PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Stephen Kelly MBE MRTPI

10 November 2026

Cambridge South East Transport and Works Act Order ('TWAO')

Aims, Objectives and Need for the Proposed Cambridge South East Transport Order Guided Busway

On behalf of South Cambridgeshire District and Cambridge City Councils as part of Greater Cambridge Shared Planning ('GCSP')

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 3

1. Introduction (Qualifications, Role and Context) 7
2. Scope of Evidence 9
3. Spatial and Geographical Context 12
4. Policy Context; purpose, intent and aims 14
5. Wider Context 26
6. Need for the CSET Scheme 35
7. Benefits of the CSET Scheme 39
8. Effect of the Implementation, Operation and Maintenance of the CSET Scheme 44
9. Overall Planning Balance 52
10. Summary and Conclusions 54

Appendix 1: Planning Conditions

Executive Summary

1. My name is Stephen Kelly. I am the Director of Planning for Greater Cambridge Shared Planning ('GCSP'). I appear at this inquiry on behalf of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (hereafter referred to as 'the Councils') in support of the proposed Cambridge South East Transport scheme ('the CSET Scheme').

2. My evidence specifically addresses matters 1, 3 (insofar as it considers the overall benefits) and 4 in the Statement of Matters.

3. My evidence presents the Councils' position on the need case; demonstrating how the proposed CSET Scheme is a critical component of a well-established and locally agreed framework to deliver Greater Cambridge's spatial, economic, and environmental objectives to achieve growth while protecting the character of Cambridge city and its surroundings.

4. The CSET Scheme addresses strategic priorities and spatial strategy set out in the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, together with existing and consented development. Supporting transport modelling assumed high-quality public transport along the Haverhill–Cambridge corridor, segregated routes and additional Park and Ride provision; the CSET Scheme would deliver a significant part of that long-planned infrastructure. I consider that the CSET Scheme would support a modal shift, reduce congestion and support sustainable economic growth along the southern (Haverhill–Cambridge) corridor. All of which is consistent with the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (2014) and the adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (2023).

5. Improved access to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus ('CBC') is central to the justification; its existing activity, consented development and continuing investment in healthcare and research require reliable transport connections.

6. Existing congestion, constrained highway capacity and residential parking pressures already require attractive alternatives to private car travel to/from the CBC. By intercepting car journeys before they enter Cambridge and improving public transport reliability and active travel connections, the CSET Scheme would help support the “modal shift” away from existing private vehicular use to sustainable transport modes.

7. I consider that the CSET Scheme would complement existing and proposed infrastructure improvements to include the Cambridge South Station, rather than replace them.

8. I believe that the CSET Scheme would facilitate better connectivity within the City alongside access to nationally significant employment sites at the CBC and the wider southern innovation cluster, including the Babraham Research Campus, Granta Park, Unity Campus and the Wellcome Genome Campus. The Councils and I consider that this would support recruitment, collaboration, labour mobility and investment, helping these sites attract leading talent and the city/Greater Cambridge attract and retain globally significant companies.

9. Beyond economic growth, more reliable public transport and safer walking and cycling connections would improve access to jobs, education and healthcare, particularly for non-drivers and people on lower incomes, promoting social inclusion. The CSET Scheme would support reduced car dependence, healthier travel, carbon reduction and air-quality objectives, while strengthening confidence in infrastructure delivery supporting Greater Cambridge’s nationally significant research, innovation and healthcare roles.

10. Justification for the CSET Scheme rests principally on adopted policy and existing and consented development. The need for the CSET Scheme is not dependent solely on future growth. That said, I believe that the CSET Scheme is necessary to enable the future growth proposed in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

11. The CSET Scheme would support the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, including further CBC expansion and the proposed Grange Farm settlement of

approximately 4,500 homes. Whilst I afford the relevant emerging policies and allocations limited weight because they remain subject to examination, these emerging policies reinforce the proposed infrastructure-led approach to growth.

12. Subject to suitable planning conditions and the Green Belt reservation below, the Councils consider the amended Scheme acceptable in relation to the planning matters assessed. Updated ecological information, design commitments and mitigation address earlier concerns relating to protected species, designated sites, trees and detailed design. Conditions would secure construction safeguards, operational mitigation, ongoing management and the commitment to 10% biodiversity net gain for the CSET Scheme. I therefore conclude that the proposed Scheme accords with the development plan when read as a whole, is consistent with national planning policy and represents sustainable development.

13. I adopt a cautious approach to Green Belt policy and continue to regard the CSET Scheme as inappropriate development requiring very special circumstances. I am not persuaded that the Applicant has demonstrated the relevant policy exceptions, including the minimisation of impacts on openness. Taking account of Green Belt harm and the other identified harms, including landscape and visual effects, heritage effects, agricultural land loss and noise, I nevertheless conclude that the combined strategic, economic, social and environmental benefits clearly outweigh those harms and establish very special circumstances. My position remains subject to further consideration of the Applicant's late Green Belt Addendum and any necessary supplementary evidence.

14. I consider the CSET Scheme compliant with the development plan as a whole. In my professional opinion, the scheme is one of the principal transport interventions required to implement the spatial strategy and realise the economic potential of Greater Cambridge. I attach significant weight to that compliance and very substantial weight to its strategic benefits.

15. On behalf of the Councils, and subject to the Green Belt reservation, suitable planning conditions, other measures and outstanding matters identified in this

evidence, I support the making of the Order and the associated grant of deemed planning permission

1. Introduction (Qualifications, Role and Context)

1.1. My name is Stephen Kelly. I am the Director of Planning for Greater Cambridge Shared Planning ('GCSP'), a partnership between Cambridge City Council ('CCiC') and South Cambridgeshire District Council ('SCDC') (jointly 'the Councils').

1.2. I am a Chartered Town Planner (MRTPI) with over 36 years of experience in public sector planning practice, including over 20 years in chief planner roles within four separate Local Planning Authorities. I have been in my current role as the Chief Planner for GCSP since 2016.

1.3. As Director I have authority, pursuant to GCSP's 'Scheme of Delegation: Planning and Related Functions Nov 2026' to "*determine, make decisions, respond, investigate or notify on behalf of the Council in respect of any application, consent, approval, certificate, notice or planning function arising under the legislation listed in Schedule A, except where otherwise reserved for planning committee determination by paragraphs 19 to 23 of this scheme*" – Schedule A includes applications made under the Transport and Works Act 1992.

1.4. The Councils have two distinct roles in relation to the proposal/Scheme.

1.4.1. Firstly, as members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership ('GCP') Executive Board, the Councils have voting rights on decisions related to the commissioning of projects funded by money provided through the City Deal (see below).

1.4.2. Secondly, the Councils are statutory consultees for the application as the local authorities for the administrative areas in which the infrastructure is proposed.

1.5. I appear at this inquiry on behalf of the Councils in **support** of the application for the Cambridge South East Transport Order scheme, made under the Transport and Works Act (1992).

1.6. Formed to deliver the statutory functions of the Local Planning Authority on behalf of the Councils, GCSP was responsible for delivering the adopted [2018] Local Plans for both CCiC and SCDC. This included overseeing the evidence base, coordinating public and stakeholder engagement, and guiding the Plans through examination to adoption.

1.7. I am currently leading the preparation of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan on behalf of both Councils ('the Joint Local Plan'). The work on the Joint Local Plan includes developing the spatial strategy to guide ongoing and future sustainable growth across the area, ensuring that the Joint Local Plan reflects the Councils' strategic objectives, responds to evidence, and is aligned with national policy.

1.8. Following the Regulation 19 consultation on the Joint Local Plan in late summer 2026, the Councils expect to submit this Joint Local Plan to the Secretary of State for examination before 31st December 2026.

1.9. Through the above responsibilities, I have played a central role in shaping the long-term planning framework for Greater Cambridge.

1.10. I am also directly involved in both Councils' ongoing engagement with the Greater Cambridge Development Corporation tasked with delivering the government's ambitions for Greater Cambridge. Through membership of the Place Directors group of the Combined Authority, I also provide a strategic interface between CCiC and SCDC and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority ('CPCA') programmes including supporting the development of the CPCA Transport Strategy, Local Growth Plan and the future Spatial Development Strategy.

1.11. I therefore consider myself well-placed to address issues as to the genesis of Local Plan policy, to include the intention and purpose of relevant policies (both current and emerging) and the needs/issues that those policies were/have been formulated to address.

2. Scope of Evidence

2.1. My evidence is given in the context of and follows representations made by GCSP on behalf of the Councils [CD2-REP-04], the Statements of Case submitted by CCiC and SCDC in September 2025 [CD3-20] but also current Statements of Common Ground between each Council and the Applicant [CD23]. I strive to avoid unnecessary repetition.

2.2. Whilst I am mindful that consistency with local planning policies is not the determinative factor in whether (or not) this Transport and Works Order for the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme ('the CSET Scheme') should be authorised, those policies exist in the context of the growth/development needs and aspirations of Greater Cambridge and so, I consider, are highly material as to the need for the Scheme. Separately, local plan policies are of course relevant to the application for a deemed grant of planning permission.

2.3. In my proof, I provide evidence as to how the CSET Scheme directly aligns with the spatial strategy for Greater Cambridge, and its importance as a critical piece of infrastructure necessary to support the local, regional and national case for growth within Greater Cambridge. This includes, if made/confirmed, the CSET Scheme's direct contribution towards enabling expansion at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus ('CBC') and new housing in the southern innovation cluster.

