

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Subject: RE: Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway linking Cambourne to Cambridge
Date: 16 December 2024 16:38:49
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Ali,

Can you please confirm you received my brief reply to this email?

My address is [REDACTED].

Best regards,

Simon Harries

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE <TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE@dft.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 December 2024 15:34
To: Simon Harries [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway linking Cambourne to Cambridge

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your email. In order to register your objection we require a postal address.

Kind regards,
Muhammad Ali



Muhammad Ali
Casework Officer, Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit,
First Floor, Great Minster House, 33 Horseferry Road, London,
SW1P 4DR
+44 7812 686 519

[Follow us on twitter @transportgovuk](#)

From: Simon Harries [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 December 2024 15:26
To: TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE <TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE@dft.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway linking Cambourne to Cambridge
Importance: High

Dear Secretary of State,

[Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport \(DfT\) for a new busway linking Cambourne to Cambridge](#)

I am a long time resident of Cambridge and its surrounding area (39 years in the City, 8 years in Ely). In that time I have consistently supported improved public transport and advocated for the growth in knowledge industry leadership in this region. I was a councillor in East Cambs for a term and have always taken a special interest in the way transportation, housing and employment affect each other. Despite my strong support for developing a viable, efficient mass transit system, that will take people away from the road, **I strongly object to the busway proposal**

between Madingley Mulch and West Cambridge for the following reasons:

1. This is not part of a clearly developed strategic plan. As an example, the government's decision to back East West rail means a better option is now being planned, one that will make this section of busway redundant. There is no joined-up thinking here.
2. The busway itself is a proven failure. The initial busway has gravely underperformed and there is no evidence to suggest this will do better. It is not a true mass transit system and is not a substitute for a more practical option (such as light rail or tram).
3. The proposal will not succeed in its objectives because the planned route runs straight into a natural congestion area, with no plans to improve it.
4. A better option on road already exists- there is no need to impose the most destructive option possible.
5. The loss of a mature habitat in Coton Orchard will be wildlife and environmental vandalism of the worst kind. There is no possibility of effective mitigation, and even the systematic denigration of the orchard and its owners cannot conceal the fact that the busway proposal will lead to mass animal deaths and very serious environmental destruction.
6. The discussions at Council level have been ill-informed, biased and affected by commercial influence. The policy is designed to support University enterprises with dormitory town labour, rather than addressing the real interests of the people in the region.
7. The proposed cost benefit ratio is almost non-existent, and does not count the inevitable massive amenity and environmental losses. The sightlines of the American cemetery will be damaged, the status of Coton as a rural centre close to the city will be lost, and payback will be negligible.
8. Finally, this is one of several proposals for the development of Cambridge that seek at the same time to promote Cambridge as a great place to live and work, while undermining the reasons that make it special. This is probably the most obviously stupid part of the plan, and one that ministers and officials seem unable to grasp. People will not keep on paying ridiculous prices to live in Cambridge when it is no longer... Cambridge. Why would they?

My last comment is to go back to the environmental issue. As a councillor I was one of thousands asked to vote for a motion to mandate net environmental gain for each development. I objected at the time on the grounds that there were no plans, no roadmap, no credible way that such a goal could be reached, also no measurements and a timescale that made sure nobody could ever be helped to account if/when such motions failed.

Councillors in Cambridgeshire have convinced themselves that, thanks to "mitigation" the environmental loss does not matter. The smearing of the Coton Orchard owners, together with shamefully ignorant statements about the issue, have made it seem as if the loss will be negligible and easily borne. This is not true. The largest orchard left in the county cannot simply be dissected without consequence. Planting saplings in a field miles away is not mitigation. The wildlife will not move, it will die. The habitat will not recover, it will die. Mitigation will not happen. Anybody with any insights regarding environmental matters will know this. Growth may be a good thing but not at any price.

This is a foolish plan that has not chance of success by any criteria. It should be stopped, and ministers who wave such things through in the sacred name of economic growth will not be forgiven. For the record, I am not of the same political view as the owners of the orchard. This is one of the factors that drove me to leave my own party and that is now causing serious political damage to the UK's ruling party. It is worth reading these trends and learning the lessons.

Best regards,

Simon Harries

Email: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The information in this email may be confidential or otherwise protected by law. If you received it in error, please let us know by return e-mail and then delete it immediately, without printing or passing it on to anybody else.

Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications and for other lawful purposes.

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