

DfT Ref: TWA/24/APP/03

Document Ref: CD26-01-APP-W1-1

The Cambourne to Cambridge Order

Cambridgeshire County Council

Transport and Works Act 1992

Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004

Inquiry into:

THE CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE ORDER

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

of

Jo Baker, BSc, MSc, FCIHT, FCILT, ACGI

of Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership

On behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council

15th August 2025

CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Qualifications and Experience	4
1.2 Context of my Evidence	4
1.3 My Evidence	4
1.4 Summary of Evidence	7
2. THE CITY DEAL AND GOVERNANCE	9
2.1 Greater Cambridge Partnership	9
3. NEED FOR THE SCHEME	11
3.1 Transport Context and Constraints	11
3.2 Economic Context and Constraints	12
3.3 The Cambridge Phenomenon and the City Deal	14
3.4 Opportunities	15
4. SCHEME DEVELOPMENT AND OPTIONS	17
4.3 Consideration of Alternatives	18
4.4 STAGE 1 – OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT THROUGH TO SOBC	18
4.5 STAGE 2 – PARK AND RIDE OPTIONS SELECTION	19
4.6 STAGE 3 – OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT THROUGH TO OBC	19
4.7 STAGE 4 – OPTION REFINEMENT TO REFLECT STAKEHOLDER ISSUES	21
4.8 Key Stakeholder Engagement	23
4.9 Statutory Consultation	25
5. THE PREFERRED OPTION	26
5.1 The Preferred Option	26
5.2 Approach to Bus Guidance	27
5.3 Safety	28
5.4 Funding	29
5.5 Procurement	29
6. TRANSPORT ISSUES	30
6.1 Does the scheme overcome the transport constraints?	30
6.2 Does the scheme comply with transport policy?	30
7. ECONOMIC ISSUES	32
7.1 Does the scheme allow the economic opportunities to be realised.	32
8. HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES	33
8.1 Compliance with the ECHR	33
9. ALTERNATIVES	34
9.1 Introduction	34
9.2 Do Nothing	34
9.3 Improve the Existing Infrastructure	35
9.4 New Infrastructure	35
10. INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER PROPOSALS	37
10.1 East West Rail	37
10.2 Anglian Water	37
10.3 Bourn Airfield	38
10.4 Comberton Greenway	38
10.5 West Cambridge	38
11. RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS	39
11.2 Issues Raised by CBAG	40
11.3 Impact on Coton Orchard	42
11.4 Impact on American Cemetery	43
11.5 Lack of Engagement	43
11.6 Safety of the Scheme	44
11.7 Design Matters	45
11.8 Other Matters	46
12. CONCLUSIONS	49
12.1 Matter 1	49
12.2 Matter 3a	49
12.3 Matter 4a	50

12.4	Matter 6b	50
12.5	Matter 6c.....	50
13.	STATEMENT OF TRUTH	50

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1.1 I hold a BSc in Civil Engineering from Imperial College, London and also an MSc in Transport Planning and Engineering from the Institute for Transport Studies at the University of Leeds. I am also a Fellow of both the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport and the Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation.
- 1.1.2 I have over 35 years transport planning experience primarily working in consultancy including major scheme development, transport modelling and business case preparation, as well as the development of innovative clean and autonomous vehicle projects,
- 1.1.3 Earlier in my career I was the Project Engineer for major Trunk Road schemes such as the A6120 Leeds Outer Ring Road and A6120 Seacroft and Crossgates Bypass as well as the Lincoln Eastern Bypass and Ropewalk to Carholme Road link with responsibility for all aspects of scheme development such as demand modelling, design, environmental appraisal and consultation.
- 1.1.4 For 8 years I led the West Midlands Joint Data Team, an outsourced local government service managed by Mott MacDonald. During that time I was responsible for overseeing a team delivering services including transport planning and modelling and scheme appraisal for Major Scheme Business Cases for a range of public transport, highway and transport technology schemes such as the Selly Oak Bypass, the West Midlands UTC Major Scheme, Midland Metro.
- 1.1.5 I was involved in the development of the various transport strategies which have guided the development of Bus Showcase, Sprint and Midland Metro in the West Midlands, Bus Priority schemes in Glasgow and Stoke on Trent, reviews of the performance of Sheffield Supertram, the initial study which finally led to the South Wales Metro, projects for London Docklands Development Corporation relating to the DLR and Jubilee Line, LRT proposals for Leeds and BRT proposals for Stoke on Trent, and proposals for extensions of the Tyne and Wear Metro.
- 1.1.6 I was the Project Manager of the EU-funded JUPITER-2 project which pioneered the introduction of electric, clean diesel and natural gas powered buses and municipal vehicles in 7 European cities, and also of the EDICT project which investigated the development of autonomous vehicle technology including the UltraPRT Pods now deployed in Heathrow Airport.

1.2 Context of my Evidence

- 1.2.1 From 2017 to 2020, I was the Mott MacDonald Project Director leading on the provision, to the Greater Cambridge Partnership, of consultancy services for CtoC.
- 1.2.2 Since 2020 I have been contracted by the Greater Cambridge Partnership as the Senior Project Manager responsible for the CtoC scheme with responsibility for all aspects of the development of the scheme.
- 1.2.3 My evidence will cover the background to the scheme, explaining its context within the Greater Cambridge City Deal, and the lengthy process of option selection which led to the preferred option which is the subject of this application.
- 1.2.4 Specifically the evidence will cover the extensive consideration which was given to an on-road alternative during this process

1.3 My Evidence

- 1.3.1 The topics I address in this proof of evidence are set out below and in Table 1.1.

