks limited English) but it would be helpful to know whether this was tested, perhaps with a</p> <p>Survey does not include questions on the section between Sawston and Shelford</p> <p>We are surprised that the survey does not contain questions about the busway route between Sawston and Shelford. This is an 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 proposals for this aspect of the project</p> <p>Lack of connectivity between South Cambridgeshire villages</p> <p>Cambridge County Council's transport strategy for South Cambridgeshire states a priority is to link villages with public transport. 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, LAFS 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 busway route along the railway line is fully feasible from a physical and engineering point of view.</p> <p>2. Design of the Park and Ride – A11 Travel Hub</p> <p>Improved landscaping of the entrance to the hub from the A1307</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Adding an entrance to the hub from the A11</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>1. Water</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | |
| 06/12/2020 | 41 I | | email | <p>photo showing muntjac deer in garden</p> | |
| 06/12/2020 | 42 O | | Little Abington Parish Council email | <p>Improved landscaping of the entrance to the hub from the A1307</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Adding an entrance to the hub from the A11</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>1. Water</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | |
| 07/12/2020 | 43 I | | email | <p>Improved landscaping of the entrance to the hub from the A1307</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Adding an entrance to the hub from the A11</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>1. Water</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | |

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.
- Commuter cyclists would have a less interrupted journey although we do not wish this to be seen as an opportunity for increased cycle speed.
- 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.
- A more pleasant and rural feel to the route for leisure active travellers with open views towards the Magg Hills not marred by passing high speed buses.
- At Sawston, there would be a direct link on to the roadside Active Travel route without the need to cross the busway.
- At Stapleford, a direct link on to the existing Active Travel route up to Magg 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 proposed. The DNA path to Shelford would serve those wanting to travel in that direction.

11/12/2020 60 O British Horse Society email

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.

11/12/2020 61 I email

Like many others, I'll be sat in front of the earthmovers if they come.
consultation on the Cambridge South East Transport scheme, we would like to submit the letter below, which we sent to the Department 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 26th 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 Magg 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;
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.

Alternative option 1 – use of the existing A1307 corridor:

11/12/2020 62 P Cllr Nick Sample 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

1. Please find set out below the response from Haverhill Town Council (HTC) in respect of elements of the SE Cambridge CAMS proposal.
2. HTC agrees with the proposed segregation of the cycling / pedestrian path along the western side of Francis Crick Avenue
3. HTC expresses no opinion on the need for a pedestrian footway along the eastern side of Francis Crick Avenue between Dame Mary Archer Way and the existing guided busway in addition to the footway along the western side.
4. HTC expresses no opinion in respect of the proposed layout of the interchange between the planned Cambridge South Station / guided busway / Francis Crick Avenue interchange
5. HTC would encourage tree planting using species natural to the location
6. We have no opinion on matters in respect of Nine Wells
10. We strongly oppose the section of route between Sawston and Babraham, considering that it cuts unnecessarily across the River Granta and that the Babraham travel hub is in the wrong location.
11. 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 vote.
12. 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 vote.
13. HTC supports the provision of seating to encourage less-fit people to undertake longer walking routes. Any picnic area needs to be able to be easily serviced and rubbish cleared.
14. HTC supports a path alongside the public transport route. This is because we do not support the location of the travel hub and it would be confusing for a path alongside the transport route to disappear – it could prompt pedestrians and others to use the main carriageway of the transport route, which would be highly dangerous.
15. Whilst HTC would support the planting of an avenue of trees along sections of the route, this should be done judiciously and under advisement from landscape professionals, so as not to alter artificially the character of the landscape. We do not know if the large open fields are a result of intrusive farming practices that altered a historically different landscape, but would expect any new planting would be complementary to efforts to re-establish natural landscapes and biodiversity.
16. HTC supports only route C, but strongly oppose all other travel routes from the hub as they are dependent on this environmentally

