Objection dated 27th December 2024 from Dr John T Green to the Department for Transport against an application for a Transport and Work Act Order for a new busway linking Cambourne to Cambridge as submitted by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) through the Cambridge Greater Partnership (GCP) on 12th November 2024

I, Dr John Timothy Green, of [redacted] am writing to make a formal objection to the above Order ('TWAO').

1. Summary of my objection

This objection cites evidence of significant failures in due process and governance by several of the organisations involved in the sequence of decision-making which resulted in this Application. The objection also cites evidence of the subsequent manipulation of this evidence by a party involved in the decision. I list the evidence under 4 broad headings:

A. Failures in due process
B. Obfuscation by persons of influence
C. Promotion of self-interest
D. Censorship of information already in the public domain

Failures in due process & governance, together with obfuscation, collusion and censorship of the public record, have resulted in this Application for a TWAO being intrinsically flawed. For these reasons I object.

I note that whilst the focus of this objection is as outlined above and evidenced below, I also object to other issues, (details of which I understand other objectors will submit), including that:

- *the GCP has persistently refused to assess an on-road alternative following the A1303;*
- *the Benefit Cost Ratio for the GCP scheme is less than 0.5 which will fall when East West Rail is complete;*
- *the GCP route terminates in Grange Road serving no major employment destinations or tertiary schools;*
- *the busway will dissect Coton Orchard.*

2. Terminology

The route detailed in this TWAO is referred to as the 'Preferred Route' in the Outline Business Case and elsewhere as 'the off-road route'. Other than in direct quotation I refer to it here as **'the off-road route'**.

Two on-road routes have been considered and almost always referred to in identical terms, leading to confusion:
a) an on-road route with both inbound & outbound busways (& ancillary walk/cycle ways) which is referred to variously as 'the on-road route'; I refer to it here as **'the on-road route'**;

b) an on-road route with is an inbound only busway (& ancillary walk/cycle ways) which has also been referred to frequently as 'the on-road route'; to obviate confusion, I refer to it here (other than in quotation of others) as **'the inbound on-road route'.**

3. Recitals

(i) On 1st July 2021 the GCP Executive Board approved[1] that the off-road route detailed in this TWAO be taken forward to the next stage in the process, basing the validity of its decision on an independent audit which it had commissioned from Amey Consulting[2]. GCP submitted their report (Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge Project)[3] to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) on 21st March 2023 recommending that CCC agree to take forwards the off-road route to an application for a TWAO.

(ii) Over the previous years, the GCP had commissioned various consultant reports regarding the off-road and on-road routes; GCP never commissioned at any time any report on the inbound on-road route.
Other bodies commissioned reports on the inbound on-road route: Cambridge Past Present & Future (CPPF) in 2021[4] and from Mott MacDonald (MM) in 2019[5], both of which were shared with the GCP.

---

[1] https://bit.ly/4gkxBQ2
[2] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/C2C-Independent-Audit-FInal.pdf
[3] https://bit.ly/41EmsoZ
[4] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/Submissions/First-Batch/250221-Cambridge-PPF.pdf
[5] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/C2C-LLF/C2C-LLF-Technical-Note-Madingley-Road-Quick-Wins-14-05-2019.pdf

4. Evidence for my objection

Some of the evidence below was presented to the Regent House of the University of Cambridge ('the University') on Tuesday 9 July 2024[6] although the version published for the record[7] was censored and redacted by the Registrary of the University (see D below).

A. Failures in due process

There was no clear and shared understanding (neither amongst members of the GCP nor of the CCC) of the purpose of an independent audit with the consequences outlined below; neither was there a shared understanding of the remit and content of the independent audit by Amey Consulting.

An independent audit (an examination of whether or not due process has been followed by an organisation) is very different to an independent report (an examination of facts leading to conclusions or recommendations).

The Vice Chair (then) of the GCP Executive (who subsequently became its Chair) was present at the GCP Executive on 1st July 2021 when a representative of Amey Consulting attended and clearly outlined the purpose, remit and scope of its Independent Audit[8]. The Audit states: "the remit of this audit is not to evaluate the merits or otherwise of specific route alignments"[9]. **To be clear this independent audit did not audit any documentation or process within the GCP concerning the inbound on-road route.**

The (by now) Chair of the GCP presented the report from the GCP Executive (Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge Project)[10] to the CCC on 21st March 2023, recommending that the off-road route be taken forward for this TWAO. An amendment to the resolution sought an impartial evaluation of the inbound on-road and the off-road option[11] as had been requested of the GCP on many occasions and by many bodies previously. In her presentation to the CCC the Chair of the GCP [redacted] the purpose and scope of the Audit leading to many of the Councillors explicitly stating that they were confused (see B). The Chair of the CCC meeting made no attempt to clarify the confusion and therefore the decision by the CCC was, at least for some members, based on an ambiguous evidence-base (see B).

The Chair of the CCC made no attempt to help members of the Council understand unambiguously what they were voting on and its true evidence base.

The failure (by the Chairs of GCP & CCC) to clarify misunderstandings demonstrates inadequate governance of process which therefore calls into question the veracity of the decision to proceed with an application for this TWAO.

B. Obfuscation by persons of influence

In the meeting of the CCC on 21st March 2023 the conduct of the Chair of the GCP was wholly inappropriate resulting in the decision taken by the CCC to have no credibility.