2.4. My evidence also takes account of updates to planning policy since the application was submitted, including the National Planning Policy Framework 2026 ('the Framework 2026') [CD11-01.1] and the progress of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, affording appropriate weight in decision making.

2.5. My evidence specifically addresses matters 1, 3 (insofar as it considers the overall benefits) and 4 in the Statement of Matters, namely:
'1.' <u>The aims and objectives of, and the need for</u>, the proposed guided busway.

‘3.’ The main alternative options considered by Cambridgeshire County Council and the reasons for choosing the preferred option set out in the Order. The cost of the scheme and overall benefits.
‘4.’ The effect of the implementation, operation and maintenance of the scheme.

2.6. The Councils’ position and my proof of evidence is informed by the substantial engagement undertaken between the Applicant, GCP and GCSP at the pre-application stage and ongoing since the application was submitted.

2.7. My evidence and opinions draw on specialist advice from GCSP colleagues and relevant Council officers who have reviewed the Scheme, supporting plans and technical evidence and reported to me following engagement with the Applicant.

2.8. For the avoidance of doubt, I have not personally reviewed every report, examined every technical detail or independently assessed compliance with every relevant policy and statutory requirement. I am however confident in the diligence, work and professional opinions of those colleagues and officers, which I have considered and accepted in forming my own opinions.

2.9. My evidence is provided in the following sections:

- Section 3 briefly sets out the spatial and geographical context of the CSET Scheme.
- Sections 4 and 5 provides the planning, political and economic context which outlines the infrastructure required to unlock the local and national growth ambitions for Greater Cambridge including at the CBC, the southern innovation corridor and beyond.
- Section 6 explains why the CSET Scheme is needed. With Section 7 considering its benefits.
- Section 8 considers the effect of the implementation, operation and maintenance of the CSET Scheme and updates the Councils’ assessment of the Scheme against adopted development plan policies since preparing its Statement of Case, including securing appropriate mitigation for the impacts of the development through planning conditions.

- In Section 9 I undertake a planning balance and give my opinion as to the merits of the application for deemed planning permission.
- Finally, in Section 10 I provide my summary and conclusions.

3. Spatial and Geographical Context

Order Lands

3.1. The CSET Scheme is a linear scheme generally extending south-east from Cambridge City and connecting to the Cambridge Road (A1307) on the western side of the A11. The route passes through the parishes of Babraham, Pampisford, Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford to include through open countryside and Green Belt land.

3.2. I, along with colleagues, walked the application land in summer 2025 and have also considered the CSET Scheme proposals from vantage points within/upon the public highway and footpath network. I plan to undertake a further visit/inspection prior to the start of the Inquiry in December 2026.

3.3. I consider myself familiar with the land affected by the CSET Scheme and its physical/spatial context; this has helped me to form an opinion as to the reasonableness and robustness of various reports and assessments (to include, without limitation, issues of Green Belt, landscape, land use, biodiversity and landscape impact of the Scheme) reviewed by colleagues and reported back to me.

Geographical and Spatial Context

3.4. Cambridge is a historic, but thriving city. It is internationally renowned as a location for academic excellence and innovation.

3.5. Unsurprisingly, Cambridge and the surrounding settlements are subject to land supply pressures, not only for housing but also (without limitation) land needed to fulfil employment, transport, healthcare and educational needs. Planning policies (both made and in formulation) strive to address these pressures.

3.6. Greater Cambridge accommodates one of the most significant concentrations of knowledge-intensive employment in the United Kingdom. Internationally recognised clusters in life sciences, artificial intelligence, ICT, advanced manufacturing and clean technology are focused around locations including the CBC, West Cambridge, Cambridge Science Park, Babraham Research Campus, Granta Park, Unity Campus and the Wellcome Genome Campus. Collectively these locations underpin the area's international competitiveness and make a substantial contribution to both the local, regional and national economy.

4. Policy Context; purpose, intent and aims

4.1. In this section I give evidence as to the purpose and intent of relevant planning policies and why, as an outcome, I consider that the CSET Scheme is or would be a critical component of the long-term spatial framework for Greater Cambridge.

4.2. Further below, I go onto to explain why the CSET Scheme is needed.

Adopted development plan

4.3. I cannot improve upon the purpose/objective of a development plan as set out in Chapter Two of the Framework 2026 [CD11-01.1], namely to:

> *"…[direct] growth to the most appropriate and sustainable locations, mitigating and adapting to climate change, supporting regeneration and conserving and enhancing the quality of the built and natural environment".*

Local Plans

4.4. The relevant adopted local plans for the two administrative areas are the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan ('SCLP') [2018] [CD8-02] and the Cambridge Local Plan ('CLP') [2018] [CD8-01]. Those plans have been the subject of examination and, having been found sound, thereafter adopted.

4.5. A full list of the relevant policies is set out in Section 3 of the Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20.01 paragraph 3.1], alongside a list of the relevant supplementary planning documents [CD3-20.01 paragraph 3.2] and other material considerations [CD3-20.01 paragraph 3.3], including the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire [2014] [CD9-07] and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan [2023][CD8-09]. I have not repeated these lists here but have referred to them throughout my evidence.

4.6. The intention of Greater Cambridge's spatial strategy is to focus growth in accessible locations in and around Cambridge and in sustainable new communities beyond the Green Belt, large enough to support everyday infrastructure and connected to Cambridge's economy, services and principal employment via existing or proposed high-quality sustainable transport [CD8-01; CD8-02].

4.7. The aim of this 'Cambridge-focused' approach is to support the city's internationally significant knowledge economy and future workforce housing needs while safeguarding its historic character, compact urban form and Green Belt setting [CD8-01; CD8-02]. Further, I believe that businesses and investors are choosing Cambridge for its 'Cambridge-first" approach and strategy.

4.8. The adopted Local Plans concentrate additional sustainable transport capacity along strategic corridors to support housing, labour mobility and economic competitiveness while mitigating climate change and protecting landscape character.

Transport Strategy

4.9. Spatial and transport strategies underpinned the 2014 Cambridge 'City Deal' between local leaders and Government [CD9-02]. Recognising Greater Cambridge's national and international importance in science, technology and innovation, it committed £500 million towards investment in infrastructure, housing and skills to address congestion, housing pressures and skills gaps threatening global competitiveness.

4.10. The City Deal had a primary purpose of *"...supporting infrastructure needed to unlock the benefits of growth in the Greater Cambridge area*" [CD9-02 page 3]. It recognised that "*In order to deliver more jobs and economic growth, the city region has to accommodate new and growing businesses and research centres and the people who work in them whilst ensuring ease of movement between key economic hubs"* (page 3). To achieve this, it identified that enhanced

transport capacity is required "*along key strategic corridors to and from the city (particularly along those corridors where significant new housing or employment growth is planned) as well as within the built up area of the city*" (page 3).

4.11. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire ('TSCSC') [2014] [CD9-07] was prepared alongside the adopted Local Plans and with the purpose and intent of underpinning their spatial strategy.

4.12. Its aim is to support planned growth, with policies to address the transport needs and impacts of the area but, at the same time, protecting the area's character and environment.

4.13. CLP 2018 Policy 5 (Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure) requires contributions towards its implementation and supports strategic schemes improving sustainable access to employment centres, hospitals, research clusters and educational institutions [CD8-01]. SCLP 2018 Policy TI/2 (Planning for Sustainable Travel) similarly promotes sustainable travel appropriate to development locations and reduced car dependence [CD8-02].

4.14. The strategy sets out a high-level programme identifying seven main corridors between the city and nearby towns. A high-quality passenger transport network of bus, guided bus and rail services forms the backbone of the strategy with these corridors, complemented by comprehensive pedestrian and cycle networks [CD9-07 Policy TSCSC 1 'The strategy approach'].

4.15. Of those corridors, the Haverhill to Cambridge corridor is a strategic priority; the strategy sets out a high-level programme of measures over the short-medium term and long term. It identifies the challenges within the corridor including congestion at points on the A1307 "*particularly coming over the Gog Magog Hills into Cambridge which not only holds up cars, but also buses, which then become unreliable*" [CD9-07 page 5-14]. It goes on to explain, "*The potential for this to worsen is significant, with considerable development planned at both ends of the corridor, as well as expansion of the high-tech cluster in the middle*" [CD9-07 page 5-14].

4.16. The strategy seeks to intercept trips and limit additional vehicles on radial routes by creating a high-quality passenger transport corridor [CD9-07 page 5-15]. Figure 5.8 [CD9-07] lists short-term bus improvements and the long-term interventions 'Busway/HQPT [high-quality public transport] corridor along line of former Cambridge-Colchester railway' and 'Additional Park and Ride site between A11 and Linton' [CD9-07 page 5-15]. Walking, cycling and interchange measures include connections to the CBC and other southern innovation cluster sites.

4.17. The adopted Local Plans' growth was tested in the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model ('CSRM') using a 'do something' transport package, documented in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report (November 2015) [CD12-26] and its Supplementary Technical Note (November 2015) [CD12-27]. The package included likely TSCSC [2014] improvements and the high-quality passenger transport network [CD12-26 Appendix B]. The Local Plans' soundness therefore rested on provision of that network.

4.18. The CSRM Supplementary Technical Note [CD12-27] included employment growth from the Addenbrooke's allocations (CD12-27 Appendix E). The package assumed high-frequency public transport on the Haverhill (A1307) corridor, guideway-quality segregated routes and an additional Park and Ride site [CD12-26 Appendix B section B.2.2].