- 1.3.2 In making reference to page numbers in Core Documents, where there is a document page number this has been used and where not I refer to the PDF page number.

Table 1.1: Coverage of certain matters in Proofs of Evidence as set out in the Statement of Matters [CD25-01, pages 1 and 2]

Statement of Matters [CD25-01] Reference	Statement of Matters text	Coverage through my Proof of Evidence	Coverage through Proofs of Evidence of Others
1	The aims and objectives of, and the need for, the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge guided busway ("the scheme").	I will explain the background to the scheme including Governance and the policy context within which it sits.	Mr Lewis [CD26-01-APP-W10-1] will provide further detail on the various planning policies which prevail and Mr Whitehouse [CD26-01-APP-W6-1] will summarise the Outline Business Case which presents this Matter.
3	The main alternative options considered by CCC and the reasons for choosing the preferred option set out in the Order.		
3a	a. The rationale for the preferred option and the alternatives considered.	I will describe the rationale for the preferred option and the process followed in the development and consideration of alternatives	Mr Saunders [CD26-01-APP-W3-1] will describe how the ES has reported alternatives including a description of the reasonable alternatives studied and the main reasons for selecting the preferred option.
4	The effect of the implementation, operation and maintenance of the scheme.		
4a	The effect on East West Rail land safeguarded for the construction of a new railway between Bedford and Cambridge and the upgrading of existing railway between Oxford and Bedford.	I will describe how GCP and EWR have collaborated in order to develop Heads of Terms and a Collaboration Agreement to avoid conflict	Mr Lonergan [CD26-01-APP-W8-1] will describe the Engineering arrangements in the vicinity of the potential point of conflict.
6	Having regard to the criteria for justifying compulsory purchase powers in paragraphs 12 to 15 of the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government 'Guidance on		

Statement of Matters [CD25-01] Reference	Statement of Matters text	Coverage through my Proof of Evidence	Coverage through Proofs of Evidence of Others
	the Compulsory Purchase Process' published in October 2024 and updated in January 2025		
6b	Whether the purposes for which the compulsory purchase powers are sought are sufficient to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected (having regard to the Human Rights Act 1998).	I will summarise the assessment of the balance between scheme benefits and the impacts of compulsory purchase powers.	Scheme Benefits are outlined by Mr Whitehouse [CD26-01-APP-W6-1] whilst the need to make use of CPO powers is discussed by Mr Franklin [CD26-01-APP-W7-1] along with detail of the endeavours made to engage those with land interest.
6c	Whether there are likely to be any impediments to CCC implementing the scheme, including the availability of funding.	I will explain the basis of the funding available to the GCP and the delivery of the scheme	

Matter 1: The City Deal, Governance and Need for the Scheme

- 1.3.3 In relation to Matter 1, I will explain the context of the scheme as a part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal and the Governance structure which has led to the application prepared by the Greater Cambridge Partnership being submitted to the DfT on behalf of the applicant, Cambridgeshire County Council.
- 1.3.4 In response to the English Devolution White Paper (16 December 2024) it is likely that the Governance structure for Cambridgeshire will be revised with a move towards some form of unitary status. That is not yet confirmed and the Assurance Framework for the Greater Cambridge Partnership [CD7-06] is based upon the current structure. Should that change then a new Governance Structure will need to be agreed between the local partners and central Government.
- 1.3.5 From a transport planning perspective, the Assurance Framework will remain unchanged and will continue to follow the appropriate Government requirements such as HM Treasury Green Book and DfT Transport Analysis Guidance.
- 1.3.6 As such, devolution and potential reorganization is not discussed further.
- 1.3.7 Also, in relation to Matter 1, I will summarise the transport strategy, policies and economic context within which the scheme sits and which has guided the development of the scheme and the objectives which it addresses as well as the opportunities which it creates.
- 1.3.8 Specifically I will explain how the scheme overcomes the transport constraints and how the scheme complies with transport policy.
- 1.3.9 I will also explain how the scheme allows the economic opportunities to be realised.

Matter 3a: Scheme Development and Options leading to the Selection of the Preferred option

- 1.3.10 I will address Matter 3a: the rationale for the preferred option and the alternatives considered.
- 1.3.11 I will outline the process by which the scheme has been developed from its initial inclusion in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire which supported development of the adopted Local Plans, to agreement of the preferred option which is the subject of this application.
- 1.3.12 I will also outline the consideration given to alternatives during that process.
- 1.3.13 I will introduce the preferred option.
- 1.3.14 I will also explain how the scheme is to be delivered including the approach taken to vehicle guidance.

Matter 4a: Interaction with Other Proposals

- 1.3.15 I will address Matter 4a: the effect on East West Rail land safeguarded for the construction of a new railway between Bedford and Cambridge and the upgrading of existing railway between Oxford and Bedford.
- 1.3.16 I will explain how the scheme interacts with other proposals which impact or are perceived to impact it.

Matter 6b: Human Rights

- 1.3.17 I will summarise the assessment of the balance between scheme benefits and the impacts of compulsory purchase powers. Thereby addressing, in part, Matter 6b: Whether the purposes for which the compulsory purchase powers are sought are sufficient to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected (having regard to the Human Rights Act 1998 **[CD5-11]**).

