TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004

The Cambridge South East Transport Order ("CSET")
(Ref: TWA/25/APP/01)

Proof of Evidence of Lynda Warth for The British Horse Society



For horses. For people. For life.

The British Horse Society is an Appointed Representative of Howden Insurance Brokers Limited
(Firm reference 309639) who are authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.

Registered Charity Nos. 210504 (England and Wales), SC038516 (Scotland) and 1382 (Isle of Man).

THE BRITISH HORSE SOCIETY

Proof of Evidence – Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) TWAO Inquiry

Introduction

I appear on behalf of the British Horse Society (the BHS). BHS does not object to the scheme but seeks protection of equestrian access.

BHS is not asking CSET to deliver every future route or development connection. We seek safe and practical provision, secure rights where appropriate, and clear arrangements for delivery and long-term management.

1. Statutory bridleway rights and wider connectivity

BHS welcomes the proposed statutory bridleway between Granhams Road, Great Shelford, and High Street, Babraham. However, although the Applicant confirms that the CSET infrastructure is physically capable of accommodating equestrian use along the entire route, statutory rights and equestrian crossings are proposed only between these two points.

Although the Applicant has confirmed the suitability of the CSET infrastructure for equestrian use, its Statement of Case refers to the EMAT being suitable over **most of** the route. In its response to Issue 3 of the Statement of Common Ground, the Applicant confirms that the associated maintenance track is physically suitable along its entire length. BHS seeks clarity over this distinction and how the Applicant intends to reconcile its documents and secure the equestrian access described in the Environmental Masterplan.

The Applicant cites the absence of secure onward connections and concerns about interactions with other users and vehicles as reasons for excluding equestrians from the remaining sections. It offers to consider permissive access at detailed design, but this is not equivalent to a statutory public right. BHS does not consider the absence of an existing onward connection sufficient justification for withholding statutory rights over infrastructure that can safely accommodate equestrians. Specific safety concerns should be identified and evidenced, with appropriate mitigation considered through detailed design, rather than used as a general justification for exclusion.

BHS recognises that, where no safe onward connection is available, riders may need to turn around and retrace their route. This is no different in principle from reaching the end of the available route at the CBC

end or using an interim circular arrangement at Babraham. The concern is not the need to turn around, but that the arrangements at the route ends must be safe and practical and must not prejudice future equestrian connections.

BHS seeks statutory bridleway rights over CSET sections capable of safely accommodating equestrians, together with appropriate equestrian provision at signalised highway crossings. Only if that is not possible then the Order must secure a clear review mechanism, with defined triggers, timescales, responsibilities, funding and legal process for securing those rights when safe onward connections become available. The Applicant's approach risks creating a circular barrier to future connectivity: landowners may reasonably be reluctant to agree an onward connection to a route where there is no secure statutory right of access in place. The absence of statutory rights could therefore prevent the very connections that the Applicant relies upon to justify withholding those rights.

2. Stapleford Bridleway 212/2 crossing

BHS welcomes confirmation that Bridleway 212/2 will be retained with a crossing over the guided busway. The Applicant says the current proposal is an uncontrolled crossing, with hard surfacing and gates shown on the southern side, and that gates, materials and colours will be reviewed with BHS at detailed design.

The crossing must be safe and practical for horses. The need for a gate should be reviewed, not assumed; if required, it must be suitable for equestrian use and to British Standard BS5709:2018 as recommended in BHS Guidance. Where a gate is deemed necessary, mounting blocks to BHS standard should be planned for riders who may have difficulty mounting or dismounting. The surface must provide grip and safe transitions.

The design must specify bus-warning measures and provide a suitable waiting area.

3. River Granta bridge crossings

The bridge cross-section provides a 3.5-metre route and 1.8-metre parapet, broadly consistent with equestrian guidance. BHS seeks parapet infill and kickboard arrangements on Structures 6 and 8, and the opportunity to review detailed designs before opening.

4. Interim circular route and High Street, Babraham crossing

BHS requests retention or reinstatement of the original lollipop-loop arrangement as an interim provision, allowing equestrians and other soft-surface users to complete a circular return towards Sawston while safe onward access remains unavailable, rather than having to turn around and retrace their route.

The BHS does not seek equestrian access into the Park & Ride at this stage. However, the interim loop must not be treated as a substitute for continued equestrian access along CSET or for securing future connectivity towards and across the A11.

The BHS notes the Applicant's confirmation that a Pegasus crossing is specified at High Street, Babraham, with the final specification to be confirmed at detailed design. The BHS seeks confirmation that this provision will be retained and designed to accommodate horse riders safely.