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan ('LTCP') [2023] [CD8-09.0]

4.19. The LTCP [2023] [CD8-09.0] was approved by CPCA in 2023. It has a main section setting out its overall vision, goals, strategic and local priorities, strategies, delivery and monitoring. The LTCP [2023] also has local strategies for East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Greater Cambridge, Huntingdonshire and Peterborough. The relevant local strategy for the proposed scheme is Greater Cambridge [CD8-09-1].

4.20. The LTCP [2023] builds on the TSCSC [2014] [CD9-07], linking sustainable transport to planned growth. Its six goals are productivity, connectivity, climate, environment, health and safety, supported by reliable, affordable and attractive public transport, cycling and walking alternatives to car journeys.

4.21. The Greater Cambridge local section [CD8-09-1] identifies four segregated public transport and active travel corridors to the west, north, east and south-east, the aim being to link growing communities, including Cambourne and the new town north of Waterbeach, with West Cambridge, North East Cambridge, CBC and Granta Park. GCP's delivery projects include the Cambourne to Cambridge guided busway and the CSET Scheme.

Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD [2025] [CD10-05]

4.22. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD [2025] [CD10-05] guides development within the adopted Local Plans 2018, addressing landscape, public realm, built form, connectivity, sustainability and delivery. It promotes active travel and connections to existing and future sustainable modes for all mobility levels.

Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (2025) [CD8-13.1]

4.23. The Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (2025) [CD8-13.1] was made on 2 October 2025 and now forms part of the development plan for South Cambridgeshire. The proposed CSET Scheme is within the designated neighbourhood area.

Emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Timetable and weighting

4.24. The Proposed Submission Local Plan [CD8-34] was published for public consultation, pursuant to Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, for the period from 3 August to 25

September 2026; submission of this emerging Local Plan to the Secretary of State is anticipated by the end of December 2026.

4.25. The Framework 2026 [CD11.01] sets out the weight to be given to emerging development plan proposals in national decision-making Policy DM4. Weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies, and the degree of compliance with the policies for plan-making in the Framework 2026. The emerging Local Plan has reached an advanced stage in the plan-making process. Accordingly, at this stage, the Proposed Submission Local Plan and its relevant policies are afforded **limited** weight as material considerations in the assessment of the proposal.

Consistency

4.26. The emerging policies continue spatial principles established through successive local plans since the turn of the century and endorsed by the Greater Cambridge Development Corporation [CD8-33.1]. They build on CLP 2018 [CD8-01] and SCLP 2018 [CD8-02], maintaining an infrastructure-led approach to growth.

4.27. In short, the strategic aims of planning policy remain aligned with current and previous plans and I endorse the doctrine of "*consistent planning is good planning*" which helps secure public (and business) confidence in the plan-making and development control spheres.

4.28. Successive plan stages — First Proposals 2021 [CD8-05], the *Development Strategy Update* Regulation 18 Preferred Options [2023] [CD8-01.01] and Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan [2026] [CD8-34] — identify substantially higher annual employment and housing requirements than the adopted [2018] plans. Their scale has evolved with economic forecasts, national policy and the revised standard method for calculating housing need [CD8-05; CD3-20.06; CD11-05; Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan 2026 CD8-34].

Planned Growth

4.29. The Proposed Submission Local Plan identifies an objectively assessed requirement for 73,300 additional jobs and a minimum housing requirement of 48,096 dwellings over the plan period [CD8-34 Policy S/JH, points 1(a) and 1(b)]. Under the proposed draft policies, the purpose and aim of policy is to direct growth to locations with existing or planned high-quality public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure, supporting a community wide shift towards active and sustainable travel and ensuring that future development can be accommodated sustainably whilst supporting continued economic growth [CD8-34 Policy S/JH].

Cambridge Biomedical Campus ('CBC')

4.30. The emerging Joint Local Plan [CD8-34] recognises the national importance of the CBC. The existing site allocations within both adopted Local Plans (CLP 2018 Policy 17 and SCLP 2018 Policy E/2)[CD8-01 and CD8-02] are carried forward in the proposed site allocation Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital), which also proposes the release of an additional 22 hectares of land from the Green Belt for expansion and to meet future needs.

4.31. The proposed policy therefore seeks to grow the CBC to form a vibrant and sustainable area of Cambridge for investment in research and health innovation, the development of world class healthcare and treatment and as a place live, visit and work. The proposed allocation covers the existing CBC campus and part of the Cambridge Green Belt area and provides for 645,000 sq.m (GIA) of floorspace through intensification, redevelopment and expansion. This equates to an additional 23,227 new jobs (41,924 in total) and 11,892 additional patients and visitors (30,092 in total) with an estimated 94,000 daily person trips across all modes (one-way) forecast based on a total of 72,016 daily on-site employees, patients and visitors for 2050 [CD12-30]. In addition, the proposed allocation has capacity for approximately 1,000 additional homes on the campus as well as hotel and leisure facilities.

4.32. The intention of policy is that the CBC continues to be not only a cornerstone of the UK's health and life sciences innovation ecosystem, but also a positive and exemplary part of Cambridge's future. This reflects both its international importance and its strong connections to the wider city and sub-region.

4.33. Policy S/CBC seeks coordinated infrastructure, services and facilities to support high-quality local and regional healthcare and international research competitiveness, with exemplary sustainable transport, inclusive access and active travel.

Southern Innovation Cluster

4.34. The emerging Joint Local Plan [CD8-34] equally recognises the national importance of the businesses in the rural southern cluster, with the proposed expansion of the Wellcome Genome Campus and the Babraham Research Campus. Emerging policies S/WGC and S/BRC together propose the allocation of an additional ~195,000 sqm employment use, to include research and development, along with ~32,600 sqm metres of supporting retail, service, education, community and leisure uses to support a proposed 1,583 additional homes. Planning permission for up to 150,000 sq.m. of new labs/office floorspace and 1500 new homes has already been granted at the Wellcome Genome Campus [CD7-01].

4.35. Both emerging policies identify the need for an interconnected, and sustainable, travel network to support the proposed allocations. Proposed policy S/BRC expressly refers to the CSET Scheme's travel hub and its role in the provision of public transport routes to nearby railway stations, employment campuses and Cambridge City Centre itself.

Housing allocations

4.36. The emerging Joint Local Plan [CD8-34] locates housing in new settlements with high trip internalisation and sustainable links to employment, supporting reduced car reliance and carbon emissions. Strategic spatial options and Preferred

Options modelling found lower car mode shares and trips per dwelling at settlements on high-quality public transport routes [CD8-32 paragraph 1.9]. Proximity to existing or proposed routes therefore informed settlement selection [CD8-32 paragraph 1.20].

4.37. Following in depth consideration of reasonable alternative new settlement options, the emerging Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Plan 2026 Greater Cambridge Local Plan [CD8-34] under Policy S/GF includes a proposed allocation of land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm. The allocation proposes approximately 4,500 dwellings and approximately 35,000 square metres gross internal area of employment floorspace, together with supporting infrastructure, community facilities and employment opportunities, creating a sustainable new settlement to the south-east of Cambridge. The proposed site allocation represents a significant contribution towards meeting the Councils' housing delivery targets. Importantly, it would provide homes within an area of significant existing and ongoing growth in employment, enabling more people to live close to their work [CD8-32 paragraph 2.22].

4.38. The proposed policy requires the development to facilitate the CSET Scheme through direct delivery, enabling works and financial contributions. The Greater Cambridge Local Plan Proposed Submission Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) [August 2026] [CD8-35] identifies the CSET Scheme's Phase 2 as critical infrastructure [CD8-35 Table 5-1 p44]. Its evidence includes the Transport Evidence Report (October 2025) [CD-8-26.2], which treats CSET Phase 2 as a baseline scheme, and WSP's Councils-commissioned 'New Strategic Allocations Assessment Transport Mitigation Measures' report, published for the Draft Local Plan - Regulation 18 consultation [December 2025 - January 2026] [CD12-23], which identifies the CSET Scheme contributions as essential to the allocation's mode share targets.

4.39. Proposed Policy I/SI: 'Safeguarding important infrastructure' protects CSET's construction and safe operation from prejudicial development, reinforcing its role in the CBC and Grange Farm allocations and wider regional growth [CD8-34]).

Infrastructure

4.40. The emerging Joint Local Plan explains that the relationship between homes, jobs and sustainable transport opportunities has been a key influence its preparation [CD8-34 paragraph 10.3].

4.41. Policy I/ST strives at securing sustainable transport modes and connectivity "from the off" [CD8-34]. This aligns with, and cross-references, CPCA's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (2023) [CD8-09] and is supported by the Draft Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy [CD9-26].

4.42. As part of its strategy, mobility hubs are to be integrated into major development to facilitate interchange and interconnection between transport modes, particularly walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport. Emerging policy I/MH then sets out the policy expectations and requirements for new or improved mobility hubs [CD8-34].

Emerging Plan policies generally

4.43. For the reasons set out at paragraph 4.25, I give the relevant emerging policies and allocations limited weight. They evidence the Councils' proposed approach to future growth but remain subject to examination.

Emerging Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy

4.44. In November 2026 CPCA is due to adopt the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy ('GCTS'). This document supports the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan development strategy to 2045, while also providing the broader strategic platform for growth, investment and delivery in line with the Mayor's Local Growth Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the Government's Growth Agenda for Greater Cambridge being spearheaded through the Greater Cambridge Development Corporation in partnership with the Combined Authority and local partners.

4.45. The GCTS will be a child document to the adopted LTCP [2023] [CD8-09] referred to previously, and will supersede the TSCSC [2014] [CD9-07] as the transport strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The updated interim draft GCTS [September 2026] [CD9-26] sets out the direction of travel for the final GCTS document.