Matter 6c: Implementation and Funding

- 1.3.18 I will summarise the funding and procurement of the proposals. Thereby addressing, in part, Matter 6c: whether there are likely to be any impediments to CCC implementing the scheme, including the availability of funding.

Responses to objections and representations

- 1.3.19 I have addressed a number of issues raised by Objectors in their Statements of Case.
- 1.3.20 Responses to Objections are addressed in **[CD23-01 CCC SoC]**.

1.4 Summary of Evidence

- 1.4.1 My evidence explains firstly the governance behind the proposals and, importantly, the process of democratic accountability which has overseen the development of the scheme and which will ensure that, if consented, the scheme is funded and delivered.
- 1.4.2 I will explain the evolution of the scheme and how the Preferred Option has been developed in accordance with adopted policy and scheme objectives in line with governance. This will confirm that an on-road alternative has been fully considered during the scheme development process.
- 1.4.3 The Design of the Preferred Option will be covered by Mr Lonergan.

- 1.4.4 The Planning Appraisal of the Preferred Option itself will be covered by Mr Ralph Lewis.
- 1.4.5 The assessment of the Preferred Option itself will be covered by Mr Whitehouse and a range of technical specialist witnesses.

2. THE CITY DEAL AND GOVERNANCE

2.1 Greater Cambridge Partnership

- 2.1.1 Cambridgeshire County Council is the applicant for the scheme which has been prepared by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) as the body responsible for delivery of the Greater Cambridge City Deal on behalf of the GCP Executive Board
- 2.1.2 The GCP Executive Board has been established by Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. It is a joint committee of the three Councils, established by Cambridgeshire County Council under section 102(1) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972 **[CD5-03]** and by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council under section 9EB of the Local Government Act 2000 **[CD5-12]**. The three Councils have agreed to delegate exercise of their functions to the Executive Board to the extent necessary to enable the Executive Board to pursue and achieve the objectives of the Greater Cambridge City Deal and to undertake any actions necessary, incidental or ancillary to achieving those objectives, and, accordingly, the three Councils have made the necessary changes to their respective schemes of delegation. This is reflected in Part E3 of the County Council constitution **[CD10-10]**.
- 2.1.3 A full summary of the governance structure within which the Greater Cambridge Partnership operates is provided in the Applicant's Statement of Case **[CD23-01]** and Appendix 1 **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2]** of this proof.
- 2.1.4 Central to this structure is the GCP decision making process in which all decisions are made by elected Executive Board representatives of the 3 constituent local authorities following scrutiny by the Joint Assembly, the majority of whose members are also elected representatives of the 3 authorities. The academic and business sectors are able to provide input to both the Assembly and Board but do not have voting powers.
- 2.1.5 As such, decisions made by the GCP are democratically accountable within an agreed governance structure. The GCP decision making process is guided by an assurance framework **[CD7-37]** that was agreed between government and the partner bodies when the city deal was signed and subsequently updated as necessary.

The Combined Authority

- 2.1.6 In March 2017 the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was created by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Order 2017 ("the 2017 Order" **[CD5-30]**). The CPCA became the Local Transport Authority for the area **[CD5-30, Article 8]**. **[CD5-30, Article 5]** provides that there shall be a mayor for the area. A mayor was first elected in May 2017.
- 2.1.7 Whilst the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority is the transport authority for the County, the 2016 Devolution Deal **[CD7-03, Page 6, clause 2]** within which it operates confirms that:
- "The local authorities of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough recognise and have agreed that the principle of subsidiarity should apply to the discharge of functions by the Mayor and Combined Authority and governance of this devolution deal. This includes the delegation of responsibility from the Combined Authority to individual Councils or appropriate bodies, such as City deal mechanisms, for delivery".*
- 2.1.8 This is reflected on **[CD5-30, Page 12]** which states:
- "A decision on a question relating to the following matters requires a vote in favour at a meeting of the Combined Authority, at which all members of the Combined Authority are present, by a majority of at least two-thirds of all members appointed by the constituent councils to include the members appointed by the councils for the local

government areas of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, or substitute members acting in place of those members, present and voting on that question to be carried—

(a) the transport plan; and

(b) any spending plans or plans for the allocation of transport-related funding”.

2.1.9 As such, the current Local Transport and Connectivity Plan remains valid and will remain so unless the County Council agrees with any proposed amendments. Similarly any plans for the allocation of transport related funding are also dependent on County Council support.

2.1.10 The GCP is committed to working closely with the Mayor for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to work towards shared objectives to the benefit of Greater Cambridge and the wider region. In view of this, the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is currently a regular non-voting invitee to the GCP Executive Board, at the discretion of the Chair of the Executive Board, in accordance with the Standing Orders appended to the Executive Board Terms of Reference **[CD10-02, Page 7, Clause 13.1]**.

Accountable Body

2.1.11 Cambridgeshire County Council acts as the Accountable Body for the GCP. As such, Cambridgeshire County Council holds funds and oversees payments to delivery partners and suppliers where relevant.

2.1.12 Cambridgeshire County Council accounts for City Deal funds in such a way that they are identifiable from the Authority's own funds, and provides financial statements to the Executive Board as required.

2.1.13 All financial decisions are overseen by the County Council Section 151 Officer or delegated to an appropriately qualified and experienced member of their team. The S151 officer ensures further scrutiny and oversight by being an active member of the GCP's Leadership Group. In addition, the S151 officer attends or is represented at every Joint Assembly and Executive Board meeting. To ensure transparency and scrutiny they play an active and challenging role.