The GCP Chair ('the Chair') in presenting the report from the GCP to the CCC began: "you have been lied to"[12] and later, in summarising the debate, stated that she had become "intolerant of falsehoods being offered"[13]. Yet the Chair herself had continuously repeated the GCP mantra[14] that the GCP has properly assessed the alternatives

---

[6] Discussion 090724 JTGreen contribution.pdf (timed 8/7/24@1035 submitted in advance as required by email to contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk by email 8/7/24@1145) *Appended*

[7] https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6749/section5.shtml

[8] https://bit.ly/49HheL0 Minute 12

[9] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/C2C-Independent-Audit-FInal.pdf $6.1 p57

[10] https://bit.ly/41FkyEp

[11] https://bit.ly/3ZEGqNH Appendix D Item 7 Minute 128

[12] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q at 1:41:20

[13] Ibid at 2:27:48

[14] Ibid at 43:09, 43.28, 36:20, 47:20 and at 52:57 etc

explicitly citing the GCP commissioned audit of May 2021 by Amey Consulting. She repeats the [redacted] that it is "[redacted]" to say that "no-one has ever properly compared the on-road route with the off-road route"[15]; [redacted] ['the on-road route'] which ambiguity, without any correction being offered, was a failure in process and governance leading to a decision of questionable robustness.

Towards the end of the debate one Councillor rehearsed [redacted] that "the on-road route has been examined over many years and would have a significant impact on trees"[16]. This exploited the ambiguity of terminology and did nothing to clarify the position for confused Committee members: the on-road option has been examined but not the inbound on-road option which the CPPF proposed.

Madingley Wood (an SSSI) and the American Cemetery have been referred to many times as reason why an on-road solution would not work; such claim has been made by the GCP and its Chair[17] who stated that it is "false" to claim that "the on-road route would not result in the removal of any trees"[18]. That is misleading: both the 2019 MM and the 2021 CPPF reports conclude that the inbound on-road busway could be accommodated without any take of land or impact on these sites (such as the removal of trees), a conclusion supported by the Superintendent of the American Military Cemetery at the GCP Executive on 1st July 2021. No GCP report has concluded that the inbound on-road route would "result in the removal of any trees".

The Chair claimed[19] that "the GCP has properly assessed the alternative routes for public transport and this has been confirmed by independent audit ... Evidence does not support the assertion that the on-road solution would perform better … nor that an overall bus lane could be provided … there is insufficient space to deliver such a scheme at the more constrained points of Madingley Wood & the American Cemetery".
These claims above obfuscate in places and are factually incorrect in others:
- the independent audit has not "confirmed" that "the GCP has properly assessed the alternative routes" (nor could it or should it have done so);
- the GCP has not considered the alternative route of an inbound on-road route despite the many requests to do so;
- there is no "Evidence" (other than evidence to the contrary in the MM & CPPF reports) – and the Chair fails to reference her assertion that Evidence does not support the assertion that the on-road solution would perform better;
- she gives no evidence to support her claim "there is insufficient space to deliver such a scheme at the more constrained points of Madingley Wood & the American Cemetery"; both MM & CPPF reports demonstrate otherwise for the inbound on-road route.

The Chair relies upon the independent Audit to justify rejection of the inbound on-road option (whilst the Audit didn't evaluate, consider or review that option in any way at all, nor was its remit to do so).

Many statements made to the CCC by the Chair, as well as others, [redacted] and are [redacted]. The 55 Councillors were, at the GCP Chair's own admission, "[redacted] to"; **indeed they were [redacted] or, if not, certainly confused including by the GCP Chair** which the CCC Chair took no steps to rectify. Over many years there have been endless reports, confusing terminology and ambiguous use of the term 'on-road busway' thereby obfuscating which option is being addressed at any time. How could Councillors be expected to distil the truth from the mountain of ambiguous evidence? As one Councillor summed it up[20]: "there is so much misinformation going on".

These [redacted] made time and time again by the Chair of the GCP bring into question the legitimacy of the CCC's subsequent vote and therefore its decision to approve the application for a TWAO.

[15] Ibid at 2:27:55
[16] Ibid at 2:25:55
[17] Ibid at 36:20
[18] Ibid at 2:28:05
[19] Ibid at 43.09 – 43.12
[20] Ibid at 1:21:45

C. Promotion of self-interest

The Executive Board of the GCP at the times in question comprised three elected members with full voting rights (one from each of the three partner councils) and two non-voting members co-opted by the Executive Board itself: one nominated by the business board and one nominated by the University[21].

The non-voting representatives appointed by the University exploited their position by exerting undue influence.

a) I set aside whether or not it was appropriate to have the major landowner in the area (the University) on the GCP Executive and if one landowner why not others. Nevertheless, it is irrefutable that the University and the GCP have worked closely together over many years whilst developing the off-road route, exemplified by the alignment of the off-road route with existing and proposed University roads, buildings and infrastructure: that could not be mere coincidence.