4.46. The updated interim draft GCTS provides a phased transport and connectivity framework to 2045 and beyond, supporting the emerging Local Plan and carrying forward TSCSC [2014] objectives and projects.

4.47. The GCTS continues to include all four radial corridor schemes included in the TSCSC [2014] and LTCP [2023], including explicitly identifying "*Cambridge South East high-quality public transport corridor (including A11/A1307 travel hub)*", as well as a "*Mass rapid transit extension to Grange Farm*" [CD9-26 page 130].

4.48. The purpose and aims of the GCTS are therefore consistent with the overarching strategy.

Community Infrastructure Levy

4.49. CCiC and SCDC intend to adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL') Charging Schedule. The Councils ran a consultation between 16 February 2026 and 29 March 2026 and submitted the Draft Charging Schedule and associated documentation for Examination on 13 July 2026. A Hearing took place on 12 and 13 October 2026.

4.50. Once adopted and in force CIL will help pay for the strategic transport infrastructure required in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Accordingly, CIL receipts will have a future role in the funding of infrastructure improvements in the Greater Cambridge area.

National Planning Policy Framework 2026 [CD11.01]

4.51. The Framework 2026 [CD11.01], published on 17 August 2026 constitutes, a significant change in national planning policy during the course of the CSET Scheme application. The Framework 2026 includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development (Policy S3); directing that decisions actively guide development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.

4.52. The Framework 2026 promotes a 'vision-led approach' to transport in sustainable, inclusive and well-designed places (CD11.01 objective box under chapter 15). Policy TR1 requires alignment of land uses, Local Transport Plans and investment to address development's transport impacts, as also required by the adopted and emerging plans I outline above.

4.53. The Framework 2026 also contains policy-making and decision-making policies on: delivering homes and supporting growth, creating high quality, sustainable places; and conserving and enhancing the environment. These are relevant to the CSET Scheme.

5. Wider Context

5.1. The policies set out above also sit within the context of wider Government aims and objectives. In this section I reference reports and statements which I believe are material to the CSET Scheme.

National Growth Context

5.2. Successive Governments have increasingly recognised the strategic national importance of the Greater Cambridge economy.

5.3. The previous Government's publication, The Case for Cambridge [March 2024] [CD9-01], identified Cambridge as "*a central component of the UK economy's overall success*" (CD9-01 page 10) and highlighted its exceptional productivity performance. More recent evidence, including the 2025 Dealroom Report [CD3-20.17], has reinforced Cambridge's position as a leading innovation cluster, ranking it as the most innovative city in the United Kingdom and Europe and fourth globally.

5.4. The Case for Cambridge [CD9-01] identifies housing affordability, congestion and employment space shortages as constraints on growth, warning that science and technology businesses could relocate internationally if these constraints are not overcome or resolved.

5.5. This position has subsequently been reinforced through a series of Written Ministerial Statements issued by the Secretary of State in July and December 2023 [24 July and 19 December 2023 – CD11-38 and CD11-37](‘the WMS’). These highlighted the need to increase both housing delivery and research space to support Cambridge's continued success.

5.6. Correspondence from Housing and Planning Minister Matthew Pennycook MP during 2024 similarly confirmed the Government's in-principle support for the

infrastructure required to facilitate Cambridge's long-term growth ambitions [CD11-40].

5.7. The current Government has placed Cambridge at the centre of its wider economic growth agenda. The Chancellor has repeatedly identified Cambridge as a key component of the Oxford-Cambridge Growth Corridor, describing it as "*Europe's Silicon Valley*". The Government's Oxford-Cambridge Growth Corridor Investment Prospectus [May 2026] [CD9-20.01] emphasises the importance of strategic investment in transport, energy, grid and planning infrastructure as a means of unlocking productivity, innovation and private sector investment across the Corridor.

5.8. The Government's commitment to realising these ambitions led to the establishment of the Cambridge Delivery Group in 2023. Following the change of Government, Peter Freeman was re-appointed to lead the Cambridge Growth Company, with a remit to develop an infrastructure-first growth strategy, coordinate national investment and establish long-term delivery mechanisms [CD9-16].

5.9. The Government subsequently established the Greater Cambridge Development Corporation on 23 July 2026, to build on the work started by the Cambridge Growth Company. The Explanatory Memorandum accompanying the Establishment Order [CD4-50.02] explicitly recognises that transport capacity, housing affordability, water infrastructure and laboratory space are acting as constraints on growth and explains that the Development Corporation has been created to coordinate the infrastructure investment and delivery required to overcome those constraints.

5.10. These documents establish infrastructure investment as a prerequisite for Greater Cambridge’s nationally significant innovation-led growth. The CBC and Southern Innovation Cluster are central to that ambition (CD11-45); their development and transport needs are considered below.

Cambridge Biomedical Campus

5.11. The CBC is one of Europe's leading centres for biomedical research, healthcare and life sciences, accommodating Cambridge University Hospitals, Royal Papworth Hospital, the University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, AstraZeneca's global research headquarters and a wide range of other public and private research organisations.

5.12. The CBC has developed as a nationally significant employment location whose continued success depends upon maintaining excellent connectivity for employees, patients, visitors and research partners. 22,000 people currently work at the site [CD21-26 page 3] and an estimated 18,200 additional visitors travel to the site each day [CD12-30 page 5]. The CBC has plans for expansion, with a published vision indicating that the number of people working on the site could more than double by 2050 [CD21-22 page 35].

5.13. The clinical services on the CBC are continuing to expand with Cambridge Children's Hospital and Cambridge Cancer Research Hospital both gaining detailed planning permissions and due to come forward for development (see below). Both will provide important specialist services for the East of England and thereby build upon the current role of the CBC as a provider of regional clinical services.

5.14. The Cambridge Cancer Research Hospital and Children's Hospital are of national importance. Both are being developed in partnership between Cambridge University Hospitals and the University of Cambridge, benefitting from the important role of the university in bringing together world-class research with patient care.

5.15. Clinical and biomedical expansion was allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Southern Fringe Area of Major Change and carried forward in CLP 2018 Policy 17. Phase 1 received outline permission in 2009 for up to 215,000sqm (planning application reference 06/0796/OUT); Phase 2 received outline permission in 2017 for up to 75,000 sqm (planning application 16/0176/OUT).

5.16. Within Phase 1, an early building to be delivered was the Medical Research Council Laboratory of Molecular Biology ('MRC LMB') which opened on the campus in 2013. In 2020, AstraZeneca opened its 'Discovery Centre' - a global research and development facility – and added support facilities at The Hub including a nursery, shop, café and gym, and a multi-storey car park. AstraZeneca is currently constructing the Rosalind Franklin Building to provide office space and a conference centre to support its research and development facilities.

5.17. Implementation is also progressing within Phase 2. The Abcam Building and 1000 Discovery Drive have been completed, while 2000 and 3000 Discovery Drive, comprising two mixed-use laboratory and office buildings, are currently under construction. Most recently, reserved matters approval was granted in July 2026 for 4000 Discovery Drive, comprising a further mixed-use laboratory and office building (planning application reference 26/01066/REM). It has been publicly announced that GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) is relocating its UK research and development operations from Stevenage to take up 2000, 3000 and 4000 Discovery Drive buildings once completed (relevant to planning application references 24/01529/NMA2 and 26/01066/NMA).

5.18. Phase 3 of the CBC is its expansion onto land to the south of the city boundary released from the Cambridge Green Belt and allocated under SCLP 2018 Policy E/2. No planning applications have been submitted on this land yet.

5.19. CBC Limited published an updated vision to 2050 for the CBC in July 2024 [CD21-22]. Its plans for expansion for the next 30 years include, but go beyond, applications and sites referred to above. The vision seeks to "*create a place that innovates in every area of the life sciences and which works to improve all aspects of human health, a place where life-saving treatments are not only provided but also discovered*" (CD21-22 page 7). It projects that demand from research and development businesses would require a development pipeline of between 150,000 and 200,000 square foot gross internal area per annum. To 2050, this would equate to an additional workforce of around 30,000 in total with

an extra 18-22,000 workers on site every day. That would more than double the number of staff and visitors visiting the campus each day (CD21-22 page 35) representing the scale of aspiration at the CBC.

5.20. As part of the preparation of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, the Councils' have engaged extensively with the landowner collaboration group, CBC Ltd and stakeholders on the site, who, between them, have developed a range of studies to support the promotion of the site through the plan making process. Alongside the Written Ministerial Statement of May 2024 [CD11-45], I believe that the commitment and investment evidenced by interested parties on the Campus demonstrates the importance of a strategic scale response to planning for CBC and a level of business/investor confidence in the Council's adopted and emerging development plans.

5.21. For example;

5.21.1. CBC Ltd's 'The Power of Proximity' report [CD21-25] cites Centre for Economics and Business Research (CEBR) research suggesting CBC's output could more than double in a decade, accommodating 50,000 workers, if development combines transport links, amenities, green social spaces and events that enable interaction. This report reinforces the need for reliable public transport in supporting competitive research, life sciences and technology sectors.

5.21.2. 'Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study: Life science and ICT locational, land and accommodation needs' (September 2024) [CD3-20.08] commissioned by GCSP identifies transport and infrastructure as important to successful innovation ecosystems (CD3-20.08 page 61). High-quality connectivity supports collaboration and innovation, strengthening the cluster's attractiveness to businesses.

