



THE CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE ORDER (REF DPI/E0535/25/1)

Note of pre-inquiry meeting held at 10.00 on Tuesday 24 June 2025

**Venue - Lee Seng Tee Hall, Wolfson College, Barton Road
Cambridge CB3 9BB**

Text in *italics* records post-meeting updates

References in brackets e.g. (CD1-01) are to , core documents on the
[Gateley/Hamer inquiry website](#)

Introductions

1. The pre-inquiry meeting was led by ourselves, Richard Clegg and Geoff Underwood, as the appointed Panel of Inspectors. Joanna Vincent and Brenda Taplin were introduced as the Programme Officers, who are dealing with the administrative arrangements for the case. Contact details for the Programme Officers are given at the end of this note (para 35).
2. Participants on behalf of the parties are listed in the appendix to this note.
3. The purpose of the meeting was to consider the ongoing management of the case and arrangements for the inquiry, in order to ensure that it proceeds in an efficient and effective manner.

Scope of the proposals

4. The application for the TWA Order is accompanied by a request for a direction concerning deemed planning permission, and an application for an open space certificate. The scope of the scheme which would be authorised by the Order is summarised in paragraphs 3 & 4 of the application letter (CD1-01), and includes the guided busway, a travel hub and park & ride facility, two bridges, access roads, compounds, the acquisition of land and rights, alterations to public rights of way, and highway works.
5. The request for a direction as to deemed planning permission concerns development for which provision is included in the draft Order (CD1-14, para 3). Article 20(1) of the draft Order refers to the authorised works, which are the scheduled works (the guided busway, bridges, the access track and highway work) and any other works. For clarity, the Applicant is to provide a single list of the development to which the request for a direction as to deemed planning permission relates.
6. The application for a section 19 certificate concerns the replacement of open space at plots 14-153 & 14-154 with land at plots 14-144b & 14-144c (CD1-22, paras 1.6-1.8). There are typographical errors in the

original statement of matters concerning the plot references (CD25-01, paras 10 & 11), but the application, the book of reference (CD1-13, pgs 59, 60 & 64) and the public notice are correct. An amended statement of matters was issued on 24 June 2025.

7. For the Applicant, NC outlined proposed changes to the draft Order. These concern typographical corrections, plot references, and protective provisions (CDs1-02a-c). Notwithstanding an email from the Applicant concerning validation, it was acknowledged that this process was not relevant at this stage. Whilst there are currently no further changes proposed to the draft Order, some may arise as a result of negotiations between the Applicant and other parties.

Main considerations and other matters

8. In our advance note for the pre-inquiry meeting, we suggested that the main considerations in this case would be likely to reflect the statement of matters. Matter 2 concerns the statutory procedural requirements, which it is intended would be addressed separately. The Applicant has submitted a procedural note (CD25-04), which responds to matter 2.
9. RS expressed concern about the way in which negotiations concerning the interests of J & W R Sadler had been handled. This concern does not relate to matter 2, but can be addressed in evidence at the inquiry.
10. Clare Hall has submitted a note suggesting that the following should be main considerations for the inquiry (CD25-07):
 - i) The effect on the grade II* listed building of Clare Hall.
 - ii) Flood risk.
 - iii) The adequacy of the environmental statement, with particular reference to cultural heritage and noise impact.
 - iv) The effect on Clare Hall as an academic research institution.
11. It was acknowledged that the matters referred to by Clare Hall should be addressed in evidence. However, the effect on the listed building is intended to be covered as part of matter 4e (the effect on heritage assets), flood risk as part of 4c (the effect on the environment), and the effect on Clare Hall as an academic research institution could be included with the subjects listed under matter 4b (the effect on local residents, pedestrians, cyclists and motorists). *The adequacy of the environmental statement, which is concerned with whether the scheme has been appropriately prepared, is intended to be addressed separately from the main considerations.*
12. CPPF & Coton PC have queried whether the emergency and maintenance track falls within the scope of the matters in respect of which an Order may be made. This matter will be considered in evidence, *but as with the adequacy of the environmental statement, it is intended to be addressed separately from the main considerations*
13. *Our current understanding of the main considerations is:*