11/12/2020 63 O Haverhill Town Coun email

We are instructed by Axis Land Partnerships Ltd (Axis Land) to respond to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultation for the Cambridge South East Transport Project (CSET Project).
Axis Land is promoting land between Hinton Way and Haverhill Rd in Stapleford for the provision of a retirement care village, a planning application for development of the land for these purposes is presently pending determination. A site location plan is enclosed which defines the site area for the proposed retirement care village. The land in question would be directly affected by the preferred route of the CSET Project between Stapleford and Great Shelford.
Axis Land is also promoting land at Hinton Way for residential development. A site location plan showing the extent of this land is also enclosed. The proposed Hinton Way bus stop would conflict with the promoted use of this land.
Axis Land is supportive of the principle of the CSET Project and the principle of a better public transport and active travel route between Granta Park and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. However, Axis Land strongly objects to the specific elements of the detailed scheme that conflict with their proposals for a retirement care village at Stapleford.
With minor alteration to the design to the CSET Project this conflict can be avoided without detrimental impact upon the CSET Project itself.

Background

Axis Land has previously promoted two parcels of land at Stapleford through the 'Call for Sites' process of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The details of these land parcels are as follows:

- land south of Hinton Way in Stapleford (JDI Ref. 40246) - promoted for residential development (up to 100 units) including affordable housing or a retirement/care village.
 - land west of Haverhill Road in Stapleford (JDI Ref. 51758) - promoted for a retirement/care village or residential development (up to 90 units) including affordable housing. As set out below, a planning application has been submitted for a retirement care village on the Haverhill Road site.
- Both parcels are located within the Green Belt. It is considered that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of the sites from the Green Belt as part of the local plan process. These relate to the need for housing, affordable housing, and retirement/care dwellings in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. It is

11/12/2020 64 O Axis Landpartnership email

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).

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.

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!

12/12/2020 65 I email

[name redacted]
Babraham Parish Council
GCP's proposed route for the Cambridge South-East Busway with particular reference to the environmental damage caused to the 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 consider that the questionnaire developed by GCP allows the kind of response that is demanded if serious comment is to be made concerning the Environment Impact of the proposed route.

I should be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this email and the enclosed attachment which is being sent to GCP on 12 December 2020.

I am copying this paper to the following:

- The Chair of the Magg Down Trust
- The CEO of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
- The MP for South Cambridgeshire
- The Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
- Councillor Roger Hickford
- Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer
- Councillor Lewis Herbert
- The Department of Transport

12/12/2020 66 I email

Consultation 2020.
This letter is a response to the revised proposals for this new public transport route and the associated Park and Ride site. Our response is primarily concerned with the details of the active travel elements, in particular the new shared-use path for cyclists and walkers alongside this new public transport route.

We strongly support a new shared-use path for cyclists and walkers alongside this new public transport route. We consider this path to 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 we are disappointed by the standard path design that is proposed in the latest plans. We think this new path should be designed for higher levels of use and this requires the path to be wider than currently proposed.

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 [Cycle Infrastructure Design: Local Transport Note 1/20 – July 2020]. We think this is needed to promote and support the growth in active travel as part of your stated objective to reduce congestion in Cambridge. This letter recommends a series of changes to rectify the substandard elements that currently fail to meet this standard.

This response makes clear how the proposals fail to meet the minimum standards specified in LTN 1/20. We also identify how the cycle and walking proposals also fail to meet your own Non Motorised User Working Group design principles as listed in the consultation documents.

We find it hard to understand the rationale for proposing substandard active travel elements given the high cost of this scheme. We argue that the economic case is stronger if the active travel elements are designed to comply with the published standards for the complete route. It would be a false economy to continue with a design with so many substandard elements.

It is hugely disappointing to see the plans proposing a very expensive busway with substandard cycling and walking elements. The modal shares of Cambridge travel show why this is misguided. Modal share for walking and cycling is over 40%, while modal share for bus travel is well below 10%. As many others have pointed out, expensive new busways will not make a significant difference to the congestion in Cambridge unless they are combined with effective measures to discourage the use of private motor vehicles and combined with substantial extra

12/12/2020 67 O CTC Cambridge email

Regarding the consultation, I wish to register my opposition to this scheme.

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 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 downgrades and destruction of the environment.

The route along the old railway line should be 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.