The University has supported the off-road route for many years as part of its strategy and has taken steps 'to actively promote the route through the site'[22] **notwithstanding that the inbound on-road route (but not the on-road option) would also go through their West Cambridge site**. The University has never spoken in favour of examination of the inbound on-road route demonstrating its unwillingness to subscribe to an open and transparent process, despite posturing otherwise: for example, at the meeting of the GCP Executive on 1st July 2021, the University's member (Philip Allmendinger) stated that the University supported the off-road solution rather than the on-road solution and spoke to justify the resultant transection of the greenbelt[23] whilst accepting the environmental impact as inevitable, after which a vote was taken to recommend the University's preferred route, i.e. the off-road route, to be progressed (now the subject of this TWAO).

b) At the meeting of the GCP Executive on 1st July 2021 both the University representative and the business representative (Claire Ruskin) held up their hands and voted to support the motion (which was noted by members of the public present). Yet the video record of the meeting on1st July 2021 is puzzling. The publicly available record (available on YouTube from the meeting until now) dropped out at exactly the time the vote was being recorded[24]. When in December 2024 I asked GCP's Democratic Services to explain this, Nicholas Mills (11/12/24 at 08:49) emailed me a reference to a different version of the meeting which does indeed show the vote (including the two representatives holding up their hands)[25].

Public observers at GCP Executive meetings have noted that such behaviour in GCP meetings has occurred over several years and practised by different incumbent non-voting members. The GCP Executive has only 5 official members; the fact that 2 of those (non-voting) members do hold their hands up within such a small executive group is a sign of lax governance, unchecked by the chair of the meeting. Whilst I do not question that the clerk of the meeting recorded votes appropriately, such behaviour could be construed as undue influence in the decision-making process.

The inappropriate interventions of the University's non-voting member created an aura of collusion which may have influenced the members who were eligible to vote, particularly when voting; at least the behaviours demonstrated flaws in due process not checked by the Chair of the meetings at any time.

[21] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/about-us/governance/executive-board#:~:text=The%20board%20comprises%20three%20elected,by%20the%20University%20of%20Cambridge.
[22] https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6744/section1.shtml#heading2-6
[23] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nPewwgf7Lk at 4:21:0
[24] Ibid at 4:26:25
[25] https://youtu.be/vopKQYMxhwM?si=Gyy9Gj2RXZUGJUi6

D. Censorship of information already in the public domain

In early 2024, the University proposed that it lease a parcel of its land to the CCC in order for the off-road route to take its planned course (thereby aligning with the main road through its West Cambridge site, built many years before)[26]. Such a decision required the agreement of the Regent House (the body of its senior members). Sufficient members of the Regent House were concerned about this lease that a 'Discussion' was called before it being agreed.

Discussions of the University give any member of the Regent House the opportunity to record their views in the public record. Having given notice of wishing to speak on a topic, a member may either speak on the day off-the-cuff (as it were) after which the contribution is transcribed verbatim or, more commonly, especially after Covid, one submits the text electronically in advance to the Proctors and it is 'read to the record', the 'record' being the Reporter which is available to the public in printed and digital formats. I contributed electronically to the Discussion held on 9th July 2024 by submitting my contribution[27] to the Proctors on 8th July 2024; the Senior Proctor replied by email the same day at 13:37 stating that "we will ensure these are read into the record". But they were not – **they were censored and redacted, something which has not, in my and many others' experience, happened in the many years over which I have been a senior member of the University**.

The version of my contribution which was subsequently published in the Reporter[28] differs in two material respects (**i** & **ii**) from the contribution which I submitted to the Discussion.

(i) A redaction made by the Reporter's Editor as a fait accompli
The Discussion took place on 9th July. On 13th July I was informed by the Officer of the Reporter Editor ('Officer') that the Discussion Report would be published on 17th July. Just 30 hours prior to its eventual publication, the Officer sent me a marked-up version[29] of my remarks with various amendments to my submitted contribution stating she had "suggested some amendments to the remarks at issue which would enable publication". I was bewildered by this apparent threat of non-publication and particularly concerned about one redaction. At this late hour, thinking publication might be suppressed altogether, I reluctantly agreed to the changes. These two sentences from the beginning of para 8 of my submitted contribution were redacted:
Many statements made to the CCC (and indeed to the GCP including by its Chair) are [redacted] *and are misleading. The 55 Councillors were, at GCP Chair's own admission, "*[redacted]*to"; indeed they were* [redacted] *or, if not, certainly confused including by the GCP Chair.*
My submitted contribution[27] listed the references to the record of the CCC to justify this statement (as are also listed here as footnotes 12-19).

The Officer sent me several Comments within her marked-up version[29] of my submitted contribution citing the following reasons for her redaction:
- This statement is indirect but it does identify one person - the GCP Chair - as the source of [redacted]'.
- This suggests that the GCP Chair was admitting that the GCP had [redacted] to the Councillors, but that was not the meaning of the GCP Chair's words.
- Where is the evidence that the Councillors were [redacted] (or confused) including by the GCP Chair?

- I note, but don't fully understand, the first comment; maybe it should read "…. the GCP Chair - as the **a** source of '[redacted]'."
- The second comment maybe her interpretation of the GCP Chair's words but it was not mine.
- The "evidence" lies in the entirety of 2½ hours of the CCC meeting from which I referenced 11 (each < 60 second) video clips (references numbered 9,10,12,13,14,15,18 etc).

Each reader may form their own (and differing) opinions by reviewing the whole meeting. The record has, as I indicated, many other references (not cited by me) which, in my view, also evidence that the Councillors were [redacted] (or at least confused) with several Councillors explicitly saying precisely that.