Southern Innovation Cluster

5.22. The wider southern innovation cluster includes the following existing and expanding South Cambridgeshire employment sites, contributing to transport demand along the southern corridor.

5.23. The Babraham Research Campus is home to the Babraham Institute and approximately 60 biomedical companies. It is located to the north west of Babraham. That campus has expanded its research and development space in recent years and has plans to further expand having submitted an application for outline planning permission for up to 40,500 square metres of employment (laboratory and office) floorspace, supported by up to 83 dwellings, nursery provision, retail and community facilities and a mobility hub (planning application reference 25/04634/OUT). This application is under consideration and indicates an aspiration for further growth, rather than consented development.

5.24. Granta Park is a leading location for life sciences including The Welding Institute, and companies such as Illumina and Pfizer. Located to the west of Great Abington, this campus is an Established Employment Area under Policy E/15 ‘d’ of the SCLP 2018. In 2024, The Welding Institute gained outline planning permission for redevelopment including up to 31,500 square metres of floor space with associated ancillary facilities and infrastructure (planning application reference 22/05549/OUT).

5.25. The Former Spicers site in Sawston is also within the catchment of the CSET Scheme and is an Established Employment Area under Policy E/15 ‘k’ of the SCLP 2018. The site was granted planning permission in 2020 for erection of 50,445 square metres (GIA) of research and development accommodation including ancillary accommodation (planning application reference S/0158/20/FL).

5.26. Sawston Unity campus is currently undergoing its expansion for a new business park with approximately 20,000 square metres (GIA) approved in phases 1, 2 and 3 planning application references S/2284/17/OL and 24/00166/OUT as amended). Phases 1 and 2 are completed.

5.27. The Wellcome Genome Campus is a world leading cluster for genomic research located in Hinxton village approximately 9.5 kilometres (as the crow flies) the south east of the CBC. This campus originated on land within and adjacent to

the estate of Hinxton Hall and is a defined Established Employment Area under Policy E/15 of the SCLP 2018. In 2020, outline planning permission was granted for a significant expansion of the campus on land to the east for up to 150,000 square metres of flexible employment uses including research and development office and workspace supported by up to 1,500 residential dwellings, community use and associated infrastructure (application reference S/4329/18/OL – CD7-01, all documents). This represents a significant expansion in the overall size of the campus. Reserved matters have been granted for two laboratory buildings and construction is underway with the first new building expected to be completed in 2027, showing the commitment to develop the site at pace.

Wider catchment and neighbouring areas

West Suffolk

5.28. West Suffolk provides relevant context for the CSET Scheme because the south-east corridor connects Greater Cambridge with Haverhill and its surrounding area, extending the CSET Scheme's potential catchment beyond the Councils' administrative boundaries.

5.29. West Suffolk is in the Cambridge housing market area, and in terms of economic development, is part of the Cambridge sub-region.

5.30. The West Suffolk Local Plan 2024-2041 [CD8-25] was adopted at a meeting of the relevant council on 15 July 2025. It identifies allocations for 14,875 new homes within the plan period to meet the overall housing requirement, the majority of which (10,202 homes) are focussed in towns of Brandon, Bury St Edmunds, Clare, Haverhill, Mildenhall and Newmarket (CD8-25 Local Plan page 73). These towns are well-connected including their connections to Cambridge via the A14, A11 and A1307 (CD8-25 Local Plan paragraph 4.3.15).

5.31. Site allocations in the adopted Local Plan include three sites within Haverhil for approximately a total of 3,560 homes, including a significant extension on 175 hectares north-east of town allocated for mixed-use development (allocations

AP13, AP14 and AP15 – CD8-25 Local Plan pages 228-233). The significant housing growth planned for Haverhill is within the catchment of employees working in Greater Cambridge.

5.32. Haverhill also has a concentration of major biotechnology employers and a large industrial estate and business park (CD8-25 Local Plan paragraph 4.5.7), which have a complementary role to the Greater Cambridge southern innovation cluster.

5.33. These housing and employment relationships help explain the importance of sustainable transport connections along the south-east corridor.

Uttlesford

5.34. Uttlesford also provides relevant context for the CSET Scheme because its economy is linked to the Greater Cambridge southern innovation cluster. The Uttlesford Local Plan 2021–2041 [CD8-36] was formally adopted on 25 March 2026.

5.35. Chesterford Research Park is a major research park located in the north of the District. Located on a 250-acre campus, it provides around 32,000m2 of commercial floorspace for various biotechnical, pharmaceutical, and technical research and development companies. Current occupiers include AstraZeneca, Isogenica, Microbiotica and Biomodal (CD8-36 Local Plan paragraph 4.37). The adopted Local Plan supports economic growth at Chesterford Research Park identifying it as a key location for the expansion and provision of high-quality employment use and anticipating the biotechnical, pharmaceutical and research sectors to grow beyond Cambridge (CD8-36 Local Plan page 33).

5.36. The Park masterplan sets out the potential for around 33ha for research and development uses of which approximately 10ha of space is already built and occupied, and 10 hectares has planning permission (Local Plan paragraph 4.41). The Plan allocates the remaining approximately 13.5 hectares of land for research and development use (Local Plan table 4.7).

6. Need for the CSET Scheme

6.1. This section explains why I believe that the CSET Scheme is needed to fulfil strategic objectives which includes meeting national growth ambitions, fulfilling local plan policies, supporting the CBC and southern innovation cluster, and delivering economic, social and environmental benefits across Greater Cambridge and its wider catchment.

6.2. The policies I have outlined above support a clear case in support of the need for the CSET Scheme. Indeed, the adopted development plan, together with existing and consented development continues to provide the primary basis for my assessment of need.

6.3. The spatial strategy set out in the adopted Local Plans:

6.3.1. Require sustainable new communities to be supported by the infrastructure necessary to accommodate growth (CLP 2018 paragraph 2.13; SCLP 2018 Policy S/5); and

6.3.2. Identify the need to improve sustainable transport capacity between the principal economic hubs and residential communities (CLP 2018 Policy 1, paragraph 2.21)

6.4. The TSCSC [2014] [CD9-07] identifies a need to intercept car trips before they enter Cambridge and promote alternatives to car travel along the southern corridor. The identified need including the provisions of a walking and cycling route linking the CBC, Babraham Research Campus and onward connections over the M11 to Granta Park, consistent with the strategy's planned interventions.

6.5. As explained at paragraphs 4.17–4.18 above, the adopted Local Plans' modelling assumed high-frequency public transport on the Haverhill corridor, segregated routes and an additional Park and Ride site [CD12-26, Appendix B, section B.2.2]. In my opinion, the CSET Scheme would deliver corridor improvements on which the soundness of the CBC allocation(s) rely.

6.6. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD [2025] [CD10-05] expressly included the CSET Scheme (CD10-05 paragraph 4d.3.1), along with early infrastructure delivery (CD10-05 paragraph 4f.2.1), to meet the need of CBC users' (of all mobility levels) for active travel options and connections to existing and future sustainable modes.

6.7. The Greater Cambridge local section of the LTCP [2023] [CD8-09.01] records progress towards the CSET Scheme's Transport and Works Act Order submission (page 8), confirming its role in delivering the adopted LTCP [2023].

6.8. The LTCP's 'East – the Biotech Corridor and towards Newmarket and Haverhill' identifies CSET's segregated public transport and active travel route and Travel Hub as the means to intercept drivers before Cambridge, integrate local bus and active travel networks, and connect the CBC with Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park along the A1307 corridor [CD8-09.01, page 16].

6.9. The employers located within the CBC draw their employees from a wide geographical area including Greater Cambridge and beyond. The CBC travel to work area extends around 30km from the Campus, with 80% of the workforce drawn from this area that also covers Newmarket, Haverhill, Royston, Huntingdon and Ely (CD21-26, page 23). The Commercial Life Sciences sector has the largest travel to work area from CBC reflecting greater choice/purchasing power and an older workforce (CD21-26, page 23). However, the Health sector is largest sectoral employer at 71% of CBC's workers (CD21-26, page 22) but this sector has significantly lower incomes than those in Commercial Life Sciences (CD21-26, page 22). This means that both access to a wide catchment area and affordable housing is significant issue facing the CBC. Providing transport enhancements that support accessibility to CBC via public transport is one of the 'key asks' of the CBC (CD21-26, page 54) to ensure housing does not act as an ongoing and significant barrier to the ability to recruit and retain workers at the CBC, both for existing organisations and/or new ones as they locate to the CBC.

6.10. The Draft Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy [CD9-26] expressly references the CSET Scheme as the best performing intervention to fulfil the transport needs of the CBC, the Wellcome Genome Campus and the Grange Farm allocation (table 4.2).

6.11. The CBC Transport Strategy [May 2026] [CD12-30] sets out a package of transport measures considered to be necessary to bring forward development across all phases of the CBC – the CSET Scheme was included as an integral part of that strategy

6.12. The GCP Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) Transport Needs Review 2018 (CD12-28) identified rising demand in southern Cambridge as a substantial pressure on an already constrained network. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) Transport Needs Review Update [2022] (CD12-09) assessed greater certainty over Cambridge South Station and GCP schemes alongside reduced capacity following withdrawal of the Cambridge Autonomous Metro. Even with planned interventions, it identified a residual shortfall of approximately 4,600 highway trip reductions by 2031 and concluded that the Station and GCP corridor schemes, to include the CSET Scheme, were critical to minimising development-related highway trips.