- i) *The aims and objectives of, and the need for, the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge guided busway.*
- ii) *The main alternative options considered by Cambridgeshire County Council, and the reasons for choosing the preferred option set out in the draft Order.*
- iii) *The effect on East West Rail land safeguarded for the construction of a new railway between Bedford and Cambridge and the upgrading of the existing railway between Oxford and Bedford.*
- iv) *The effect on local residents, pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, and Clare Hall as an academic research institution.*
- v) *The effect of the scheme on the environment, including flood risk, biodiversity, habitats, and wildlife, with particular reference to the Coton Orchard and Coton Orchard County Wildlife Site.*
- vi) *The effect of the scheme on the Green Belt.*
- vii) *The effect of the scheme on heritage assets, with particular reference to the grade I registered park and garden of the American Military Cemetery at Madingley, and the grade II* listed building of Clare Hall, University of Cambridge.*
- viii) *The effects of the scheme on statutory undertakers, statutory utilities and other utility providers.*
- ix) *Whether the scheme is consistent with guidance on the compulsory purchase process*
- x) *Whether the exchange land is equally advantageous to the open space land to be acquired, and whether it is appropriate for a certificate to be granted in accordance with the provisions of section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.*

Participation in the inquiry

14. Parties intending to participate in the inquiry, and their representatives, as advised at the pre-inquiry meeting, are listed in the appendix to this note.

The form of the inquiry

15. The proposal to hold the inquiry as a face-to-face event, with the opportunity for on-line participation if the need arises (and subject to technical feasibility), was agreed. It was also agreed that round-table sessions be held to discuss possible conditions and, if necessary, any proposed amendments to the draft Order.
16. The Applicant suggested that the inquiry be arranged as follows (CD25-06):
- Block 1– the Applicant to present its overall case, with cross-examination by other parties. It was not intended that witnesses would be recalled unless there was a specific need to do so.
 - Block 2 – the cases for interested parties with scheme-wide objections, with cross-examination, closing submissions for these objectors.
 - Block 3 – the cases for interested parties with site-specific objections, with cross-examination, possible conditions, closing submissions on behalf of the Applicant.

17. Clare Hall suggested that the Applicant's approach be modified to limit questions in block 1 to scheme-wide issues, potentially including evidence from the Applicant in respect of scheme-wide objections in block 2, and including the Applicant's evidence in respect of site-specific matters in block 3 (CD25-07).
18. CPPF & Coton PC suggested that, following the introduction of the scheme by the Applicant, individual objectors should present their cases, with the Applicant presenting evidence in response (CD25-05).
19. Other parties pointed out that a number of objectors are concerned with the eastern end of the route.
20. We undertook to respond to suggestions about the form of the inquiry in this note. *It is important that at the outset of the inquiry, the scheme as a whole is introduced, and that evidence about scheme-wide merits is heard then. That will provide an appropriate context for subsequent sessions. The inquiry should then hear evidence on site-specific matters from both the Applicant and interested parties. We appreciate the Applicant's preference that its witnesses should not be recalled as a matter of course, but it would be most useful if all the detailed evidence on site-specific matters is heard together in the same part of the inquiry. Moreover questions to the Applicant's witnesses on detailed matters at the beginning of the inquiry would interrupt the delivery of scheme-wide evidence.*
21. *Our preference is for all closing submissions to be heard at the end of the inquiry, probably following a break in sitting when site visits could be arranged. The Applicant should also respond to written representations prior to closing submissions.*

Timetable

22. Eight weeks have been scheduled for the inquiry:

Block 1

16-19 September

23-26 September

30 September – 3 October

Block 2

14-17 October

21-24 October

Block 3

4-7 November

11-14 November

18-21 November

Having regard to our views about the structure of the inquiry (above, paras 20 & 21), an indicative order of proceedings is set out below:

Block 1 – Opening statements, initial site visits, the Applicant's case for the overall scheme.

Block 2 – The cases for interested parties in respect of the overall scheme,

- *series of site-specific sessions (with objections and themes grouped where possible) including the cases for the Applicant and for interested parties.*

Block 3 - Site-specific and thematic sessions continued, possible conditions, the Applicant's response to written representations, site visits, closing submissions.

Following the receipt of time estimates, the Programme Officers will prepare a timetable for the inquiry. Mr Freeman (Applicant) is available on 17 & 18 September; Mr Kelly (South Cambridgeshire DC & Cambridge CC) is available on 19 September.