---

[26] https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6747/section1.shtml#heading2-3
[27] Discussion 090724 JTGreen contribution.pdf *Appended*
[28] https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6749/section5.shtml
[29] Editor's marked up version 16/7/24 at 1325: Busway – Dr Green remarks with Markup.docx *Appended*

The result of the redaction was to remove from the University's public record, many references (although already publicly available) which justified my opinion, thereby removing from a public record, references which were unsupportive of the University's position.

The purpose of a Discussion is for contributors to present their opinions, differing as they may, from one another or from those of officers of the University. **The Editor's opinion may differ from that of a member but that is not a reason for the redaction of a contributor's opinion, particularly when it is evidenced by the public record and particularly when it is not libellous or unlawful – and if it were so, surely it would have been censored in the CCC meeting itself or indeed on its public record?**

(ii) An unexplained substitution about which I was neither consulted nor notified before its publication and which substitution I believe to be completely unjustifiable

The Officer had advised me that there may be a further change required. Subsequently, on 16th July at 20:17 (just 23 hours before publication) she wrote: "in the event that we do need to a make a small adjustment tomorrow (and that is by no means certain) we'll do so in a way that is sensitive to your message and context (and of course we'll let you know)". I responded immediately asking her to inform me before 10:15am on the following day (which indeed turn out to be the day of actual publication) of "your position at that time, indicating what specifically is causing you a problem" but I heard nothing. This change was made (apparently within the then 9 hours prior to publication) without my being told or given opportunity to comment. I was informed by the Editor of the substitution one hour after its publication (17th July at 20:42).

The following paragraph of my submitted contribution was **deleted**:
Tangled up within these discussions has been the effect on Madingley Wood, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and on the American Cemetery which has been referred to many times as a reason why "an on-road solution" would not work. This claim has been made by the GCP and its Chair [ref https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q, at 36:20] who stated that it is "false" to claim that "the on-road route would not result in the removal of any trees" [*https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q at 2:28:05*].

It was **substituted** with:
Tangled up within these discussions has been the effect on Madingley Wood, a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and on the American Cemetery which has been referred to many times as a reason why 'an on-road solution' would not work. This claim has been made by the GCP and its Chair. However, both the 2019 MM[3] and the 2021 CPPF[2] reports note that moving the route to the south to avoid taking land from the SSSI and the American Cemetery was possible.

The deletion of 2 references which supported my argument was certainly not "sensitive to [my] message and context" and weakens the paragraph's impact. The Editor, in so doing, contradicted the very principles underlying my whole contribution to the Discussion - **only statements for which evidence is cited can be credible**.
As in (ii) above, the result of the substitution was to remove many publicly available references from a public record, references which were unsupportive of the University's position.

So why did the Editor delete these evidential references which are on the public record? My contribution is in no way libellous and only repeats public record. Whilst the Editor might disagree with my opinions, she should not make independent edits which weaken their impact nor should she delete evidential references in rewriting my submission. It is up to each reader to form their own opinion from the opinions of all the contributors to a Discussion.

On 21st July I appealed to the Council of the Senate (the University's ultimate governing body) asking that my concerns be addressed 'on the record'. The Registrary is the chief administrator of the University and as such is also Secretary of the Council of the Senate; she is also 'Editor of the Reporter'. In response[30] to my appeal she refuted almost all my concerns except agreeing to publish a correction in the Reporter to her amended insertion (*"Tangled up within these discussions …"*) as follows:
'the contents of the two reports do not appear to support the conclusions drawn in this paragraph of your remarks. … I have asked the team to publish a correction omitting the following text and related footnotes from the Discussion report as published on 17 July, with a note to explain the omission: "This claim has been made by the GCP and its Chair. However, both the 2019 MM and the 2021 CPPF reports note that moving the route to the

[30] Letter from Registrary dated 30th July 2024 sent by email: Dr Green 30.07.2024.pdf *Appended*

south to avoid taking land from the SSSI and the American Cemetery."
This correction has never been published (incomprehensible to me as it is).

In the Editor's opinion "the contents of the two reports do not appear to support the conclusions". Why does that allow her to suppress publication of my opinion?

It is notable that the Editor of the Reporter did not choose to edit or correct or change contributions to the very same Discussion (footnote 27) of the following contributors:
Dr O'Brien, Pro Vice-Chancellor (*a senior office of the University*) claimed that "potential environmental impacts … and alternative route options … are beyond the University's remit and control".
Ms Flood (*a member of the Council of the Senate*) said "There is not an option that does not include the disposal of this land").
No evidence is given by these contributors to support their claims; references cited in my published contribution show them to be false. Why did the Editor not take opportunity to correct these – undoubtedly because they supported the University's preference namely the off-road route at any cost – environmental or financial.

This matter could be viewed as being wholly within the remit of the University itself and not within the remit of the Department of Transport. But the **consequences** of the Editor's unprecedented censorship of my contribution to a Discussion which should be accurately reported in the public domain ***is*** of significant relevance to the TWAO Application since it reflects the extent to which the University will go in order to achieve its own ends.

The University, as a key player in the GCP and its decision-making, has censored and distorted the veracity of the written record by redacting facts already on the public record in order to promote its, and the GCP's, preferred route; this evidences further collusion between the GCP and the University.

Collusion and censorship within the process leading to this application for a TWAO bring the credibility of the recommendations and conclusions of this application for a TWAO into serious question.

5. Conclusion

Failures in due process & governance, together with obfuscation, collusion and censorship of the public record, resulted in this Application for a TWAO being intrinsically flawed. For these reasons I object.