5. Hobson's Brook structure – headroom

The Applicant has designed the structure to provide 2.4 metres headroom but considers this insufficient for unmounted horses to pass. The BHS considers the clearance adequate for a horse to be led through when dismounted.

In Garland & Anor v Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [2021] EWCA Civ 1098, the Court of Appeal considered an existing underpass with a minimum clearance of approximately 2.3 metres and referred to BHS guidance on minimum underpass heights. Although the judgment does not establish a universal design standard, it provides relevant support for the BHS position.

6. Babraham Restricted Byway 12/10

Restricted Byway 12/10 is legally available to pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and horse-drawn vehicles. Its existing approaches are enclosed and constrained, and users will need to negotiate the EMAT, busway and farm access route. A Stage 2 Road Safety Audit is welcome, but visibility and signage alone do not establish that the crossing is safe.

The audit must assess the complete crossing movement for all lawful users, including the space needed to approach, wait, manoeuvre and cross safely. This must take account of the restricted southern approach and the constrained northern approach between the business park and housing fencing, together with

interactions with buses, farm and maintenance vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, and potential sudden noise from the adjacent business area.

There must be sufficient space for individual horses, horse-drawn vehicles and groups of horses to manoeuvre and cross without conflict. The audit should also compare the available options from Bridleway 196/24: via the byway crossing, the bridleway alongside the busway, or the highway crossing and, if available to equestrians, the North Farm Fields agricultural access. The Applicant should clarify whether the latter is feasible and could reduce the need for crossings.

Any gate or access control must be justified, proportionate and suitable for all lawful users. Gates can obstruct carriage drivers and create difficulties for riders unable to operate them while mounted, particularly where there is insufficient space to dismount. The least restrictive appropriate solution should be considered, taking account of the specific risk of unauthorised vehicle access.

BHS seeks confirmation that these matters will be expressly addressed in the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit and detailed design, with BHS consultation before the arrangements are finalised.

7. EMAT grassed soft-surface provision: delivery and maintenance

BHS welcomes the grassed verge alongside the EMAT as a natural-surface element of the bridleway. It must be treated as functional access infrastructure, not landscaping to be completed after the main route. As a grass sward and root system take time to establish, provision should be progressively created during construction wherever practicable, so that it is usable when the route opens.

The grassed provision must be included in the scheme's construction and delivery contracts, with clear, secured requirements for soil preparation, grading and seeding; establishment timing and criteria; protection from construction traffic, storage and damage; monitoring and remedial works; and long-term maintenance. The contracts and associated funding arrangements must clearly allocate responsibility, timescales and funding for creation, establishment, protection, remedial works and ongoing maintenance, including any necessary work after the main construction contract has ended.

Experience at Mere Way illustrates the difficulties that arise when delivery methods, contractual responsibilities, establishment requirements and funding are not clearly defined and secured. Although the circumstances are not identical, CSET should avoid similar uncertainty by incorporating these requirements into the delivery arrangements and securing the necessary funding from the outset.

Conclusion

BHS asks the Inspector to:

1. Secure the proposed statutory bridleway over the entire EMAT or, only if that is not possible at this stage, require a legally secure mechanism, with defined triggers, timescales, responsibilities, funding and legal process, for securing statutory bridleway rights over other suitable CSET sections when safe onward connections become available. Ensure that the Environmental Masterplan and deposited documents clearly identify the extent and legal status of equestrian access and do not prejudice future connectivity.
2. Ensure the Bridleway 212/2 crossing is safe and practical for equestrians, with suitable surfacing, access arrangements, bus warnings and waiting provision.
3. Confirm appropriate equestrian parapet infill and kickboard arrangements for River Granta Structures 6 and 8.
4. Retain or reinstate the interim lollipop-loop arrangement and ensure the High Street, Babraham Pegasus crossing is retained and designed safely and suitably for equestrians.
5. Confirm that the 2.4-metre headroom beneath the Hobson's Brook structure will be retained to allow horses to be led through safely.
6. Require a full assessment of Restricted Byway 12/10 for all lawful users, including groups of horses and horse-drawn vehicles, with adequate manoeuvring space, proportionate access control and consideration of alternative routes.
7. Secure the specification, contractual delivery, progressive establishment, protection, monitoring, maintenance, responsibility and funding of the EMAT grassed soft-surface provision.

BHS seeks safe, legally secure and lasting equestrian access.

British Horse Society 6 November 2026