2.1.14 Land included in the application for the scheme falls within the administrative boundary of Cambridgeshire County Council. As such, and specifically as the relevant Highway Authority, the County Council is also a consultee in the application process as defined in **[CD5-18, Schedule 5]** Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2006.

3. NEED FOR THE SCHEME

3.1 Transport Context and Constraints

- 3.1.1 The Greater Cambridge region is one of the most successful and fastest growing economies in the UK as well as one of the UK's foremost innovation centres, home to a flourishing scale-up ecosystem and range of globally significant companies. As of 2023, a total of 23 businesses originating in Cambridge have reached the \$US one billion 'unicorn' status and the city is Europe's largest technology cluster, home to over 5,000 high tech firms. This explosion of innovation and entrepreneurship has been termed the 'Cambridge Phenomenon' **[CD7-01, Page 7]**.
- 3.1.2 Despite this success there are existing constraints which put in doubt the future growth and success of Greater Cambridge.
- 3.1.3 The main constraints in transport terms include the following:
- 3.1.4 the existing highway network connects Cambourne and Cambridge by the A428/A1303, and which is particularly at risk of congestion on the single carriageway A1303 as discussed in **[CD23-01, Page 17]** CCC SoC.
- 3.1.5 the existing highway networks within Cambourne and Cambridge are constrained and neither offer scope to create an end to end busway. As such the scheme connects the east of Cambourne with the west of Cambridge. As with the existing Guided Busway, buses would then use existing roads into the city centre.
- (a) In particular the Medieval City centre of Cambridge is not suited to modern motorized traffic levels and does not have the scope to accept further growth so whilst bus travel is a challenge, increased car usage is simply not viable
- (b) planned growth at Bourn and other locations is on brownfield sites outside the Green Belt which are former airfields. This represents good use of available sites but creates a need for connectivity as provided by schemes such as CtoC. The counterfactual would be to build on the green belt through urban extensions
- 3.1.6 These constraints are recognised in a series of policy documents as outlined below.
- 3.1.7 The transport programme for the City Deal was developed based on the Transport strategy and high level programme for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) 2014) **[CD7-07]**, a sub- strategy of the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan aligning with the emerging Local Plans for Cambridge **[CD6-01]** and South Cambridgeshire **[CD6-02]**.
- 3.1.8 The transport policy objectives of the TSCSC Transport strategy and high level programme for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) 2014) were set out on **[CD7-07, pages 2-7 and 2-8]**:
- 1) *To ensure that the transport network supports the economy and acts as a catalyst for sustainable growth.*
 - 2) *To enhance accessibility to, from and within Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (and beyond the strategy area).*
 - 3) *To ensure good transport links between new and existing communities, and the jobs and services people wish to access.*
 - 4) *To prioritise sustainable alternatives to the private car in the strategy area, and reduce the impacts of congestion on sustainable modes of transport.*

- 5) *To meet air quality objectives and carbon reduction targets, and preserve the natural environment.*
- 6) *To ensure that changes to the transport network respect and conserve the distinctive character of the area and people's quality of life.*
- 7) *To ensure the strategy encourages healthy and active travel, supporting improved well-being.*
- 8) *To manage the transport network effectively and efficiently.*

3.1.9 **[CD7-07, Page 5-24]** Transport strategy and high level programme for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) 2014 also specifically identified the need for an intervention on the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor including the following elements:

- Segregated bus links on the A1303 or on an offline alignment between the A428 and the M11;
- Provision of an outer Park & Ride on A428 between Cambourne and A1303; and
- A1303 busway / HQPT infrastructure to serve Bourn Airfield / Cambourne.

3.1.10 These constraints have been recognised in a number of other documents, for example:

- **[CD6-07, Page 102]** Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan 2019 Plan referenced the scheme stating that “along the A428/A1303 corridor, the Camborne to Cambridge scheme being led by the Greater Cambridge Partnership will deliver a segregated public transport corridor from Cambourne. This corridor will serve the future housing sites at Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield, to West Cambridge and other key employment sites and destinations”.
- **[CD7-04, Page 4]** Planning for sustainable growth in the Oxford- Cambridge Arc 2021 also reiterated the importance of the overall corridor of which Cambourne to Cambridge is the eastern end specifically noting the “severe and longstanding infrastructure deficit – particularly east-west transport infrastructure – felt across the Arc”.
- The supporting document to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan 2023 (LTCP) **[CD6-09]**, namely Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport – Supporting Bus Strategy 2023 **states [CD6-11 , Page 10]** that it “aims to set out how bus services will be improved to deliver the goals and objectives of the Combined Authority’s Local Transport and Connectivity Plan and Greater Cambridge Partnership’s transformation of the public transport network”.

3.1.11 Significant assessment of the future transport needs of the area has also been undertaken during the preparation of the transport evidence which has been developed in support of the emerging Local Plan. Greater Cambridge Local Plan Transport Evidence Report Preferred Option Update 2021**[CD6-05, Pages 215-220, paragraph 14.5]** show that the transport impact of achieving growth aspirations for Cambourne envisaged in the First Proposals for the Local Plan would need to be mitigated through a package of measures including the complementary provision of CtoC and East West Rail with a future station in Cambourne.

3.2 Economic Context and Constraints

3.2.1 Mr Whitehouse will discuss the economic appraisal of the scheme in detail but headline matters of economic context are summarized below.