12/12/2020 68 I email

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

Location plans

referenced within the

submission:

Alternative Alignment

Plan

Land East of Hinton

Way

Site Location Plan

Axis Stapleford

Illustrative Masterplan

Land Use & Heights

Parameter

I am a regular user of the 'DNA' and guided-busway cyclepath to Cambridge using it most weekends for shopping or leisure, and (in non-covid times) on some weekday evenings. It takes me only 20 minutes to cycle to the centre of Cambridge, reliably, at any time of day or night, or traffic-conditions – so, except in particularly inclement weather, is my default way of getting into town.
I have had phases of cycling to work (redacted) via the DNA path, Lammas Land and West Cambridge, but given that it takes 45 mins each way (compared to 15mins to drive) I don't do that regularly.
I also enjoy exploring the south Cambridge countryside by bicycle on off-road paths or low-traffic roads for leisure and exercise and am familiar with many of the local routes, including the NCR 11 to Ely, and existing routes from Stapleford to Babraham.
As a resident, I also have an interest in maintaining the local environment and appeal of the area. I have wider concerns at the pace and scale of development in the Cambridge area.
Please find my comments on the Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) project on the following pages.

The Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) project is of no direct benefit to me.
I am a frequent user of the 'DNA' and guided-busway cyclepath to Cambridge; it is my primary way to travel from Shefford to Cambridge for shopping and leisure.
I already have 'leisure' cycle routes to get to Babraham – though admittedly those routes via the Stapleford, the black barn and Rowley Lane are not 'commuter' routes, especially during the wet winter months. The Active Travel Route (ATR) (cycleway) part of the scheme would be 'nice to have', but I presume could be achieved at considerably lower cost by following the existing route and track-bed of the old railway line from Shefford/Stapleford to Granta Park.
I rarely ever use buses or guided-buses as I can't take my bicycle on them, which leaves me stranded for the 'last mile(s)' at the far end. Trains are vastly superior in this respect, as you can use a bicycle at both ends of the journey.
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 bicycles can somehow be carried safely, as a 'plus bike' combination allows vastly more flexibility.
The proposed CSET scheme is essentially a Park and Ride between the A11 Granta Park area and Addenbrookes site. I have strong reservations about the cost-benefit of this scheme, particularly the justification for building a whole new roadway (largely parallel to the existing A1307), the capacity and cost-effectiveness of the bus system and carpark. If the traffic congestion on the A1307 could be mitigated some other way, then the bus could use that route, with no huge infrastructure costs. (What is the effect of more post-Covid work-from-home? We need to reduce car use for pollution reasons anyway).

Images showing maps and visualisations used as part of the consultation materials:
Francis Crick Avenue
DNA path
Shefford Stop
River Granta Bridge
near Stapleford

Dear Sir/Madam,

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.

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.

We feel that the money would be better spent on improving cycling infrastructure, bus services and travel hubs, not building huge car 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.

https://www.smartertransport.uk/travel-hubs/?utm_source=General&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=7b7d4f8437-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2020_12_13_12_26&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_dff1204f23f-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.

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.
May I take the opportunity to endorse Smarter Cambridge's response
• Smarter Cambridge Transport's response

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 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 environmental cost and wider social benefit."

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.

In the short-term, improved pedestrian, cycling facilities and bus services would be a better option.

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.
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.

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 link was severed in 1967. Reinstating the railway as either heavy rail or light rail to link into the main network at Shefford and hence to Cambridge South would also provide for Sawton, 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 than 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. The 2015 survey for Cambridgeshire Council did not identify any 'deal breakers'. There is the opportunity to carry out a more detailed assessment using the Government's current 75% grant for restoring former railway lines. It is important that GCP join together with West Suffolk and support the initiative sponsored by Railfuture to explore this option further before it is too late.