Inquiry venues

23. The venue for the inquiry will be The Cambridge Belfry Hotel at Cambourne, Back Lane, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6BW for all scheduled dates except 21 November 2025. On that date, the venue will be the Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6EA.
24. It is understood that retiring rooms will be available and that on-line participation and streaming can be provided.

Documentation

25. The Programme Officers have prepared an inquiry website, which includes a core documents library.

[Core documents - Gateley](#)

All documents should be available digitally, and should be submitted to the Programme Officers for inclusion on the website. Suggestions for core documents should be discussed between the parties. The parties are encouraged to co-operate in the preparation of statements of common ground, as suggested in appendix 2 to the Applicant's letter to the inspectors of 20 June 2025 (CD25-06).

26. Documents should not include links to websites or on-line resources. *Rather, PDF copies of the material should be provided in an appendix.*
27. The Applicant has submitted an addendum to the environmental statement (ES) concerning trees at Coton Orchard. In addition, it is intended to make available a document entitled 'CPPF Alternative Scheme – Engineering Assessment' and a technical note on updates to the Department for Transport's transport analysis guidance by 22 July 2025 on the inquiry website. The Applicant agreed to publicise the ES addendum with an advertisement in the local press, which would also ask interested parties to check the inquiry website for new documentation.
28. JP expressed concern about the possible introduction of new traffic data in the additional documentation from the Applicant.

29. The Applicant explained that the proposed list of suggested planning conditions would be an update to that attached to the request for a direction as to deemed planning permission. It was suggested that possible conditions be addressed in statements of common ground.
30. Proofs of evidence from all parties should be submitted by 19 August 2025. Proofs should be submitted electronically to the Programme Officers, and to other parties in accordance with Rule 16(4) of The Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004. Any rebuttals should be submitted by 9 September.
31. We will require two hard copies of proofs of evidence and the following plans:
- CD1-16.1 location plan, 2 x A1
 - CD1-16.4 proposed site plans, 2 x A1 and 1 x A3
 - CD1-16.5 proposed site sections, 2 x A1*
 - CD1-16.6 structures, M11 overbridge 2 x A1; Bin Brook bridge, 2 X A1
 - CD1-16.7 construction compounds, 2x A3.

Site visits

32. We explained that we had seen parts of the area through which the route was proposed on 23 June 2025. We will undertake a full programme of site visits at a later date, probably towards the end of the inquiry. There was agreement to our suggestion that a series of site visits also be made before evidence was heard.

Costs

33. None of the parties present currently intend to make an application for an award of costs.

Summary of key dates

34. The key dates for submission of documents are set out below:

- By 8 July 2025:
 - hard copies of plans from the Applicant,
 - site visit suggestions,
 - *a single list of the development to which the request for a direction as to deemed planning permission relates from the Applicant.*
- By 22 July 2024 – the Applicant's documents 'CPPF Alternative Scheme – Engineering Assessment' and a technical note on updates to the Department for Transport's transport analysis guidance.
- By 29 July 2025 – statements of common ground.
- By 19 August 2025 (4 weeks prior to the inquiry) – proofs of evidence.
- By 26 August 2025 (3 weeks) – any costs applications.
- By 2 September 2025 (2 weeks) - time estimates for presenting evidence, cross-examination, opening statements, and closing submissions.
- By 9 September 2025 (1 week) - rebuttals, responses to any costs applications.

Programme officers' contact details

35. Joanna Vincent

Telephone: 07483-133975

Email: Joanna.Vincent@gateleyhamer.com

Brenda Taplin

Telephone: 07493-972022

Email: Brenda.Taplin@gateleyhamer.com

Please contact one of the Programme Officers in advance to arrange the submission of any hard copy documents.

Richard Clegg, Geoff Underwood

INSPECTORS

2 July 2025

Annex – Participants in the pre-inquiry meeting (PIM) and intended inquiry appearances (Inq)

