From: Wendy Blythe <wendy.blythe.fecra@gmail.com>
Sent: 08 March 2025 03:14
To: TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE
Subject: Re Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway to the southeast of Cambridge- sent 7 March - postal address added

Ref: Application for a Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway known as the Cambridge South East Transport (CSET2) for a public transport route between a new travel hub near the A11 to A1307 and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, as submitted by Cambridgeshire County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership, on 9 January 2025

Postal address added to Objection
Wendy Blythe,
Chair, The Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations (FeCRA)
269 Hills Rd,
Cambridge
CB2 8RP

From: Wendy Blythe <wendy.blythe.fecra@gmail.com>
Date: 7 March 2025 at 21:29:56 GMT
To: transportinfrastructure@dft.gov.uk
Cc: FeCRA Committee <committee@fecra.org.uk>
Subject: Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway to the southeast of Cambridge

Dear Secretary of State,

Ref: Application for a Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway known as the Cambridge South East Transport (CSET2) for a public transport route between a new travel hub near the A11 to A1307 and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, as submitted by Cambridgeshire County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership, on 9 January 2025

The Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations strongly object to the above application by Cambridgeshire County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership to build an off-road busway between a new travel hub near the A11/A1307 A1307 junctions and the Cambridge BioMedical Campus. We support the on-road option proposed by Cambridge Past Present and Future.

I attended many of the earlier Local Liasion meetings when the proposals involved building sections of the busway next to the A1307 and one mile of new road. It is disturbing that the applicant is now proposing such an environmentally damaging alternative.

Cambridge residents say it would be much better to build the busway next to an existing road and build one mile of new road instead of building two bridges over the River Granta.

The Cam chalk streams are unique and world famous. They are also vulnerable and known to be in dire straits because of over abstraction. This application to build bridges and put a chalk stream in a

culvert will create ugliness and harm the river. Many residents support the objections made by the Hobson's Conduit Trust and others who have highlighted that the proposed five-mile bus road will destroy the habitat of water voles and concrete over the top of Hobson's Conduit with a large bridge close to Nine Wells Nature Reserve. They find it incomprehensible that the proposals now also include a huge and intrusive construction right next to the nature reserve. It is shocking that the route crosses the River Granta twice, creating the need for another two large road bridges. This damage is totally unnecessary because the alternative route wouldn't need to cross the river or Hobson's Conduit.

When the planning inspector gave approval for the Stapleford retirement village, he set great store by the environmental benefits that would come from the associated countryside park which the developer has to provide. One third of this park will be lost, largely under concrete, if the bus road is granted approval. It would be an act of environmental vandalism when the less damaging option along the A1307 is available.

Residents find it shocking that the applicant does not think that the Gogs landscape is worth protecting and is happy to create a scar in the Gog Magog Hills and build a road through a countryside park.

They say that this proposal has very little to do with improving public transport. The real reason and claimed major benefit is 'land value uplift'. The proposal has been designed to break up prime agricultural farm land and the countryside within the green belt for further development. They share the concerns about this expressed by CPRE Cambs and Peterborough and others and highlight :

GCP document: "The Cambridge South East Transport Order - Outline Business Case", Reference CSET-20-00, dated January 2025, but actually written by Mott Macdonald in May 2020, see Page 4.
Table 7.4 of the Section titled "Outline Business Case - Economic Case" reads in 2.2.3 Level 3: Wider Economic Impacts (Land Use Change)
"The assessment of the Level 3 impacts has been based on a Land Value Uplift (LVU) approach which examines how the CSET Phase 2 project supports the planned development along the corridor."
The document goes on to say:
"Overall, the monetised journey time benefits across the options are reasonably consistent, with the scheme generating benefits in the region of £40-£46m over the 60-year appraisal period."
So that's around £7m per annum from journey time savings. This doesn't appear to be very much for such an expensive project - £161m, as set out in the Form 3 Estimate of Costs at document reference CSET-09-00-00. But taking into account the Land Value Uplift
7.4.1 Conclusion of Wider Economic Benefits Analysis
In summary it was found that the development of the three residential sites and single employment site identified in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018)9 could produce:
Approximately 404 gross jobs and £18m of gross GVA per annum; and
A single uplift in land values of approximately £113m.
In other words, without the £113m of Land Value Uplift, this project does not have reasonable cost benefit case.
According to the document "Economic Dimension Addendum":
The Benefit Cost Ratio, BCR, for a scheme provides an indicative measure for the VfM, Value for Money, of the investment, whereby a BCR greater than 1.0 indicates that the benefits outweigh the costs. DfT has defined value for money categories, which are as follows:
i. BCR less than 1: Poor
ii. BCR between 1 and 1.5: Low
iii. BCR between 1.5 and 2: Medium
iv. BCR between 2 and 4: High
v. BCR of 4 and above: Very High
Table 1.47 of this document shows a BCR of 1.47, Low. So the document then goes on to say:
"The new analysis yields a higher BCR improving from 0.81 to 1.47, and a higher VfM from poor to low, as compared to OBC 2020. Table 1-13 below compares the PVB, PVC, BCR and VfM values

between OBC 2020 and this Economic Dimension Addendum. This change is a result of a larger increase in PVB (an 83% increase) than the increase in PVC (a 14% increase), with more monetised benefits coming from local air quality (increased by £37,000), economic efficiency for consumer users (increased by £37,541,000) and, business users and providers (increased by £40,522,000). This can be attributed to the different methodologies used in the economic appraisal approach. OBC 2020 assessed economic efficiency using journey time benefits (calculated by the multiplication of the time savings based on a defined Value of Time (VoT) per user purpose split) and MEC methods. The Economic Dimensionn Addendum did so through TUBA, which aligns with DfT guidance TAG unit A1-1 Cost-Benefit Analysis.
The latest BCR of 1.47 gives a project value for money category as Low VfM. Achieving so requires an increase in BCR by 0.3, which can be facilitated by an increase in PVB by £2,607,227, or a decrease in
PVC by £1,738,151."
Table 1-13 - Summary of PVB, PVC, BCR and VfM of OBC 2020 and MEC calculations
OBC 2020 Calculations MEC calculations
PVB £69,762,000 £127,578,790
PVC £85,652,000 £86,790,678
BCR 0.81 1.47
VfM Poor Low
So, having got the BCR up from POOR to LOW, the document goes on to massage the figures further. Apparently, people can't walk or cycle without a nearby busway to add risk to their lives which, for some unexplained reason, see Table 1.19 – Active Travel Benefits, reduces their risk of premature death and adds significant journey ambience.
The consequent massaged figures are presented in Table 1-20 - Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits (£), where, the BCR has now crept up to 1.53, just about achieving MEDIUM.

Our conclusion, like that of CPRE Cambs and Peterborough (who are quoted above) and others, is that this scheme is both environmentally damaging and very poor value for public money.

Best wishes,

Wendy Blythe,
Chair, FeCRA

269 Hills Rd,
Cambridge
CB2 8RP

Wendy Blythe
Chair, FeCRA

www.fecra.org.uk
www.facebook.com/CambridgeRAs
www.twitter.com/fecra2

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