6.13. The review recorded approximately 22% of CBC staff parking on surrounding residential streets during the working day [CD12-09]. It concluded that extending parking controls required simultaneous alternative access, including expanded Park and Ride capacity and high-quality public transport, to transfer existing demand from private vehicles to sustainable modes.

6.14. The CSET Scheme's direct, off-road links to Cambridge and the CBC, onward active travel and proximity to research establishments were key to selecting Grange Farm as an emerging settlement for approximately 4,500 homes (CD8-32 paragraph 2.3). The WSP mitigation report identifies the CSET Scheme and a segregated extension from the Travel Hub across the A11 into the site as important enabling infrastructure [CD12-23 paragraph 4.36]. I give the emerging allocation limited weight for the reasons at paragraph 4.25.

6.15. Generally, nationally and internationally significant employment sites south of Cambridge form an interconnected cluster. Efficient movement of people, knowledge and investment between businesses, universities, NHS organisations and research institutions is essential to its productivity, labour market resilience and competitiveness. I believe that there is an essential need for reliable connections between homes and employment – especially given specialist recruitment and housing pressures in the locality and a critical and ongoing need to attract and retain both staff and business investment in the local economy.

6.16. I believe that the above point is reinforced by Regulation 19 consultation responses to the emerging Local Plan which have been published and are currently being assessed by the Councils. Of these, a number emphasise the need for a coherent and sustainable transport network across Greater Cambridge to support connectivity existing communities and employment sites. For example:

6.16.1. Wellcome Genome Campus Limited (CD8-33.03 representations 214281 & 214307) identifies sustainable connectivity across the Southern Cluster and into Cambridge as its "*single biggest priority and concern*" which it says is essential to realising the Campus's nationally and globally significant life sciences potential. The representations warn that infrastructure uncertainty risks investment and seeks firmer policy commitments as investment plans develop, supported by an integrated delivery programme. These submissions clearly link transport delivery to investment at a major life sciences campus.

6.16.2. Babraham Research Campus Limited (CD8-33.02 representation 213049) make a direct request for improved public transport to/from their site by seeking an amendment to the draft policy as follows: "*Contributing to and securing high-quality local public transport routes to and from the Site ~~nearby railway stations, employment campuses and Cambridge City Centre~~, including via the Cambridge South East Transport schemes (CSET)*" (additions shown underline, deletions in ~~strike-through~~ text)

7. Benefits of the CSET Scheme

7.1. Subject to the section below, I believe that the CSET Scheme addresses the above needs and gives rise to the following benefits.

7.2. At its highest level, the CSET Scheme would deliver a critical component of the adopted spatial strategy. It would amount to the delivery of an identified need which has been planned for many years and part of a wider, holistic, strategy to secure more sustainable travel within Greater Cambridge. The benefits which I identify (see below) are capable of attracting substantial weight in both the planning balance but also the need for the CSET Scheme itself. I note that support for my analysis can be found in the reasoning from the Cambourne to Cambridge Guided Busway Order [CD21-15].

7.3. In my opinion, the CSET Scheme performs a practical transport management function in addition to supporting future growth, by enabling existing travel demand to transfer from private vehicles to more sustainable modes.

7.4. In my opinion, the CSET Scheme would complement, rather than compete with, other transport schemes and advance the policy objectives identified below.

7.5. I also believe that, if constructed, the CSET Scheme would play an important role for the interconnectivity of public and sustainable transport options having been “hard-wired” into Cambridge’s rail stations. Whilst not part of this application (and so not considered by me in terms of support for its need), I consider it foreseeable that further opportunities arise from local bus services linking into the proposed travel hub which can give rise to route efficiencies and service improvements (i.e. busses with higher occupancy and more frequent bus services), which would be entirely consistent with strategic and policy aims, both existing and emerging, regarding the use of travel hubs (for example the Draft Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy) .I also believe that delivery of the CSET Scheme would secure ongoing confidence in Cambridge as a place to live, work and study. Namely, residents, business owners, investors and stakeholders can have confidence that policy objectives are fulfilled, albeit subject to robust assessment such as through this Inquiry process. I see ongoing confidence in the development control regime as a benefit capable of attracting moderate weight.

7.6. Indeed, given the CBC is considered to be an asset of importance to both the local and national economy, and the delivery of a world class campus environment to meet the academic, research/innovation priorities of the nation and the health needs of the region [CD11-45], delivery of the CSET Scheme is a clear benefit.

7.7. In my opinion, the CSET Scheme would strengthen the cluster connections identified in Section 6, supporting collaboration, labour-market resilience, productivity, competitiveness and continued investment.

7.8. With more particular reference to the matters I have outlined above, I consider that the CSET Scheme:

7.8.1. Realises the modelling adopted in the Local Plans CSRM: Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report (November 2025) [CD12-26] and Supplementary Technical Note (November 2015) [CD12-27] which underpinned the site allocations within the adopted Local Plans, including the Cambridge Biomedical Campus allocation in CLP 2018 Policy 17 'Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) Area of Major Change' for development that meets local, regional or national health care needs or for biomedical and biotechnology research and development activities, related higher education and medical research institutes. SCLP 2018 Policy E/2 'Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension' allocates further land to the south for similar biomedical and biotechnology research and development, related higher education and medical research institutes.

7.8.2. Improves access to the CBC by public transport and active travel in accordance with the site allocations CLP 2018 Policy 17, SCLP 2018 Policy E/2 and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD (2025) [CD10-05]. More specifically:

7.8.2.1. site allocation (CLP 2018 Policy 17) supports measures to enhance access to the CBC including for cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users and other disabled people, and mitigate the impact on the existing road network and parking in the surrounding area. It also supports provision for the extension of existing conventional bus services, busways and Park and Ride services to meet the needs of the resident and working populations, including disabled people; and

7.8.2.2. site allocation for the campus extension land (SCLP 2018 Policy E/2) specifically requires enhanced access for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled users, together with measures to mitigate impacts upon the wider road network, among other policy requirements.

7.8.3. Delivers the TSCSC [2014] busway, Park and Ride and active travel connections between the CBC, the Babraham Research Campus and onward connections over the M11 to Granta Park, complementing other corridors, intercepting car trips before they enter Cambridge and supporting growth while protecting the area's character and environment.

7.8.4. Encourages sustainable alternatives to car journeys through the Travel Hub and walking and cycling facilities away from existing road routes, reducing congestion and carbon emissions and improving air quality. This accords with TSCSC [2014] [CD9-07, page 2-8], SCLP 2018 Policy S/2 objective 'f' [CD8-02] and CLP 2018 Strategic Objectives 1, 9, 10, 13 and 14 [CD8-01].

7.8.5. Supports the social objectives of the TSCSC [2014] [CD9-07] and development plan. Public transport and safer active travel would improve access to Cambridge and the CBC for employment, healthcare and education, including 6th Form education at Long Road, particularly for non-drivers and people on lower incomes. This accords with TSCSC [2014] [CD9-07] objectives on access to jobs and services, healthy travel and wellbeing (page 2-8), SCLP 2018 Policy S/2 objective 'e' [CD8-02] and CLP 2018 Strategic Objectives 13 and 15 [CD8-01].

7.8.6. Delivers the segregated public transport and active travel route and Travel Hub identified in the LTCP's Greater Cambridge section [CD8-09.01], connecting internationally significant life sciences and research and development clusters along the A1307 corridor towards Haverhill [CD8-09.01, page 16].

7.8.7. Fulfils the CBC Transport Strategy (May 2026) [CD12-30] by improving public transport and active travel options, journey times and reliability in the A1307 and A1301 area, linking communities and employment sites south-east of Cambridge [CD12-30, page 38].

7.8.8. Facilitates the extension of parking controls to address the recorded ~22% of CBC staff parking on surrounding residential streets during the working day [CD12-09].

7.8.9. Supports sustainable housing delivery at Grange Farm through direct, off-road links to Cambridge and the CBC and onward active travel discussed in Section 6. I give the emerging allocation limited weight, as explained at paragraph 4.25.

8. Effect of the Implementation, Operation and Maintenance of the CSET Scheme

8.1. My assessment draws on my familiarity with the spatial context and the specialist advice described at paragraph 2.7.

8.2. That advice follows extensive engagement with the Applicant and its professional team, reflected in each Council's Statement of Common Ground [CD23].

Current position as to planning issues

8.3. Subject to suitable planning conditions and the Green Belt reservation below, the Councils consider the CSET Scheme acceptable against the planning policies assessed, as amended by the three recent change requests at the date of this proof.

8.4. The Councils' positions are set out in their respective Statements of Common Ground [CD23] which I will not unduly repeat. That said, I (briefly) comment further and as below.

Biodiversity and Ecology

Impact on protected species

8.5. The Councils' concerns regarding the adequacy of ecological survey information have been addressed through updated surveys and technical reports provided by the Applicant [CD24-01 through to CD24-10].

8.6. The ecology officer considers the surveys sufficient to assess impacts and secure mitigation through conditions. The applicant has agreed to update earlier surveys during construction and submit them for Council review, informing construction and operational mitigation.

8.7. Agreed conditions require a Construction Ecological Method Statement (Condition 10) to protect species and important habitats during construction, and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Condition 11) covering ecological design, species mitigation and ongoing management.

8.8. In respect of bats, the ecology officer welcomes the use of ecologically-sensitive lighting. Planning conditions will secure a bat monitoring strategy based on up-to-date surveys and relevant guidelines (Condition 19), construction lighting controls within Condition 10 and operational lighting controls under Condition 23. The ecology officer will be consulted at the detailed design and discharge of condition stage.