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:

1. The environmental impact assessment should have been undertaken prior to choosing a single option for the route to ensure that independent assessment is not biased now a great deal of money has been spent on only one option.
2. The Magg down is a local wildlife site that is a precious and unique source of green space and tranquility for local and wider Cambridge residents that will be heavily impacted by this development.
3. Alternatives to the route are very viable e.g. the existing train line route which would serve the community of Shefford and Stapleford much better without increasing light, noise and pollution to more residents of these communities. The majority of residents in Shefford and Stapleford would not use the proposed bus stops at the periphery of the village.
4. Home working and reduced travel has significantly changed the need for this development. An impact assessment of this change is required.
5. The impact of fly by parking for the roads serving the bus stops needs to assess the congestion and pollution to the local area.
6. This is essentially a glorified park and ride. Why not analyse the option of using green-powered public transport buses on existing roads.

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.

We would like to submit this document for consideration. It focuses primarily on autoroute alignment around Babraham. In compiling the document, we sought the advice of Richard Buxton Solicitors, local villagers, Babraham Parish Council, Babraham Neighbourhood Plan Committee and Cheveley Farms (the landowner). 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 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 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 Europe, the Americas and Australia. These connections give the Site great historic interest, at a local, national and international level.

It concludes:

We (names redacted) would like to re-iterate our strong objection to the recent suggested change to the auto bus route between Babraham and Sawton. We are aware that (name redacted) has explored this in great depth and so strongly support his views which are outlined in the attached document.

Camcyle 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 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 not comment 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.
We expect that such ATRs will be used by cyclists, pedestrians, mobility scooter riders, equestrians and any other legally allowed user as defined 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 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.

ATR on the north side of the PTR
Pros – Avoids PTR station facilities, reducing conflict between passengers and users of the ATR.
– Integrates much more cleanly with the Babraham Road / Sawton Road section of the ATR.

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-planning-2>.

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 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 Sawton to the new Sawton 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 agricultural revolution that transformed British farming in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries".

"The designed progression from Babraham Hall through formal gardens and the canalised River Granta to parkland with trees and thence to open treeless fields contributes to our understanding of the Hall as the centre of the Adene Estate (figure 1). The open farmland setting contributes to our understanding of Church Farm as the centre of a historically important sheep-farming operation: it is part of

I strongly oppose the current routing of the busway to the East of Shefford 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.

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 Shefford, 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.

a number of images, photographs and diagrams were supplied and referenced within the attachment

two images were supplied and referenced within the text

a number of images, photographs and diagrams were supplied and referenced within the text

Babraham Neighbourhood Plan Committee

12/12/2020 69 I

email

13/12/2020 70 I

email

13/12/2020 71 I

email

13/12/2020 72 I

email

13/12/2020 73 I

email

13/12/2020 74 I

email

13/12/2020 75 I

email

13/12/2020 76 I

email

13/12/2020 77 I

email

13/12/2020 78 I

email

13/12/2020 79 I

email

13/12/2020 80 I

email

13/12/2020 81 O

Camcyle

email

13/12/2020 82 O

Babraham Neighbourhood Plan Committee

email

13/12/2020 83 I

email

I am strongly opposed to the Cambridge South East transport project. I fully support the statement from Smarter Transport - <https://www.smartertransport.org.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 unit 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 fit 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 probably 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.

acknowledgement.

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

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

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.org.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 plans should support in the longer term the re-opening of the Cambridge-Haverhill line, possibly aligning it with a further extension to 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 worked on mini-roundabouts and early simulation programs for roundabouts and major junctions. 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 through 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 NEEDS to solve those in the City Centre. Do that either by effective congestion and pollution charging, or by a new public transport facility 'within' the City (say a short 2 mile tunnel under the historic core with surface connections to PR sites being terminators for express buses, using 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.

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.

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 proposed. There will also be significant noise and light pollution for residents close to the crossings and for wildlife. The use of the existing railway will generate much less pollution on every count.

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.

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

Within the immediate Cambridge region, we have proposed a light rail line from the Girton Interchange in the northwest to Granta Park in the southeast, via the University West Campus, city centre, Cambridge Central Rail Station, Addenbrookes, Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston. The line would extend ~22 km (~14 mi) and we call this route the 'Isaac Newton Line' (Figure 3) (Harris et al. 2019). The light rail line would follow existing and former rail alignments, run underground within the historic city core, and follow the busway alignment between Cambridge Central Rail Station and Addenbrookes. Extensions to the 'Isaac Newton Line' light rail backbone are possible in due course, for example to Haverhill and Cambourne.