Dr J. T. GREEN (Life Fellow Queens')

Deputy Vice-Chancellor

I agree that, as the Notice states, a "busway will provide a much-needed and desired public transport option to Cambridge West" and that as such it "aligns with the University's vision for the site". The main three options for the route of a busway have been discussed for many years: one off-road, one on-road (dual bound), and another on-road (inbound only) option added later (alongside several variants of these which were dismissed over time). The off-road option requires the use of this land for which approval for disposal is sought.

All options are well known to the University through the work of the Strategic Projects group within the Estates Division and through the University's (non-voting) membership of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) over many years. There is a huge amount of information in the public domain which has been accumulated by the GCP[1] and others over the ten or so years that this project has been under consideration. This includes much credible information and data supporting the inbound on-road option as a simpler, cheaper and environmentally more sustainable solution, including reports from Cambridge Past Present & Future (CPPF) in 2021[2] and from Mott MacDonald (MM) in 2019[3]. Either of the extant on-road options can provide access to the University's West Cambridge site for bus passengers (as can the offroad) by utilising current routes through the site as does the U bus.

The University has supported the off-road option for many years and, as mentioned in this Notice, taken steps 'to actively promote the route through the site'. For example, at a meeting of the GCP Executive back in July 2021, the University's member stated that the University supported the off-road solution rather than the on-road solution and spoke to justify the resultant transection of the greenbelt[4] whilst accepting the environmental impact as inevitable. At that meeting the GCP decided to approve (only) the off-road solution[5] and accordingly submitted their report[6] to a meeting of the Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) in March 2023 recommending that the GCP's proposal for the off-road option be agreed (and taken forward for an order authorising its construction). The CCC after a long debate agreed the GCP's proposal, despite an amendment being tabled even as late as this in process, which repeated hitherto ignored requests for an impartial evaluation of the inbound on-road and the offroad option[7]. This decision by the CCC was far from evidence-based.

---

[1] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/sustainable-transport-programme/public-transport-schemes/cambourne-to-cambridge

[2] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/Submissions/First-Batch/250221-Cambridge-PPF.pdf

[3] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/C2C-LLF/C2C-LLF-Technical-Note-Madingley-Road-Quick-Wins-14-05-2019.pdf

[4] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nPewwgf7Lk at 4:21:0

[5] https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/CCC_live/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=udkvWux0crzWgDuLtIwaNNR%2bUHyxcWnBctW%2bnNCb0baWpKEG71%2fy2Q%3d%3d&rUzwRPf%2bZ3zd4E7Ikn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNlh225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlg%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPlIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5olA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d

[6] https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/CCC_live/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=asxZp9KCTTNLbalyYYHBzpPF%2bqLKkiAQvdrzVRNryrkpsUVgLq9SgQ%3d%3d&rUzwRPf%2bZ3zd4E7Ikn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNlh225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlg%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPlIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5olA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d

The GCP Chair put the GCP's proposal to the CCC beginning "you have been lied to"[8] and later, in summarising the debate, stated that she had become "intolerant of falsehoods being offered"[9]. Yet the GCP Chair has continuously repeated the GCP mantra[10] that the GCP has properly assessed the alternatives citing the GCP commissioned audit of May 2021 by Amey Consulting[11]. In the meeting, the Chair of the GCP repeats the [redacted] to say that "no-one has ever properly compared the on-road route with the offroad route"[12]. At the end of the debate one Councillor rehearses t[redacted] "the on-road route has been examined over many years and would have a significant impact on trees"[13] – some on-road options have been examined but not the inbound on-road option which the CPPF proposed.

Tangled up within these discussions has been the effect on Madingley Wood, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and on the American Cemetery which has been referred to many times as a reason why "an on-road solution" would not work. This claim has been made by the GCP and its Chair[14] who stated that it is "false" to claim that "the on-road route would not result in the removal of any trees"[15]. That is misleading: both the 2019 MM and the 2021 CPPF reports concluded that an inbound on-road busway could be accommodated without any take of land or impact on these sites, such as the removal of trees.

An independent report (an examination of facts leading to conclusions or recommendations) is very different to an audit (an examination of whether or not due process has been followed by an organisation). The Amey audit does not evaluate the inbound on-road option but audits the GCP's governance of the process, as indeed the audit states: "the remit of this audit is not to evaluate the merits or otherwise of specific route alignments"[16]; the University's member similarly explained its purpose to the GCP Executive as so[17]. No GCP report has concluded that the inbound on-road option would "result in the removal of any trees".

Why does the GCP continue to refuse to commission an independent report to evaluate the offroad together with the inbound on-road (as has they have done for dual bound on-road and offroad)? Instead the Chair continues to claim[18] that the Amey audit is sufficient to justify their rejection of the inbound on-road option (whilst the audit report itself itself states within it, that it didn't evaluate that option at all).