- 3.2.2 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review Final Report (CPIER) 2018 produced by the Cambridge and Peterborough Independent Economic Commission (CPIEC) found evidence, discussed on **[CD7-05, Page 44/45]**, that across the Greater Cambridge region, economic growth is higher than official Office of National Statistics figures suggest. The report concludes that the examination of employment growth in individual companies suggests firms are increasing employment at a rate greater than that captured by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) data; similarly, turnover growth is strong.
- 3.2.3 Despite this success there are existing constraints which put in doubt the future growth and success of Greater Cambridge.
- 3.2.4 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review Final Report (CPIER) 2018 **[CD7-05, Page 13, Key Recommendation 7]** states
- “A package of transport and other infrastructure projects to alleviate the growing pains of Greater Cambridge should be considered the single most important infrastructure priority facing the Combined Authority in the short to medium term”.*
- 3.2.5 Furthermore Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review Final Report (CPIER) 2018 **[CD7-05, Page 80, Key Recommendation 7]** also states that:
- “There should be a focus on providing the fastest transit possible to those who need to work in the Greater Cambridge area using currently available, low-cost technology, which can prepare the ground for better long-term solutions. The risks to business are too great to delay in this regard”*
- 3.2.6 Similarly, The Case for Cambridge 2024 **[CD7-01, Page 7]** identified a number of challenges facing Greater Cambridge including:
- Housing affordability: Cambridge is one of the most expensive cities in the UK for buying a home relative to local pay. Since 2014, house prices have increased by 78% and pay by only 23%. Rents are also high, often making it difficult to live close to work.
 - Transport and mobility: Severe Road congestion in Cambridge is a feature of daily life, leading to delays, frustration for local people, poor air quality and related health consequences. Critically, pressured public transport and poor connectivity is constraining the local economy, creating delays and is inefficient for everyone.
 - Laboratory Space: There is a significant shortage of laboratory space in Cambridge. Larger occupiers expanding in Greater Cambridge could take years to acquire the right facilities, with the risk that they choose to locate outside of the UK entirely.
- 3.2.7 The main economic constraints are the need to accommodate committed growth in the area. Specifically the opportunity for the CtoC scheme is to connect development sites, each lying just to the south of the A428/A1303 Corridor, identified in the Adopted Local Plans:
- Cambourne West, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) **[CD6-02, Page 78, Policy SS/8]**),
 - Bourn Airfield, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) **[CD6-02, (Page 72, Policy SS/7]** and
 - West Cambridge, Cambridge Local Plan (2018) **[CD6-01 Page 73, Policy 19]**.

- 3.2.8 These sites are now consented, providing 2,350 houses at Cambourne West, 3,500 houses at Bourn Airfield, and 383,000 sqm of development at West Cambridge, all situated to the south of the A428/A1303.
- 3.2.9 The respective approvals are documented as follows:
- Planning Permission subject to conditions for Land to the West of Cambourne (excluding Swansley Wood Farm) (S/2903/14/OL) 2017 **[CD4-01, Page 1]**;
 - Decision details for site at Bourn Airfield 2021 **[CD4-04-00, Page 1]**; and
 - Outline Planning Permission subject to conditions (and covering letter) (16/1134/OUT) 2024 **[CD4-05, Page 1]** for West Cambridge.

3.3 The Cambridge Phenomenon and the City Deal

- 3.3.1 In 2014 the Greater Cambridge City Deal was set up specifically to address the need to facilitate growth. It was an agreement between Central and Local Government and explicit in intent **[CD7-02, Page 2]**:

“Since 1960, the Greater Cambridge area has been home to an ever-increasing cluster of technology, life sciences and services business known as the “Cambridge Phenomenon”, a term first coined by Peta Levi in the Financial Times in 1980. The success to date has been widely celebrated, but is now contributing to a shortage of housing and significant transport congestion that threaten to choke off further economic growth.”

- 3.3.2 In May 2017 a Mayor for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was elected and the CPCA was created. The GCP is committed to working closely with the Mayor for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the CPCA to work towards shared objectives to the benefit of Greater Cambridge and the wider region. In view of this, the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is currently a regular invitee to the Executive Board, at the discretion of the Chair of the Executive Board, in accordance with the Executive Board Terms of Reference **[CD10-02]**.

- 3.3.3 The Devolution Deal set out when CPCA was formed covers similar topics to the City Deal albeit at a more strategic level **[CD7-03, Page 3]**, including:

- Accelerating the delivery of the mix of new homes and sustainable communities that Cambridgeshire and Peterborough residents demand – delivering 72,000 new homes over the next 15 years, including a number of major new settlements
- Providing world class connectivity and transport systems, fit for the 21st Century – that connects passengers and freight between Cambridge, Peterborough, our network of market towns and the rest of the country.

- 3.3.4 These issues were identified as a national priority by Michael Gove in 2023 whose Vision for Cambridge foresaw 150,000 new houses with a Development Corporation to ensure the necessary infrastructure could be delivered.

- 3.3.5 The Case for Cambridge 2024 expanded on these issues stating **[CD7-01, Page 29]**:

“Our aspiration is for an expanded Cambridge based around well-connected city quarters where residents experience...quicker journey times across and around the city as improved links between different parts of the city make it easier to get around by public transport, car, cycling or walking. We want to help people ‘move freely’ by making a wide range of safe, speedy and pleasant transport options”

- 3.3.6 Following the General Election, the new administration confirmed that the priority remained, with the Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Matthew Pennycook)

appointing Peter Freeman to lead the Cambridge Growth Company **[CD7-39]**
Transport again features as a priority:

“Developing the evidence base to support development of an infrastructure-first growth plan and a long-term delivery vehicle: work with experts to assess infrastructure requirements, including transport, and lay the foundations for a long-term delivery vehicle”

- 3.3.7 As such, the need for improved transport has been identified as a major constraint on economic growth as a common thread through multiple documents including the City Deal itself. The other potential constraint on growth is water supply but this is being addressed through the proposals to construct the Fen Reservoir.