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 Train in developing these proposals and engaging with local organisations (e.g. CPFF, local parishes and Rail Haverhill) and residents. 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.

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 delivery in Cambridgeshire is thoroughly reviewed to include light rail.

Notwithstanding the above views regarding light rail, we recognise the Greater Cambridge Partnership (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 proposals for a fully segregated bus road following the Shelford Rail Alignment (Figure 2), not light rail.

Our evaluation is informed in part by detailed evidence developed by an independent evaluation of the option 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 below their response to the latest consultation for the CSET scheme.

In general terms the Trustees are supportive of the proposals to enhance public transport to this important location.

They do have concerns, however that the design of the scheme in Francis Crick Avenue should seek to maintain the high quality street scene that has been created and that the combined road and CSET route must be landscaped to a high quality. They consider that care will be required to ensure the route and road don't become a barrier to easy movement of people from one side of FCA to the other.

We regard the Pemberton owned field south of Addenbrooke's Road and adjoining Nine Wells as having significant hope value for inclusion in future development of CBC, should that come forward and as a result land take in this area should be kept to a minimum. The Trustees are willing to review how environmental mitigation of the scheme can be placed on less valuable land within the Pemberton ownership to the south east at White Hill Farm.

It will be critical to ensure that the CSET and Network Rail schemes are well co-ordinated to minimise land take and ensure delivery is achievable without causing significant disruption to the campus.

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 is 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).

CPRE's comments are as follows.

Integrated Transport Strategy

1 CPRE is very concerned by the apparent lack of any integrated transport strategy for the area around Cambridge and for the County as a whole.

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 scale (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.

3 The basis for this proposal arises from the flawed and out-dated concept of the infinite expandability of Cambridge.

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

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.

1. Introduction.

2. The Apt Planning Ltd response to the EIA Public Consultation.

2.1 The EIA Regs. requirement to consider reasonable alternatives.

2.2 The reasons why the Shelford Railway Alignment is a reasonable alternative.

Table 1. A Comparison of Sustainable Effects.

2.3 A suggested package of measures that should also be included.

Appendix 1. A Comparison of Environmental Effects.

Map 1. Map of Shelford Railway Alignment.

1. Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017.

2. The requirements of the EIA process.

3. The description of potentially significant effects.

3.1 Natural Resources.

3.2 Pollution & Nuisance, Noise, severance & light pollution.

3.3 Population & Health.

3.4 Water Resources.

3.5 Biodiversity.

3.6 Landscape & Visual Impact.

3.7 Cultural Heritage.

3.8 Conclusions of Comparison of Environmental Effects.

Map 2. Map of Landscape Constraints.

Table 2. A Comparison of Environmental Effects.

Appendix 2. Reasonable Alternatives Studied by the Developer.

1. Rail Viability Technical Note, 2015.

a number of images were supplied within the text map showing Isaac Newton Line and CSET route aerial map showing the railway route and proposed CSET route photo of former rail embankment photo of Crodon Tramlink alignment immediately west of Beckenham Junction station with light rail line at far left, while the remaining three lines are heavy rail

a number of maps have been supplied and are referenced within the text and attachments

Section 2.3.6 refers to: "important views into Cambridge from ... the high ground of the chalk hills to the south-east of the City."

Section 3.1.5 stated that the Hobson's Brook Corridor was a 'Defining Character of Cambridge' from Hobson's Conduit supply of water to Cambridge since 1610 & its green spaces. Its Vision was to safeguard the character of the area to maximise this resource for the future benefit of Cambridge people "from pressures for use as "rapid-transit transport corridors & cycle corridors."

Section 3.3.3 states that the Chalklands are also a 'Defining Character of Cambridge'. Its characteristics of views, & open higher rolling landscape near Cambridge, were subject to pressures from nearby development. The Vision was "to secure the area from inappropriate development, & conserve & where possible, enhance landscape features & biodiversity to improve amenity, while seeking opportunities for access & informal recreation opportunities."

3.6.3 2008 Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan.