Many statements made to the CCC (and indeed to the GCP including by its Chair) are [redacted] and are misleading. The 55 Councillors were, at GCP Chair's own admission, "[redacted] to"; indeed they were [redacted] or, if not, certainly confused including by the GCP Chair. Over many years there have been endless reports,

---

[7] https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/CCC_live/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=hmL7%2bM%2f7UVTiPJKkHYwPwkkUg5SaA%2fAKFawPhgICYGJqYIbw0TA0%2bg%3d%3d&rUzwRPf%2bZ3zd4E7Ikn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNlh225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlg%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPlIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5olA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d

[8] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q at 1:40:45

[9] Ibid at 2:27:48

[10] Ibid at 43:09, 43.28, 36:20, 47:20 and at 52:57 etc

[11] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/C2C-Independent-Audit-FInal.pdf

[12] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q at 2:27:55

[13] Ibid at 2:25:55

[14] Ibid at 36:20

[15] Ibid 2:28:05

[16] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/C2C-Independent-Audit-FInal.pdf $6.1 p57

[17] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nPewwgf7Lk at 4:21:48

[18] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q at 43.09

confusing terminology and ambiguous use of the term 'on-road busway' thereby obfuscating which option is being addressed at any time. How could Councillors be expected to distil the truth from the mountain of ambiguous evidence? As one Councillor summed it up[19]: "there is so much misinformation going on".

And why does this matter to the University? Because the Notice and decision before us comes as the result of the above flawed processes within other bodies (the GCP & CCC), one of which the University has Board membership of.

The University now has to make a decision on a matter consequent upon all this. The University must not be complicit and similarly misled; it must take an evidence-based decision using our well-established principles and processes of good governance.

How can the University continue to 'actively promote' and facilitate an option which will lead to the destruction of acres of land with a colossal, well-evidenced environmental impact, which is opposed by a large number of the University's external stakeholders[20] and do so without first seeking an independent analysis to evaluate all the factors between the offroad and inbound on-road options? The inbound on-road option leaves the green belt untouched, is environmentally sustainable and delivers the University's desired aim of access to West Cambridge (and is also cheaper).

Coincidentally a draft report is circulating within the University from the Working Group (CESRWG) on Climate & Environmental Sustainability Research Strategy Options[21] seeking comments; the report highlights the need for the University to

- 'respond to its wider societal responsibilities' and 'address societal needs';
- 'connect with external audiences' … and for there 'to be a consistent narrative for the University as a whole';
- ensure that 'there must be *credibility* with our stakeholders';
- be 'sustainable across all our activities' and 'actively engaged' … 'with internal and external stakeholders';
- have 'a whole-of-institution approach to sustainability, which includes the University's estate and operations'

In summary, over many years the University has relentlessly pursued the off-road option dismissing and ignoring options put forward by other credible stakeholders who have sought for an independent enquiry into the relative merits of each of the offroad and on-road inbound options. One of the underlying principles of a university is to be an organisation whose decisions and outputs are based upon evidence-based principles – why not so here?

I urge the University to pause before proceeding and
- to reflect hard on their current approach of promoting and facilitating one option without an evidence base, the provenance of which option is questionable, one which is contrary to their published values, and one which ignores the views of many stakeholders;
- to take serious note of the huge amount of environmental data cautioning against an off-road busway;
- to commission, contrary to its position to date and with or without the agreement of the Greater Cambridge Partnership, an independent report which assesses the offroad and the inbound on-road options for a busway including in terms of relative costs and environmental impact;
- and for the University to abide by its principles (as exemplified in the CESRWG report) and grasp this opportunity to demonstrate that we practise what we preach.

[19] Ibid at 1:20:0

[20] For example https://www.cambridgeppf.org/Pages/Category/campaigns

[21] https://universityofcambridgecloud.sharepoint.com/sites/RO_ResearchOffice-ClimateandEnvironmentalSustainability/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FRO%5FResearchOffice%2DClimateandEnvironmentalSustainability%2FShared%20Documents%2FCESRWG%20Options%20%2D%20Consultation%20Version%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FRO%5FResearchOffice%2DClimateandEnvironmentalSustainability%2FShared%20Documents&p=true&ct=1719503459355&or=Outlook-Body&cid=7D4CBA37-8D33-4268-AC5D-817BCD0CFA44&ga=1 (University Account required).

Dr J. T. GREEN (Queens' College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I agree that, as the Notice states, a 'busway will provide a much-needed and desired public transport option to Cambridge West' and that as such it 'aligns with the University's vision for the site'. The main three options for the route of a busway have been discussed for many years: one off-road, one on-road (dual bound), and another on-road (inbound only) option added later (alongside several variants of these which were dismissed over time). The off-road option requires the use of this land for which approval for disposal is sought.

All options are well known to the University through the work of the Strategic Projects group within the Estates Division and through the University's (non-voting) membership of the Greater Cambridge Partnership over many years. There is a huge amount of information in the public domain which has been accumulated by the GCP[1] and others over the ten or so years that this project has been under consideration. This includes much credible information and data supporting the inbound on-road option as a simpler, cheaper and environmentally more sustainable solution, including reports from Cambridge Past Present & Future (CPPF) in 2021[2] and from Mott MacDonald (MM) in 2019.[3] Either of the extant on-road options can provide access to the University's West Cambridge site for bus passengers (as can the off-road) by utilising current routes through the site as does the U bus.

The University has supported the off-road option for many years and, as mentioned in this Notice, taken steps 'to actively promote the route through the site'. For example, at a meeting of the GCP Executive back in July 2021, the University's member stated that the University supported the off-road solution rather than the on-road solution and spoke to justify the resultant transection of the greenbelt[4] . At that meeting the GCP decided to approve (only) the off-road solution[5] and accordingly submitted their report[6] to a meeting of the Cambridgeshire County Council in March 2023 recommending that the GCP's proposal for the off-road option be agreed (and taken forward for an order authorising its construction). The CCC after a long debate agreed the GCP's proposal, despite an amendment being tabled even as late as this in process,

[1] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/sustainable-transport-programme/public-transport-schemes/cambourne-to-cambridge.