3.4 Opportunities

- 3.4.1 As set out in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) **[CD6-01]**, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) **[CD6-02]** and Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals (Emerging Plan) 2021 **[CD6-04]**, the opportunities for growth in Cambridge are significant.
- 3.4.2 Mr Lewis will discuss the planning background in detail but in summary:
- (a) Cambourne is a new settlement which was started in the late 1990s but is already the largest settlement in South Cambridgeshire, with a population of 12,350 in the 2021 census and with nearly 6,000 further houses consented on Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield under the adopted Local Plans.
 - (b) The Greater Cambridge Local Plan will be a joint local plan between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The local plan will ensure a consistent approach to planning and construction across both areas up to 2041. At this time (Summer 2025), work is ongoing on the Regulation 18 draft of the Local Plan for consultation later in 2025.
 - (c) Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals (Emerging Plan) 2021 **[CD6-04, Page 24]** has assessed a need for 44,400 new homes and 58,500 new jobs across all employment sectors in the Greater Cambridge region. These developments are targeted to be met over the plan period of 2020-2041. In terms of housing, this reflects an annual objectively assessed need for 2,111 new homes per year.
 - (d) Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals (Emerging Plan) also suggests 19 new sites **[CD6-04, Page 22]** across Greater Cambridge for additional development to meet the needs up to 2041. The First Proposal development sites across Greater Cambridge include existing sites at Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield.
 - (e) Cambourne is identified as one of the ‘New Settlements’ to contribute 1,950 additional homes towards the 11,640 required in the region between 2020-2041. Policy S/DS: Development Strategy, Cambourne notes **[CD6-04, Page 39]** that “The most sustainable location for strategic scale development away from Cambridge is to expand on existing development in the Cambourne area, taking advantage of the significant benefits that will be provided by the proposed East West Rail station as well as the improvements already anticipated from the Greater Cambridge Partnership’s Cambourne to Cambridge scheme”.
- 3.4.3 Life sciences sector
- (a) As discussed in section 3.3.1 the potential growth in Life Sciences is a unique opportunity in Cambridge and represents an opportunity which formed the basis for the City Deal.

3.4.4 Employment

- (a) The West Cambridge campus, served directly by CtoC is major development site for Cambridge University which was created in the 1960s and which a new Masterplan will deliver a further 383,300 sq m of development to support the proposals to create a premier location for physical sciences and technology.
- (b) Other destinations include Cambridge City Centre, the Biomedical Campus as well as the Science Park. Employment opportunity remains limited in Cambourne which functions as a dormitory town for the City.

3.4.5 Education

- (a) As discussed above CtoC is directly relevant to West Cambridge campus but also services multiple colleges on Grange Road as well as City Centre and provides access from new housing which is relatively affordable for staff
- (b) As well as the University, Cambridge is home to a range of other educational establishments including Anglian Ruskin University to which Cambourne residents may need access for education and employment purposes

4. SCHEME DEVELOPMENT AND OPTIONS

4.1 Vision

4.1.1 Based on the existing and future issues identified in Cambridge, the proposed overall vision for the CtoC project was defined in the Strategic Case which forms part of the Outline Business Case **[CD1-20.05 Page 75, paragraph 8.2]** as follows:

- “To connect existing and new communities along the A428/A1303 to places of employment, study and key services to enable the sustainable growth for Greater Cambridge. We will deliver this through improved, faster and more reliable HQPT services, together with high quality cycling and walking facilities serving a new Park & Ride site to the west of Cambridge.”

4.2 Objectives

4.2.1 The Outline Business Case **[CD1-20.05, Page 76]** then defined Objectives, summarised as follows:

- To achieve improved accessibility to support the economic growth of Greater Cambridge.
 - Support the delivery of new housing and job creation through the provision of HQPT that serves current and future housing sites along the A428/A1303, including Cambourne and Bourn, and employment sites within and around Cambridge city centre.
 - Provide additional capacity during the peak periods to meet forecasted growth in demand along the A428/A1303.
 - Does not impede existing road traffic, resulting in a growth in delays for highway trips along the A428/A1303.
 - Improve connectivity on part of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc
- To deliver a sustainable transport network/system that connects areas between Cambourne and Cambridge along the A428/A1303.
 - Improve connectivity into Cambridge using sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling, and HQPT.
 - HQPT that offers peak journey times that are equal to or less than the equivalent journey by car.
 - HQPT frequency during the peak periods of six buses or more an hour.
 - End to end journey time reliability better than the car alternative journeys.
 - HQPT offering improved waiting and in-vehicle environments that are comparable to Cambridge's existing Guided Busway.
- Contribute to enhanced quality of life by relieving congestion and improving air quality within the surrounding areas along the A428/A1303 and within Cambridge city centre.
 - Improve the attractiveness of sustainable modes of travel as an alternative to using cars, leading to an increase in their mode share.

- Supports Cambridge in achieving continued economic growth whilst retaining the high quality of life and place associated with the city.
- Introducing improvements which enhance levels of safety for cyclists and pedestrians and promote a healthier life style.