The scale of development released from the Green Belt at the Cambridge Biomedical Centre adjoining Addenbrookes Hospital under the 2003 Cambridge Structure Plan has required "extensive" mitigation measures of Countryside Enhancement to the south of the City boundary. The 2008 Cambridgeshire Southern Fringe Area Action Plan Policies CSF/1 & 5 identified the need for Countryside Enhancement measures

between the City boundary, the A1307, & Haverhill Road, Stapleford, as compensation for the release of Green Belt to enable the construction of the Cambridge Biomedical Centre. (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP paragraph C3.1).

The chalkland character of the area between the City boundary and the Gog Magog Hills comprises rolling countryside rising towards a spur of high ground at the Gog Magog Hills. The

landscape is broad in scale & offers uninterrupted views from Magog Down across large arable fields with occasional hedges & copses to the city in the north west, to Great Shelford/Stapleford west, & to Sawston in the south, (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP paragraph C3.4).

This rolling chalkland landscape & these important uninterrupted public views are therefore protected under Policies CSF/1 & CSF/5 (2a-h) of the 2018 South Cambridge Local Plan & the 2008 Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan.

9. The Economic Case, May 2020.

The Department of Transport has defined categories of Value for Money. BENEFIT TO COST RATIO VALUE FOR MONEY

0-1 POOR

1-1.5 LOW

1.5-2 MEDIUM

2-4 HIGH

The proposed option has a Poor Value for Money rating, based on a Benefit to Cost Ratio of 0.8. So public sector funding from the City Deal or the Department of Transport is unlikely to meet Value for Money requirements of the:

i) The Guide to Transport & Works Act Procedures, which requires the promoter to have the capability to attract the necessary funding, paragraph 1.31 of the Guide.

ii) Local Frameworks for Funding Major Transport Schemes, which requires that all bodies have the responsibility for ensuring value for money is achieved, paragraph 21 of the Guidance.

iii) Transport Analysis Guidance, WebTAG, Dept. for Transport, May 2018, which requires an Indicative Benefit to Cost ratio.

iv) Value for Money Framework, Dept. for Transport, 2015, which provides guidance on how decision-makers ensure value for money in the use of public funds.

v) Transport Business Cases, Dept. for Transport, Jan. 2013, which allows for adjustments to account for qualitative & quantitative impacts which are not monetised. The social, economic & environmental impacts are all assessed to determine the extent to which the benefits outweigh its costs.

In June 2020, the Greater Cambridge Partnership requested further work on the Business Case to provide a Medium Value for Money Rating with a Benefit to Cost

Dear Sirs,
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!

14/12/2020 114 I email

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 email

I looked at the online survey and as far as I could see the questions all made the presumption that the 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.

14/12/2020 116 I email

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 line 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 email

15/12/2020 118 I 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 distances 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 a 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 the parking available at the proposed park and ride site.

Further clarification is required around the access arrangements to Babraham and Granta Park. If the scheme is to provide an attractive and viable alternative to the

16/12/2020 119 O email

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

The trains are currently empty, there not going to open one that was closed over 50 years ago because it was underused then ☹️ 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 users a day.

10/12/2020 120 I twitter

10/12/2020 121 I twitter

10/12/2020 122 I twitter

Two accidents on the A1307 today, one at Linton, the other at Horsehead. If only there was an alternative to cars using the A1307. @RailHaverhill @RailfutureEA @GreaterCams

11/12/2020 123 I twitter

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 ever there was a time for a train link to Cambridge - it's now!

11/12/2020 124 I 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 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 actionable responses.

11/12/2020 125 I twitter

11/12/2020 126 I twitter

I note you state 'final design' surely the final design will be after consideration of the consultation responses you are asking for? If not 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 twitter

Harston Residents' Group

Please: no more (mis)guided busways. The world has changed but @GreaterCams is stuck on outdated models. Respond now! We've submitted our objections to the CSET busway as the district councillors for Shelford ward. See m.facebook.com/ShelfordWardGCP. GCP would carve a narrow busway across the edge of the Magog Down; alternative routes would serve the existing communities better, & cause less damage.