[2] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/Submissions/First-Batch/250221-Cambridge-PPF.pdf.

[3] https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/C2C-LLF/C2C-LLF-Technical-Note-Madingley-Road-Quick-Wins-14-05-2019.pdf.

[4] See the video recording of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board meeting of 1 July 2021, on the GCP YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nPewwgf7Lk, at 4:21:00.

[5] See the Decision Summary for the meeting of 1 July 2021 of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board, available on the Cambridgeshire County Council's CMIS site, https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Home.aspx.

[6] See pages 19–46 of the Agenda document for the County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, available on the Cambridgeshire County Council's CMIS site, https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Home.aspx.

which repeated hitherto ignored requests for an impartial evaluation of the inbound on-road and the off-road option.[7] This decision by the CCC was far from evidence-based.

The GCP Chair put the GCP's proposal to the CCC beginning 'you have been lied to'[8] and later, in summarising the debate, stated that she had become 'intolerant of falsehoods being uttered'.[9] Yet the GCP Chair repeated the GCP 'mantra'[10] that the GCP had properly assessed the alternatives citing the GCP commissioned audit of May 2021 by Amey Consulting.[11] In the meeting, the Chair of the GCP repeats the claim that it is 'false' to say that 'no-one has ever directly compared the on-road route to the proposed off-road route'.[12] At the end of the debate one Councillor states that 'the on-road route has been thoroughly examined over many years and would itself have a significant impact on trees'.[13] Some on-road options have been examined but not the inbound on-road option which the CPPF proposed.

Tangled up within these discussions has been the effect on Madingley Wood, a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and on the American Cemetery which has been referred to many times as a reason why 'an on-road solution' would not work. This claim has been made by the GCP and its Chair[14] who stated that it is 'false' to claim that 'the on-road route would not result in the removal of any trees'.[15] That is misleading: both the 2019 MM[2] and the 2021 CPPF[3] reports concluded that an inbound on-road busway could be accommodated without any take of land or impact on these sites, such as the removal of trees.

An independent *report* (an examination of facts leading to conclusions or recommendations) is very different to an *audit* (an examination of whether or not due process has been followed by an organisation). The Amey audit does *not* evaluate the inbound on-road option but audits the GCP's governance of the process, as indeed the audit states: 'the remit of this audit is not to evaluate the merits or otherwise of specific route alignments'[16] the University's member similarly explained its purpose to the GCP Executive as so.[17] No GCP report has concluded that the inbound on-road option would 'result in the removal of any trees'.

Why does the GCP continue to refuse to commission an independent *report* to evaluate the off-road together with the inbound on-road (as they have done for dual bound on-road and

---

[7] See the Minutes of the County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, available on the Cambridgeshire County Council's CMIS site, https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Home.aspx.

[8] See the videorecording of the Cambridgeshire County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, on the CCC's YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q, at 1:40:45.

[9] *Ibid* at 2:27:48.

[10] *Ibid* at 43:09, 43.28, 36:20, 47:20 and 52:57, etc.

[11] *Independent Audit of Key Assumptions and Constraints: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project*, dated 25 May 2021, by Amey Consulting, available from the GCP website at https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/C2C-Independent-Audit-FInal.pdf.

[12] See the videorecording of the Cambridgeshire County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, on the CCC's YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q, at 2:27:55.

[13] *Ibid* at 2:25:55.

[14] *Ibid* at 36:20.

[15] *Ibid* 2:28:05.

[16] See the Amey Consulting audit report (footnote 11 above), at section 6.1.

[17] See the video recording of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board meeting of 1 July 2021, on the GCP YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nPewwgf7Lk, at 4:21:48.

off-road)? Instead the Chair claimed (as noted above)[18] that the Amey *audit* is sufficient to justify their rejection of the inbound on-road option (whilst the audit report itself states within it, that it didn't evaluate that option at all).

~~Many statements made to the CCC (and indeed to the GCP including by its Chair) are [redacted]. The 55 Councillors were, at GCP Chair's own admission, [redacted] to'; indeed they were [redacted] or, if not, certainly confused including by the GCP Chair.~~ Over many years there have been endless reports, confusing terminology and ambiguous use of the term 'on-road busway' thereby obfuscating which option is being addressed at any time. How could Councillors be expected to distil the truth from the mountain of ambiguous evidence? One Councillor felt compelled to speak because: 'there is so much misinformation going on'.[19]

Commented [A11]: This statement is indirect but it does identify one person - the GCP Chair - as the source of [redacted]

Commented [A12]: This suggests that the GCP Chair was admitting that the [redacted] but that was not the meaning of the GCP Chair's words.

Commented [A13]: Where is the evidence that the Councillors were [redacted] (or confused) including by the GCP Chair?

And why does this matter to the University? Because the Notice and decision before us comes as the result of the above flawed processes within other bodies (the GCP and CCC), one of which the University has Board membership of.

The University now has to make a decision on a matter consequent upon all this. The University must not be complicit and similarly misled; it must take an evidence-based decision using our well-established principles and processes of good governance.