4.2.2 The vision and objectives were used to derive the assessment criteria used in successive multi-criteria assessment frameworks based on the approach set out in Department for Transport - Early Assessment and Sifting Tool Guidance **[CD8-26]**. The full list of criteria is set out in Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project - Strategic Case **[CD1-20.05, Page 90]** which will be discussed by Mr Whitehouse **[CD26-01-APP-W6-1]**. This process was considered in Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project - Independent Audit of Key Assumptions and Constraints 2021 **[CD8-27, Page 28, Audit Comment A7]** which concluded that "It appears that the appraisal has been conducted in a robust manner by independent consultants with experience in business case development and familiar with the appraisal process".

4.3 Consideration of Alternatives

4.3.1 Throughout Scheme development a comprehensive set of alignment options have been considered and evaluated against Scheme objectives. This process is documented in the OBC **[CD1-20]** and OBC Addendum **[CD1-21]** and discussed in greater detail in CCC SoC **[CD23-01, Page 22 onwards]** and well as in the evidence of Mr Whitehouse and Mr Saunders.

4.3.2 The criteria for the assessments of options were generated from the scheme vision and objectives set out in **[CD1-20.07, Page 47 onwards]**. These are grouped into the following themes that have been selected to reflect the scheme objectives:

- Policy Fit
- Contribution to Economic Growth
- Contribution to improved transport network
- Contribution to quality of life
- Scheme Deliverability
- Stakeholder support

4.3.3 The process aligns with Stage 1 of the DfT's guidance "The Transport Appraisal Process" **[CD8-24]** and follows the Department for Transport's Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) Guidance **[CD8-26]**. Given the complexity of the process undertaken it is presented below in 4 Stages.

4.4 STAGE 1 – OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT THROUGH TO SOBC

4.4.1 The need for improvement to transport on the A428/A1303 corridor was envisaged in the TSCSC **[CD7-07]** prepared in 2014 which informed the development of the respective Local Plans, and specifically the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which identified the need for the "provision of high quality bus priority measures or busway on or parallel to the A1303 between its junction with the A428 and Queens Road, Cambridge" **[CD6-02, page 86]** to unlock Bourn Airfield as a strategic site.

4.4.2 The initial options development and assessment process took place between 2014 and 2017. This is set out in Figure 3 titled "CtoC project development process" in the Non-technical Summary of the OBC dated December 2019 produced by Mott MacDonald **[CD1-20.06, page 16]**.

- 4.4.3 An initial longlist of 34 options was gradually refined and revised through stakeholder engagement, including the 2015 consultation where options to the north and south of the A428/A1303 corridor and on-line, were considered. In each case the options were assessed against the Scheme objectives and wider requirements such as deliverability and sustainability requirements in line with [CD8-26]. Appendix B to the 2015 Consultation Report is a figure showing the 2015 consultation options [CD1-06.03].
- 4.4.4 In August 2016 the concept of the A428-A1303 Cambourne to Cambridge bus scheme was tested by consultants Mott McDonald, who prepared a strategic economic appraisal [CD7-23].
- 4.4.5 Following this, in September 2016, five options were presented in the SOBC [CD8-18]. The SOBC referred to a clear case for the Scheme and recommended that five options should be taken forward for further assessment and consultation. The optioneering carried out to inform the SOBC is summarised in [CD1-20.07] Cambourne – Cambridge Better Public Transport Project Options Appraisal Report (Part 1) - Appendix A and discussed further within the reports listed below:
- Madingley Road/A428 Corridor Study, Options Assessment Report (June 2014) [CD9-26];
 - Madingley Road/A428 Corridor Study Draft Interim Report (June 2015) [CD13-01]; and
 - CtoC SOBC (September 2016) [CD8-18, Section 8].

4.5 STAGE 2 – PARK AND RIDE OPTIONS SELECTION

- 4.5.1 The options for the location of the new Park and Ride site were considered in conjunction with the main route options development. Following initial concerns from local communities over the recommendation that a Park and Ride site would be located in the vicinity of Madingley Mulch a comprehensive review of options was undertaken in the summer of 2017 and documented in the Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Park and Ride Study [CD13-05] which informed the End of Stage report [CD13-06] which was produced in September 2017 in advance of the 2017/18 consultation.
- 4.5.2 Two options were taken forward to consultation:
- 1) Water Works (near Madingley Mulch); and
 - 2) Scotland Farm

4.6 STAGE 3 – OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT THROUGH TO OBC

Outline Business Case (OBC)

- 4.6.1 A series of appraisals were undertaken in 2016 and 2017, leading to a second public consultation between November 2017 and January 2018, which focused on routes from Madingley Mulch into Cambridge, referred to as Phase 1. This work was documented in the End of Stage report, [CD13-06], which also included the Park and Ride work.
- 4.6.2 During this process, options to the north and south of the A428/A1303 corridor were assessed alongside on-line options and options promoted by local stakeholders including groups such as Cambridge Past Present and Future (CPPF), amongst others. By the time of the second public consultation these were narrowed down to 2 on-line options and an off-line option south of the A428/A1303 with a number of local variants.

- 4.6.3 Following the approval of the End of Stage Report **[CD13-06]**, and the 2017/8 consultation, further work was undertaken to identify a preferred route alignment for Phase 1 (Madingley Mulch into Cambridge), Phase 2 (Cambourne to Madingley Mulch), as well as the Park and Ride site which was considered further in each Phase.