The Applicant – Cambridgeshire County Council

Neil Cameron KC (NR) (PIM, Inq)
Matthew Henderson, Counsel (Inq)
Jo Baker, GCP (history & development) (Inq)
Peter Freeman, Cambridge Growth Company (need) (Inq)
John Lonergan, WSP (design & construction) (Inq)
Chris Whitehouse, WSP (business case) (Inq)
Andy Saunders, WSP (environmental matters) (Inq)
Chris Carolan, WSP (landscape & visual) (Inq)
Ian Ellis, WSP (ecology) (Inq)
Chris Alder, Barrell Tree Consultancy (arboriculture) (Inq)
Toby Lewis, WSP (noise & vibration) (Inq)
Ralph Lewis, WSP (planning matters) (Inq)
Tom Wilson, WSP (heritage) (Inq)
Jack Southon, WSP (flood risk) (Inq)
James Franklim, CBRE (property) (Inq)
Paola Reason, RSK Biocensus (bats) (Inq)

South Cambridgeshire District Council & Cambridge City Council (REP-09)

Claire Nevin, Counsel (PIM)
Esther Drabkin-Reiter Counsel (Inq)
Stephen Kelly (Inq)¹

Clare Hall in the University of Cambridge (OBJ-213)

Stephanie Bruce-Smith, Counsel (PIM)
Hereward Phillpot KC (Inq)
Alan Short (Clare Hall) (Inq)
Kamran Haider, Pulsar Ltd (transport & alternative routes) (Inq)
Graham Sinclair, Create Consulting Engineers Ltd (flooding) (Inq)
Jody Blacklock, Create Consulting Engineers Ltd (acoustics) (Inq)
Fiona Lamb, Avanti Architects (heritage) (Inq)
David Conboy, Newsteer (compulsory acquisition & compensation) (Inq)
Jessica Wilson, Newsteer (planning) (Inq)

Cambridge Past, Present & Future (CPPF) and Coton Parish Council (PC) (OBJ-251)

Jack Parker, Counsel (JP) (PIM, Inq)
James Littlewood, CPPF (planning) (Inq)
Steve Johnstone (transport) (Inq)
Edward Leigh (transport, alternative route) (Inq)
Dominic Woodfield (ecology) (Inq)
Ed Pyne (trees)² (Inq)
Louise Hirst (carbon assessment)
Councillor Mark Abbott, Chair Coton PC (PIM)

East West Rail (OBJ-247)

Duncan O'Connor, TLT Solicitors (PIM)

¹ An appearance may not be required at the inquiry.

² The position of Mr Pyne is to be clarified, as he is associated with The Woodland Trust which has submitted a separate objection (OBJ-294).

One witness (Inq)³

J & W R Sadler, Madingley Hill Farm (OBJ-102)

Rob Sadler (RS) (PIM, Inq)

Coton Busway Action Group (OBJ-143)

Marilyn Treacy (PIM)

2 or 3 witnesses (Inq)

John Green (OBJ-53), individual (PIM, Inq)

Matthew Baker, local resident (OBJ-132) (PIM, Inq)

Alan Treacy, resident of Coton (OBJ -50) (PIM, Inq)

Coton Orchard & Coton Orchard Ltd (OBJ-52), Anna Gazeley, resident of Coton (PIM, Inq)

Carolyn Postgate, resident of Coton (OBJ-84), member of Coton Busway Action Group (PIM, Inq)

Bridget Sutton, local resident (OBJ-94) (PIM, Inq)

Friends of the Cam (OBJ-203)

Susan Buckingham (PIM, Inq)

Tony Booth (Inq)⁴

Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority

Alison Melton (PIM)

Paul Bristow, Mayor (environmental issues, safety) (Inq)

Kate Fry, Gough Way Residents Association (OBJ-175), individual (PIM, Inq)

Keith Glover, local resident and Gough Way Flood Liaison Volunteer (OBJ-151) (PIM, Inq)

Ashcroft Veterinary Practice (OBJ-1)

Laura Wood (changes to St Neots Road) (PIM, Inq)

Andrew Davidson, local resident (OBJ-142) (PIM, Inq)

Greycoat, Oaktree and Homes England Partnership, owners of Bourn Airfield⁵

Nick Baker (PIM)

North Newnham Residents Association (REP-03)

Humphry Gleave (Inq)

Pippa Heylings, MP for South Cambridgeshire (REP-05) (Inq)

³ Written representations may be considered sufficient.

⁴ The position of Professor Booth is to be clarified, as he has submitted a separate objection (OBJ-272), partly as a member of Friends of the Cam, and partly as an individual.

⁵ The previous owners of the airfield, R Taylor & Sons, submitted a representation in support of the scheme (SUP-12).

Other individuals associated with the parties were in attendance at the pre-inquiry meeting.