13/12/2020 128 P twitter

Councillor Peter Fane

There may be situations where it is necessary to carve a new busway through open countryside, even through sensitive and valued countryside in the green belt in order to improve sustainable transport. This is not one of them. Alternative and less damaging options are available.

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 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 important to clarify the typo.

Nov-20 129 I LinkedIn

scheme's proximity to existing Network Rail infrastructure and consideration of cumulative impacts with the proposed Cambridge South 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.

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 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 soakways 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 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 maintenance of the future CSIE scheme will not be prejudiced by the development.

18/12/2020 130 O email

Network Rail

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 of what the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CIPIER) 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 CIPIER in 2018 the CSET project could be the first Local Authority infrastructure 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 email

Cambridge Ahead

Greater Cambridge Partnerships scheme to improve public transport and active travel hub (A11) at Babraham and on to Cambridge. CUH welcomes the progress made to reach this stage of consultation, and is excited by the opportunities the new route, will bring to the accessibility of the campus.

About the Cambridge Biomedical Campus
The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is located at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city of Cambridge. The CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and patient care.

Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CUH) is situated at the heart of the Campus and has over 1,000 beds, 11,000 members of staff and is one of the largest and best known acute hospital Trusts in the country. The 'local' hospital for our community, delivering care through Addenbrooke's hospital and the Rosie maternity hospital, CUH is also a leading regional and national centre for specialist treatment; a government designated comprehensive biomedical research centre; a partner in one of six academic health science centres in the UK – Cambridge University Health Partners (CUHP); and a university teaching hospital with a worldwide reputation. CUH with its health system partners have recently secured funding from Government to develop a new specialist children's hospital serving the eastern region and following a further public announcement of additional significant funding CUH now has the opportunity to plan a new hospital, including specialist cancer care facilities, on the CBC as part of an integrated healthcare system for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Other Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) partners include The Royal Papworth Hospital, one of the largest specialist cardiothoracic hospitals in Europe and the UK's main heart and lung transplant centre which treats 24,000 in-patients and day-case patients, and 73,600 outpatients per year supported by 1,800 members of staff.
Within the last year, University of Cambridge have opened two buildings dedicated to healthcare research on the Campus and Abcam, a commercial business supplying clinical sources for research work, have occupied their building. The three developments bring an additional 1200 members of staff to site. AstraZeneca will occupy their new building in 2021, bringing with them a further 2800 members of staff.

Why this consultation is important to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge University Hospitals
With world-leading academic and industry scientists on the same site as the teaching hospitals of the University of Cambridge, the Campus is the optimum environment for the rapid and effective translation of research into routine clinical practice. 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 Greater Cambridge Partnerships scheme to improve public transport and active travel hub (A11) at Babraham and on to Cambridge. The Campus welcomed the progress made to reach this stage of consultation, and is excited by the opportunities the new route, will bring to the accessibility of the Campus.

About the Cambridge Biomedical Campus
The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is located at the heart of the UK's and Europe's leading life sciences cluster, located in the city of Cambridge. The CBC is a vibrant, international healthcare community and a global leader in medical science, research, education and patient care.

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

- Healthcare and the NHS: Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Royal Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust
- Education: The Deakin Centre and Cambridge Academy for Science and Technology
- University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine 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.
- 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 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 timely interventions in design proposals can either remove the risks or ensure that acceptable security mitigations are included. This report is being produced after consultation with the project team on 14th January and 5th February 2021 and will consider the overall proposal and look at specific elements of the design. Consideration must be given to the type of organisations already occupying premises on the Biomedical Campus, future development and the type of research being carried out. Experience shows that there is always a potential for demonstrations and protests relating to these organisations. While there is currently no specific threat relating to terrorism, (National level currently stands at 'Substantial' – an attack is likely) continued development and the addition of the Cambridge South Rail Station will increase the footprint, as such this must also be considered.

The CSET Phase 2 project is a proposed new public transport route which would link the Cambridge Biomedical Campus via Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston to a new travel hub near the A11/A1307, with connections to Babraham, the Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park.