How can the University continue to 'actively promote' and facilitate an option which will lead to the destruction of acres of land with a colossal, well-evidenced environmental impact, which is opposed by a large number of the University's external stakeholders[20] and do so without first seeking an independent analysis to evaluate all the factors between the off-road and inbound on-road options? The inbound on-road option leaves the green belt untouched, is environmentally sustainable and delivers the University's desired aim of access to West Cambridge (and is also cheaper).

The University's Environmental Policy[21] published in 2023 'applies to all aspects of the University's estate … and to a range of stakeholders'. It commits to ensuring that the University:

- 'protects and enhances the natural environment' … 'by having positive direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems';
- 'reduces the environmental sustainability impacts of its construction and refurbishment projects'; and
- 'provides … sustainable travel options'

In summary, over many years the University has relentlessly pursued the off-road option, dismissing and ignoring options put forward by other credible stakeholders who have sought for an independent enquiry into the relative merits of each of the off-road and on-road inbound options. One of the underlying principles of a university is to be an organisation whose decisions and outputs are based upon evidence-based principles – why not so here?

I urge the University to pause before proceeding and

---

[18] See the videorecording of the Cambridgeshire County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, on the CCC's YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q, at 43:09.
[19] *Ibid* at 1:20:00.
[20] See for example the Cambridge Past, Present & Future campaign pages at https://www.cambridgeppf.org/Pages/Category/campaigns.
[21] Available at https://www.environment.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/environmental_policy_2023_2024_logo.pdf.

- to reflect hard on their current approach of promoting and facilitating one option without an evidence base, the provenance of which option is questionable, one which is contrary to their published values, and one which ignores the views of many stakeholders;
- to take serious note of the huge amount of environmental data cautioning against an off-road busway;
- to commission, contrary to its position to date and with or without the agreement of the Greater Cambridge Partnership, an independent report which assesses the off-road and the inbound on-road options for a busway including in terms of relative costs and environmental impact;
- and for the University to abide by its principles (as exemplified in its Environmental Policy) and grasp this opportunity to demonstrate that we practise what we preach.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Registrary's Office

Emma Rampton
Registrary
Our Ref: EMCR/lr

30 July 2024

Dr J T Green
By Email: [redacted]

Dear Dr Green

Thank you for your email of 21 July addressed to members of the Council and others, raising concerns about the publication of remarks made at the 9 July Discussion on a proposed disposal of land at West Cambridge for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway. I am replying because I am the editor of the Reporter, with the discretion to omit or amend Discussion remarks. I am also replying in my capacity as Secretary to the Council, given that you have written to some of its members. I will share this reply with those you copied into your email.

You raise two concerns. The first relates to the publication of certain remarks made by Ms Flood and Dr O'Brien. Your concern is that they provide no evidence to support their claims that matters are now beyond the University's control and therefore there is no other avenue open to the University other than to discuss the terms of an agreement to sell the land to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC). It is not clear to which points in your remarks you are referring when you say they provide evidence showing this to be false. However, the Council's Notice published on 5 June confirms that the negotiations with CCC are already at the stage where a Transport and Works Act order has been drafted. This could lead to a compulsory purchase order to obtain the required land if no agreement is reached. The publicly available documentation on compulsory purchase confirms the position, noting that it is "intended as a last resort and acquiring authorities are expected to try to acquire land by agreement before resorting to compulsory purchase."

Your second concern relates to the editing of your own remarks. The Reporter team reviews Discussion remarks to check for various matters, including factual accuracy and whether any comments might be considered defamatory or unlawful. Where the latter is considered a risk, the team contacts the contributor to see whether a revised wording can be agreed. The team also points out factual errors and shows how it plans to correct them. These checks protect the person making the remarks and the University from the risk of legal challenge.

University Offices
The Old Schools
Trinity Lane
Cambridge CB2 1TN

Tel: +44 (0)1223 332294

Email: Registrary@admin.cam.ac.uk
www.cam.ac.uk

I have seen the correspondence between you and a member of the Reporter team. You received a tracked changes version of your remarks with comments and suggesting amendments, to which you (at least prior to publication) agreed. Most of the amendments suggested were factual corrections to quotations from two meetings when compared with the transcripts of those meetings. You also received one further tracked amendment, which you were not able to see before publication, but the emails made clear that it would be possible to publish a correction if appropriate. Although you contacted the Reporter team on 19 July to say you were not happy with the later amendment, you did not explain why. However, your email of 21 July provides further details of two changes (referred to as A and B) with which you have concerns.

Change A omits the sentences of concern, and, further, you agreed to these changes prior to publication. As is permitted under Regulation 7 of the Ordinance for Discussions, I will therefore leave the omission as it stands.

Regarding change B, the contents of the two reports do not appear to support the conclusions drawn in this paragraph of your remarks. Again, as permitted under Regulation 7, I have asked the team to publish a correction omitting the following text and related footnotes from the Discussion report as published on 17 July, with a note to explain the omission:

"This claim has been made by the GCP and its Chair. However, both the 2019 MM and the 2021 CPPF reports note that moving the route to the south to avoid taking land from the SSSI and the American Cemetery."

Yours sincerely

Emma Rampton
Registrary

University Offices
The Old Schools
Trinity Lane
Cambridge CB2 1TN

Tel: +44 (0)1223 332294

Email: Registrary@admin.cam.ac.uk
www.cam.ac.uk