8.9. In my opinion, this is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with SCLP policy NH/4 and CLP 2018 policy 70. Compliance with policies carries, in my opinion, moderate weight in the planning balance.

Impact on designated sites

8.10. The Hobson's Park City Wildlife Site (CWS) Technical Note [CD1-28.01] finds no direct construction effects, with works approximately 110 metres from the CWS at their closest point. Potential temporary indirect effects, including dust and water pollution, would be negligible with mitigation, resulting in neutral effects. The CCiC biodiversity specialist considers the proposed dust, noise, water and pollution measures adequate; these would be secured through the agreed Construction Ecological Method Statement condition (Condition 10).

8.11. The Applicant commits to a 40-metre buffer between the compound and Hobson's Brook and Nine Wells LNR, shown in the Change Request drawing [CD24-08 sheet 2]. Compound details require approval under Condition 3 and Condition 9; Condition 10 additionally requires groundwater and surface water pollution prevention, including protection of Hobson's Brook. The ecology specialist considers this adequate mitigation.

8.12. For operational impacts, the Applicant commits to removing Ecology Pond 3 and relocating Attenuation Pond 1 away from Hobson's Brook to reduce groundwater and surface water effects, as shown in its Change Request [CD24-08 sheet 2]. Detailed design remains subject to landscape (Condition 16), ecological mitigation (Condition 11) and drainage (Condition 15) conditions. The ecology and drainage specialists consider these changes a suitable basis for mitigation at condition discharge stage.

8.13. In my opinion, the additional information and proposed planning conditions are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with SCLP 2018 policies CC/7 and NH/5 and CLP 2018 policy 69. Again, I consider that this attracts moderate weight in the balance.

Biodiversity Net Gain

8.14. The 'GCP Infrastructure Programme Biodiversity Net Gain Approach' paper, reviewed by the GCP Executive Board in November 2025 [CD5-25], commits to 10% BNG for the CSET Scheme and 20% across the transport infrastructure programme and sets out a delivery strategy. The Board approved this approach [CD5-24].

8.15. A condition to secure the detail of BNG for the proposed CSET Scheme has been agreed with the applicant (Condition 17). In my opinion, the proposal satisfies SCLP 2018 policy NH/4, CLP 2018 policy 70 and the Greater Cambridge Biodiversity SPD (2022)[CD10-01].

8.16. I consider it to be a positive benefit of the scheme which should be afforded, as a minimum, limited moderate weight - consistent with the SoS's decision on the Cambourne to Cambridge guided busway [CD21-15] - in the planning balance.

<u>Trees</u>

8.17. The Applicant commits to retaining mature oak 'AT025' within the Travel Hub. Its Change Request layout [CD24-07 sheet 14] shows woodland planting at that

location, and Condition 12 would secure tree protection. I consider this sufficient to demonstrate compliance with SCLP 2018 policy HQ/1 and NH/2, and CLP 2018 policy 71 and attracting neutral weight in the balance (i.e. neither a benefit or disbenefit).

Landscape

8.18. The Councils raised no objection to the conclusions of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment within the Environmental Statement [CD1-10.02.0], (although some minor concerns unlikely to have a significant impact on the conclusions of the assessment have been identified). Landscape mitigation measures would be secured through the proposed planning condition for a hard and soft landscaping scheme (Condition 16), which would need to take account of the final design of the scheme. At this stage, I give neutral weight to this issue – with full details to follow at discharge of conditions stage.

Detailed design matters

8.19. Agreed Design Principles (CSET-16-00) address the Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20] concerns on accessibility, inclusivity, landscape, public realm, lighting, cycle parking, trees, climate resilience and sustainability. Condition 16 (landscaping), Condition 21 (busway and associated structures) and Condition 24 (A11 Travel Hub) require compliance, allowing detailed design to address the Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20] matters and secure a high-quality scheme in accordance with SCLP 2018 policies HQ/1, NH/2, NH/6, NH/8, TI/2 and TI/3, and CLP 2018 policies 5, 8, 17, 55, 56, 58, 59, 80 and 82. Again, I consider that this attracts moderate weight in the balance.

Planning conditions

8.20. The Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20.01] sought conditions securing policy compliance on landscape, soil management, heritage, biodiversity and ecology, trees, transport and connectivity, car and cycle parking, inclusive access, carbon reduction, sustainable design, contaminated land, noise and air quality.

8.21. Planning and technical officers have worked with the Applicant to secure robust conditions, building on Tables 1 and 2 of the Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20.01 pages 61- 62] and the additional technical information assessed above.

8.22. The Applicant has agreed to remove 'substantially' from Condition 2, 'Approved Plans'. In my opinion, this clarifies the proposals assessed for both the TWA 1992 Order and the deemed grant of planning permission.

8.23. In light of this recent update, the Councils are satisfied that these conditions are useable and enforceable. The measures secured are considered proportionate, reasonable, and necessary to ensure the CSET Scheme delivers its intended benefits while achieving meaningful environmental and planning betterment.

Alignment with other infrastructure projects

8.24. The Applicant has engaged with East West Rail Company, whose Statement of Case [CD3-24.1] stated that the CSET Scheme's safeguarded-land proposals "*do not involve a material conflict with the EWR proposals*" [CD3-24.1 paragraph 1.5]. It anticipated continued engagement to manage potential conflicts [CD3-24.1 paragraph 1.5] and sought a protective condition if arrangements were not agreed before the inquiry [CD3-24.1 paragraph 1.6]. This records its position when submitted, not confirmation that all interface matters are resolved.

8.25. The Applicant has provided written assurances to the Councils that the project teams working on the Sawston Greenway and the proposed CSET Scheme are working closely together to deliver both schemes effectively.

8.26. For completeness, the alignment with Cambridge South Station was addressed in paragraph 11.5 of the Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20.01] and I have no further comment on this.

Noise assessment

8.27. The noise impact of the proposed development is covered in the officers' assessment in paragraphs 16.3 and 16.4 of the Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20.01].

8.28. Construction noise and vibration effects would be negligible or minor adverse at most nearby sensitive receptors, with moderate adverse effects at some locations. The proposed construction management and working hours conditions would minimise these effects. Conditions for a Construction Environmental Management Plan (Condition 9) and to control construction hours (Condition 35) would minimise and manage this impact.

8.29. Operational effects would be negligible or minor adverse. The Environmental Statement [CD1-10.02.0] states that noise barriers and bunds will be installed at five locations along the route to reduce noise levels from operational buses to receptors. The details would come forward under the landscape condition for the bus stops (Condition 16 and Condition 21).

8.30. I consider that this matter, subject to the appropriate conditions, does not give rise to significant adverse effects that weigh against the proposals in the planning balance.

Heritage assessment

8.31. I have considered the advice of the Council's officers and adopt their conclusion as set out in section 8 of the Councils' Statement of Case [CD3-20.01].

8.32. The harm arises from changes to the setting of designated heritage assets introducing movement, noise and light into the rural setting. However the level of harm to the significance of designated heritage assets is at the low end of the less than substantial range. Conditions for a construction lighting plan and implementation of noise and vibration measures (Condition 9), and a Heritage Mitigation Plan including mitigation in the form of advance planting and screening

to reduce the visual impact on the setting of nearby buildings (Condition 20) would secure appropriate mitigation.

8.33. I give due weight to this harm and weigh it against the proposal's public benefits in Section 9 below. I have considered carefully against the duties contained in S66 and S72 of the Planning (Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Green Belt assessment

8.34. Shortly prior to submission of this proof the Applicant produced an "Addendum to Green Belt Report (consideration of Green Belt Issues, December 2024)" ('the GB Addendum') [CD1-15.05] in which the Applicant reassesses the impact of the CSET Scheme on Green Belt in light of updated national policy under policy GB7 in the Framework 2026. CLP 2018 Policy 4 [CD8-01] SCLP 2018 Policy S/4 [CD8-02] remain consistent with the Framework 2026 and not out of date; my development plan assessment is unchanged.

8.35. The GB Addendum has been fully considered by myself and colleagues. The Applicant advances a case that the CSET Scheme would not amount to inappropriate development, as such "very special circumstances" to justify the use of Green Belt land for the CSET Scheme would not need to be shown. I am not yet fully convinced by this and, on behalf of the Councils, adopt a cautious approach.

8.36. Whilst I accept the Applicant's broad assessment of spatial and visual harm, reduced through route selection and detailed design, landscape and ecological mitigation, the Applicant has not demonstrated that openness impacts are minimised under Policy GB7 part (f)(i), or that identified limited conflict with countryside protection and Cambridge's setting would not be significant under Policy GB7 part (f)(i). Specifically, the Councils have concerns that:

8.36.1. the volume of the two embankments over the River Granta (albeit not obviously excessive) have been demonstrably minimised; and

8.36.2. moderate harm to the Green Belt still carries significant weight against proposals for development.

8.37. I therefore continue to regard the CSET Scheme as inappropriate development under the Framework 2026. On that basis, I consider that national decision-making Policy GB6 applies and so “very special circumstances” need to be considered. I discuss this below.

8.38. Given the lateness of receipt of the GB Addendum my colleagues and I will give matters further consideration. Insofar as I consider it necessary to update or revise my opinions expressed above, I reserve a right to file a supplementary proof not later than the current deadline for the submission for rebuttal proofs (24 November 2026) which I trust is acceptable to the Inspectors.

Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (2025) [CD8-13.1]

8.39. The neighbourhood plan recognises there are some strategic planning issues that it is unable to address including the proposed CSET Scheme (paragraph 4.18). Nevertheless, its relevant development plan policies apply to the assessment of the proposal within the neighbourhood area, including policies addressing design, landscape character, biodiversity, trees, lighting and active travel.

