

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992 ("TWA"): THE PROPOSED CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL AND GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT ORDER; REF: TWA/25/APP/01

STATEMENT OF CASE for Mr B Kingsley of [REDACTED].

While recognising that Cambridge is regarded by the Government as an area of significant economic potential, and consequently for infrastructure development, I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that any necessary improvements in the transport infrastructure for this area of South Cambridge can be better met by alternative means which would have far less impact on the open countryside, and most importantly on the lives of local residents.

In particular, I refer to the counter-proposals for a busway to be constructed adjacent to the A1307, which would avoid material disruption to the Gog Magog Hills, to the River Granta and Hobson's Conduit chalk streams, and to the fields and countryside surrounding many villages.

As a resident of one of the affected villages which, it is said by the GCP, the busway will be designed to serve (Great Shelford and Stapleford), I and my family will have no reason to use the busway, and I believe many if not most families in the village consider themselves to be in the same position, so I wish to challenge any suggestion that it is necessary, or beneficial, for the busway to pass near to our village.

As a family we already make regular use of the DNA cycle path to travel to and from the Cambridge train stations and central Cambridge, and we shall continue to do so. We have no need to be super-connected to the Biomedical Campus, and in any event, to access the busway stops that would be closest to us on the proposed route will involve a walk out of the centre of the village equivalent to approximately half of the distance it would take to walk to the Biomedical Campus. So using the busway will take us longer and be less convenient than existing options for local travel into Cambridge, in particular the train and especially by bicycle.

As regards bicycle travel, we are concerned that the busway will, ironically, make cycling more hazardous, particularly for our children, both because of disruption to the DNA trail and because the busway/road crossings will result in more traffic backing up and frustrated drivers speeding to 'beat' the multiple proposed crossing points, or to 'make up time' after having been held waiting at a crossing point. As a community so close to Cambridge, we should be doing everything possible to make it easier not harder for residents to cycle to and from Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus.

While I accept that the case for relieving commuter congestion on the A1307 route into Cambridge may be strong, models and assumptions for local residents using the planned busway appear not to have been tested properly, or sufficiently recently, with local residents — I am not aware of anyone in this village who considers that the busway route would serve their needs better than existing cycle and train routes. Those who are not able to cycle will be less still able to walk, uphill from the village, to the proposed busway stops.

The alternative route that has been proposed, alongside the A1307, has far greater merit than the existing proposal, not least because it would reduce the encroachment of this development on our remaining local open spaces, reduce the unnecessary and unwanted impact of both the development works and traffic flow on our village life, and better serve the Babraham Research Campus where the transport links are more needed. It would also have the benefit of making the busway more visible to those drivers who continue to use the A1307 for commuting — thus, it should advertise itself to its core target audience: those drivers who might be encouraged to commute on buses rather than in cars.

I am in no way ideologically opposed to transport improvements in our area. I object though to unnecessary and unsympathetic development that will irreparably worsen rather than improve my own and my family's experience of living in our local area, and that of future generations.

When weighing the options, I hope that the Inspector and the Secretary of State will also take account of the fact that the organisations which stand to benefit financially — directly and indirectly — from the current proposals (land owners, developers, engineering and construction businesses, consultants) are well-funded and will have better access to people in positions of influence to speak for their preferred outcomes, whereas those of us who seek to advance a sensible counter-proposal and to voice the reasonable concerns of local residents do so with minimal resources and connections.

Date: 23 June 2025