

[REDACTED]

From: Will Hurrell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 February 2025 08:21
To: TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE
Subject: Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a New Busway to the Southeast of Cambridge

Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a New Busway to the Southeast of Cambridge

William Hurrell

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

06/02/2025

To: The Secretary of State for Transport
c/o Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London, SW1P 4DR
Email: transportinfrastructure@dft.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the “Application for a Transport and Works Act Order” submitted by the Cambridge Greater Partnership on 9 January 2025, which seeks to construct a new busway to the southeast of Cambridge.

Grounds for Objection

The proposed scheme would result in unnecessary and irreversible harm to the local countryside, landscape, and natural environment, while failing to provide the most efficient or least damaging transport solution. My specific objections are as follows:

1.

Unjustified Environmental Impact – The proposed busway would require the construction of a five-mile-long new road through open countryside, significantly damaging the landscape, biodiversity, and ecology of the area. In particular, the Gog Magog Hills—a key landscape feature of the region—would be permanently scarred by this development.

2.

Destruction of Chalk Streams – The current proposal would necessitate the construction of two bridges over the River Granta chalk stream and the culverting of Hobson’s Conduit chalk stream. These watercourses are environmentally sensitive and should be preserved rather than disrupted by large-scale infrastructure projects.

3.

Loss of Countryside Park and Green Spaces – The busway would cut through a designated countryside park, diminishing its value for recreation and conservation. This would be a significant loss for both local residents and the broader Cambridge community, undermining efforts to maintain green spaces and encourage biodiversity.

4.

Alternative, Less Harmful Solutions Exist – A more environmentally responsible and equally effective alternative exists: a revised version of the 2018 proposal, which would involve constructing sections of bus lanes adjacent to the A1307 and just one mile of new road. This would provide similar transport and economic benefits while minimising environmental damage.

5.

Inadequate Justification for Serving Villages – The claim that the busway is needed to serve the villages of Stapleford, Great Shelford, and Sawston is flawed. The proposed bus stops are located on the outskirts of these villages, uphill, making them less accessible for many residents. It is highly doubtful that this busway would significantly improve public transport use in these communities.

6.

Existing Cycle Infrastructure – The argument that the busway is necessary to improve non-car transport options is weakened by the fact that high-quality cycle routes are already under construction in the area. The Linton Greenway will connect Cambridge to Babraham, Granta Park, and Linton, while the Sawston Greenway will link

Cambridge to Sawston. Additionally, Stapleford and Shelford are already served by the DNA cycle path, reducing the need for a busway of this scale.

7.

Increased Development Pressure – The proposed route would sever agricultural fields near villages, potentially making them vulnerable to future development. This could lead to further urban sprawl, harming the rural character of the area and setting a precedent for more inappropriate developments.

8.

Failure to Properly Serve the Cambridge Biomedical Campus – The alternative proposal from 2018 would better support the planned expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus by providing more direct and effective transport links, ensuring that investment in public transport benefits those who need it most.

Conclusion

The proposed busway is an excessive and environmentally damaging project that does not represent the most effective transport solution for the region. A more sustainable alternative exists that would provide similar benefits while avoiding the destruction of vital landscapes, chalk streams, and green spaces. I urge the Secretary of State to reject this proposal and instead consider a transport plan that is both effective and environmentally responsible.

Yours faithfully,

William Hurrell

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