8.40. Relevant policies have been considered and, in my opinion, there are no material conflicts with these policies. The CSET Scheme would contribute towards meeting the neighbourhood plan’s objective 7 ‘Active travel’ and objective 9 ‘Countryside access’. Again, I consider that this attracts moderate weight in the balance.

9. Overall Planning Balance

9.1. My assessment incorporates the matters outlined above. As also above, I have considered the balance on a “cautious” Green Belt assessment.

9.2. I consider the CSET Scheme complies with the development plan as a whole, notwithstanding limited heritage harm [CD3-20.01, section 8 of Statement of Case] and limited noise harm [CD3-20.01, section 16 of Statement of Case]. Design, mitigation and conditions reduce and manage residual effects, which remain material to the planning balance.

9.3. Applying the national decision-making Policy GB6 test in the Framework 2026, I give weight to the identified Green Belt harm, including harm by reason of inappropriateness and to openness and Green Belt purposes. I also take account of the other harms identified, including landscape and visual effects, and in considering heritage effects having regard to the duties under S66 and S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) 1990 Act, agricultural land loss and noise effects. However, in my opinion, other considerations, taken together, clearly outweigh those harms and amount to very special circumstances.

9.4. I consider the following considerations together to establish very special circumstances:

9.4.1. The CSET Scheme is fundamental to the Councils’ adopted spatial and transport strategies for the area;

9.4.2. The CSET Scheme is critical to the Councils’ emerging spatial and transport strategies;

9.4.3. The CSET Scheme supports CBC expansion and sustainable connections across the southern innovation cluster, addressing congestion and road-capacity barriers to growth for these employment areas of national importance;

9.4.4. The CSET Scheme’s contribution to labour mobility, investment and competitiveness supports nationally significant productivity, research and healthcare;

9.4.5. The CSET Scheme supports environmental and social objectives through modal shift, improved walking and cycling infrastructure, reduced reliance upon private car travel, improved accessibility and contributions towards carbon reduction and air-quality objectives; and

9.4.6. The CSET Scheme improves sustainable links to employment, education, healthcare and other services promote inclusion, particularly for people unable to afford private car use or housing near Cambridge.

9.5. In addition to the above assessment, I attach:

9.5.1. Significant weight to compliance with development plan policies as outlined above and in the Councils' Statements of Common Ground; ad

9.5.2. Very substantial weight to the strategic benefits of the proposal to support the continued growth of the CBC and southern innovation cluster, planned housing delivery, improved labour mobility, transportation modal shift, reduced congestion and improved access to employment, education and healthcare.

9.6. In my opinion, the above benefits are sufficient to outweigh both:

9.6.1. The limited harm to heritage assets in accordance with Policy HE6 of the Framework 2026 [CD11-01.1]; and

9.6.2. The harm to the Green Belt in accordance with Policy GB6 of the Framework 2026 [CD11-01.1].

9.7. I therefore believe that the proposed CSET Scheme should be granted planning permission in accordance with the planning conditions outlined in the Councils' Statement of Common Ground [core document reference to be confirmed].

10. Summary and Conclusions

10.1. In my opinion, the Cambridge South East Transport scheme ('the CSET Scheme') is a critical component of the sustainable transport network underpinning Greater Cambridge's adopted spatial strategy. It would deliver long-planned infrastructure connecting residential communities with employment, healthcare, education and research facilities.

10.2. An important, if not primary, basis for the need case are the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, together with existing and consented development. Their supporting transport modelling assumed high-quality public transport along the Haverhill–Cambridge corridor, segregated transport routes and additional Park and Ride provision. The CSET Scheme would deliver a significant part of that infrastructure.

10.3. The CSET Scheme is consistent with the objectives of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (2014) and the adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (2023). Its segregated public transport route, Travel Hub and walking and cycling infrastructure would provide alternatives to car travel and intercept car journeys before they enter Cambridge.

10.4. There is a practical need to address existing transport pressures, independently of future growth proposals. The evidence identifies constrained highway capacity, congestion, pressure on surrounding residential parking and a continuing need to transfer journeys from private vehicles to sustainable modes. The CSET Scheme would complement Cambridge South Station and other transport investment rather than replace such infrastructure.

10.5. Improved access to the CBC is central to the Scheme's justification. Existing activity, consented development and continuing investment in healthcare and research require reliable connections for employees, patients and visitors. The CSET Scheme would support CBC's development and its contribution to regional healthcare and the nationally significant life sciences economy.

10.6. The wider southern innovation cluster reinforces this need. Existing and expanding employment locations, including Babraham Research Campus, Granta Park, Unity Campus and the Wellcome Genome Campus, contribute to demand for movement across the area. Better connectivity would support access to employment, collaboration, recruitment and continued investment. Growth in neighbouring areas also provides relevant context for the corridor's wider catchment.

10.7. The CSET Scheme would additionally support proposals in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, including further CBC expansion and the proposed Grange Farm settlement of approximately 4,500 homes. I give the relevant emerging policies and allocations limited weight because they remain subject to examination. The justification for the CSET Scheme does not depend solely on those future proposals.

10.8. The benefits extend beyond economic growth. More reliable public transport and safer walking and cycling connections would improve access to employment, education and healthcare, particularly for non-drivers and people on lower incomes. The Scheme would also support objectives relating to reduced car dependence, congestion, carbon emissions, air quality and healthier travel.

10.9. Subject to suitable planning conditions, the Councils consider the amended Scheme acceptable in relation to the planning matters assessed. Additional ecological surveys, design commitments and mitigation address earlier concerns relating to protected species, designated sites, trees and detailed design. A commitment to 10% biodiversity net gain for the CSET Scheme would be secured through a proposed condition; detailed landscaping and other matters remain subject to approval.

10.10. The agreed conditions provide important safeguards for construction, operation and ongoing management. The Applicant has agreed to remove "substantially" from the "approved-plans" Condition 2, addressing the Councils' concern over clarity.

10.11. Whilst considered carefully against the duties contained in S66 and S72 of the Planning (Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the limited heritage and noise harms remain material considerations, notwithstanding mitigation. In my opinion, the identified public benefits clearly outweigh the limited heritage harm. Relevant Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan policies have also been considered, with no material conflicts identified.

10.12. My position on Green Belt impacts adopts a "cautious" application of policy GB7 of the Framework 2026 with the effect that policy GB6 applies to the CSET Scheme. However, I believe that very special circumstances exist to justify the use of Green Belt land, for reasons identified above.

10.13. I attach significant weight to the identified development plan compliance and very substantial weight to the Scheme's strategic benefits.

10.14. For all of the above reasons, and on behalf of the Councils, subject to the Green Belt reservation, proposed conditions, other measures and outstanding matters identified in this evidence I **support** the CSET Scheme.

10.15. Accordingly, I **support** the making of the Order and the associated grant of deemed planning permission.



Signed: .

Stephen Kelly MBE MRTPI

Director of Planning

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning

Date: 10th November 2026

Definitions and Abbreviations

Term or abbreviation	Definition or meaning in this document
Active travel	Walking, wheeling and cycling, as referred to in the transport and connectivity policies discussed in the evidence
Applicant	Cambridgeshire County Council, the applicant for the Cambridge South East Transport Order
BNG	Biodiversity net gain. The evidence refers to a 10% commitment for CSET and 20% across the GCP transport infrastructure programme
CBC	Cambridge Biomedical Campus
CCiC	Cambridge City Council
CDxx-xx	Core document: 'xx-xx' being the relevant document number/reference
CEBR	Centre for Economics and Business Research
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
City Deal	The 2014 Cambridge City Deal
CLP / CLP 2018	Cambridge Local Plan / Cambridge Local Plan 2018
Councils / the Councils	Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council jointly
CPCA	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
the CSET Scheme	The Cambridge South East Transport scheme
CSRM	Cambridge Sub-Regional Model
CWS	City Wildlife Site, used in relation to Hobson's Park

Deemed planning permission	The deemed grant of planning permission sought for the proposed Scheme alongside the Order
EWR	East West Rail
the Framework 2026	National Planning Policy Framework 2026, as identified in the evidence
GCLP	Greater Cambridge Local Plan
GCP	Greater Cambridge Partnership
GCSP	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning, the shared planning partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council
GCTS	Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy
GB Addendum	Addendum to the Applicant's Green Belt Report (Consideration of Green Belt Issues, December 2024)
GIA	Gross internal area
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
the Joint Local Plan	The emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan being prepared on behalf of both Councils.
Local Plans / adopted Local Plans	The Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, where referred to jointly.
LTCP	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan 2023
MRTPI	Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute
Neighbourhood Plan	The Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan 2025
Order / the Order	The proposed Cambridge South East Transport Order made under the Transport and Works Act 1992
Proposed Submission Local Plan	The Regulation 19 version of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan referred to in the evidence

ref / refs / doc	Reference / references / document. These shortened forms are used in citations and drafting placeholders
SCDC	South Cambridgeshire District Council
SCLP / SCLP 2018	South Cambridgeshire Local Plan / South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
SoS	Secretary of State
Southern Innovation Cluster	The group of employment and research locations south of Cambridge discussed in the evidence, including Babraham Research Campus, Granta Park, Unity Campus and Wellcome Genome Campus, with links to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus
SPD	Supplementary planning document
TSCSC	Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire 2014
WMS	Written Ministerial Statements, specifically the statements dated 24 July and 19 December 2023