At the Cambridge Biomedical Campus the route would run on prioritised public transport lanes on Francis Crick Avenue, connecting to the existing Busway and enabling services to continue to the proposed South Cambridge station and Cambridge city centre via the Busway. The proposed route will provide additional public transport capacity as an alternative to the car. The route would be entirely off-road, only interacting with other traffic at junctions. Junctions between existing roads and the new public transport route would be controlled by traffic lights. Alongside this new public transport route would be a new path for active travel. This scheme would be part of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's emerging Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) scheme.

In general terms I believe that this scheme will be beneficial to the City by:-

- Linking significant business and research areas locally and more widely to destinations throughout the Country.
- Allowing better access to the railway for many residents in the South of Cambridge.
- Improving access and reducing journey times for the staff, patients and visitors to Addenbrookes and The Royal Papworth hospitals.
- Easing access for employees working within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and
- Reducing the amount of car journeys in the City.

I do however have some concerns in relation to certain areas of the design, in the knowledge that we have seen crime series occurring in the area of the proposed route. I do raise for your consideration several of the learning points that came from the Guided Busway, in the form of the questions below:

• Assume the route will be subdivided into sections (probably based around junctions with the main road network), what will the naming/identification protocol for these sections be?
o This is a starting point for accurate identification of an incident location (an injured cyclist requiring an ambulance may have no idea of their exact location)

• Does the route have adequate mobile phone reception?
o For the injured cyclist to make their call.

• Will there be CCTV and radio comms with drivers
o CCTV for preventative closures or warnings at junctions. Comms for your control centre to pre-warn drivers or receive situational updates.

• Can sections be closed (with the use of traffic light overrides or variable messaging signs VMS)?
o This helps create a safe/protected working area for emergency services or recovery crews on the route, and enables the use of sectional detour routes.

• Will there be any weight limits on the route?
o Some specialist vehicles can be 18 tonnes plus

• Is the speed limit the same for the entire route?

• Are there any areas identified as being predisposed to dense fog?

• What will be the gritting/ snow clearing policy for the route?

Following the public transport consultation to explore the construction of a new travel hub near Four Went Ways (Little Abington), Babraham (Little/Great Abington) and Granta Park (Great Abington/Hildersham) - I am still against all these options - as before. Also the proposed route goes nowhere near Sawston, Stapleford or Great Shelford with the projected cost of £155million for five years time or does this mean £200million for up to ten years time?
The entire project could link into the new Cambridge South railway station which may cost around £200million including £50million now from the Greater Cambridge Partnership?

17/12/2020 132 O Cambridge University Hospitals email

17/12/2020 133 O Cambridge Biomedical Campus email

26/02/2021 134 O Cambridgeshire Constabulary email

04/03/2021 135 O Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue email

136 I
137
138
139
140
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

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 crime along the route, in particular, that there may be a violent gang in the area targeting pedestrians and cyclists using the route.
METHODOLOGY
Crime reports, incidents and Stop Search records were analysed for the period 01/06/2017 to 31/05/18 for two locations:
• Route 1 Cambridge Railway Station and Trumpington Park and Ride
• Route 2 Trumpington Community College and Addenbrookes Hospital.
Both data extractions were given a 40 m buffer zone either side of the bus lane to include incidents that may have occurred close to the routes.
CONCLUSION
In the twelve month period requested there were multiple crime types reported but analysis reveals two predominant crime series; Cycle theft and Violence offences.
Reports are concentrated at the Cambridge Railway Station and the immediate area (2673) followed by Trumpington Park & Ride (464).
'Theft of pedal cycles' accounted for the highest proportion of recorded crime (78, 54%), 4 of these crimes have suspects who are also suspected of violent crime. Some of the pedal cycles stolen may be being used as transport for suspects committing further offences. Violent crime reports represented 16% (23 crimes) of all crime within the parameters.
Analysis of all the suspects and offenders recorded indicate two groups linked to theft of pedal cycles; one larger group and a smaller group, this group had a similar M/O to the first in that they were found with bolt croppers in the area of the railway station. Two crimes recorded showed two separate lone individuals arrested for theft of cycles.
RECOMMENDATIONS

appendices contain tables, maps, graphs, footnotes and social media screenshots