Phase 1 (Madingley Mulch into Cambridge) options assessment

- 4.6.4 The options consulted on in 2017-2018 **[CD1-20-07, pages 28-29]** for Phase 1 were:
- 1) Option A: An on-road option which includes the introduction of an inbound bus lane on Madingley Road between Madingley Mulch roundabout and Lady Margaret Road;
 - 2) Option B: An on-road tidal bus lane on Madingley Road running between Madingley Mulch roundabout and the new entrance to Eddington (High Cross); and
 - 3) Option C: An off-road public transport route running between Madingley Mulch roundabout and Grange Road, Cambridge (this included three variants).
- 4.6.5 The option development and appraisal for the Phase 1 route alignment was undertaken in two stages.
- 4.6.6 The first stage involved the assessment of the on-road options (Option A and B), and an assessment of the different variations of the off-road option (Option C) using the assessment criteria. This assessment process generated an "optimised" on-road option that reflected the best performing elements of Option A and Option B and a single specific off-road route alignment from Option C that narrowed down the three variants to one. The results of this stage are presented in OAR Part 1 – Appendix A **[CD1-20.07]**.
- 4.6.7 For the second stage of assessment, the optimised on-line and off-line options were taken forward for direct comparison. Each option was considered with each of the two short listed Park and Ride sites, as well as a Do Minimum scenario. An additional option that included new infrastructure between Cambourne and Madingley Mulch roundabout (Phase 2) was also included for further appraisal to illustrate any potential step change in benefits resulting from the implementation of both Phase 1 and 2. This was called the "Illustrative Comparator" option. The options assessed and results of this stage are presented on Page 30 and Page 78/79 of OAR Part 2 – Appendix B **[CD1-20.08]** respectively with descriptions of the options from Pages 31 to 40.
- 4.6.8 From the appraisal undertaken for Phase 1, summarised in **[CD1-20.08, from Page 80]** a Specific Route Alignment which performs best from Madingley Mulch roundabout to Grange Road, Do Something option 1, was identified. This is an off-road route alignment.

Phase 2 (Cambourne to Madingley Mulch) Options Assessment

- 4.6.9 The appraisal of the Phase 2 options used the same approach as Phase 1, with the assessment of the options. Each option was assessed with the two Park and Ride variants in turn. Again, as with the assessment of options for Phase 1, an initial economic appraisal of each option based on transport user benefits using traffic modelling outputs was also carried out. The work is described in detail in Options Assessment Report (Part 3) Outline Business Case – Appendix C **[CD1-20.09]** with the results presented in **[CD1-20.09, Pages 62/63]**.
- 4.6.10 Taking into account the alterations to the Phase 1 route alignment, as highlighted above, 3 options were assessed for Phase 2, with each option linking into the preferred Phase 1 route alignment. The definition of the three options is as follows:

- 1) Option 1: Off-road segregated route. A new public transport route adjacent to the A428 and St Neots Road. The route would be entirely off-road with minimal interaction with general traffic, except at junctions.
 - 2) Option 2: On-road with junction improvements. Public transport vehicles would run on-road along St Neots Road with general traffic east of the Bourn roundabout. There would be basic junction improvements.
 - 3) Option 3: On-road with public transport priority lanes. Public transport vehicles would run on-road along St Neots Road in priority lanes running in both directions.
- 4.6.11 Each option was tested with the two Park and Ride short listed sites (Waterworks and Scotland Farm).
- 4.6.12 The Phase 2 INSET assessment results are shown in OBC Strategic Case **[CD1-20.05, Page 108, Table 24]** which indicated that the emerging route alignment and preferred option for Phase 2 was Option 1b – Off road segregated route with Scotland Farm as the preferred Park and Ride location.

4.7 STAGE 4 – OPTION REFINEMENT TO REFLECT STAKEHOLDER ISSUES

- 4.7.1 Following the conclusion of the INSET options assessment, ongoing assessment and stakeholder engagement resulted in consideration of changes to the recommended preferred alignment. Some of these proposed changes were ultimately adopted within the Scheme, as refinements of the preferred option.

West Cambridge Development

- 4.7.2 An alignment through the campus on Charles Babbage Road rather than to the south of the campus was selected as a result of identification of potential impacts on equipment housed in the Department of Materials Science and Metallurgy and has further evolved in discussions with the University. That is reflected in the preferred route approved by the Executive Board in **[CD 10-01, Page 4]**.

Grange Road Access

- 4.7.3 Consideration was given in the early stages of the work in **[CD13-09]** Skanska: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys Grange Road Access Report to alternative approaches to Grange Road from the west.
- 4.7.4 The 2017/18 consultation **[CD13-08]** considered both the Rifle Range track and Adams Road as approaches for Off-Road solution Option C, and this is documented in OAR1 **[CD1-20.07]**. The assessment for the Off-Road route alignment to the east of Phase 1 showed that the Rifle Range track was the best option according to the assessment criteria derived from the Scheme objectives in OAR 1 **[CD1-20.07, Page 77]**.
- 4.7.5 However, as the Scheme progressed, responses from consultation with key stakeholders and members of the public were received, raising a number of questions concerning the impact on the West Fields, access and land ownership, interactions with the Rugby Club and concerns expressed by Clare Hall. This prompted a review of the original INSET assessment (summarised in OAR3 - Appendix C) **[CD1-20.09]**.
- 4.7.6 At the point when the Scheme was considered as an element of Phase 1 of the Combined Authority proposals for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), as is discussed further in ARUP's summary paper **[CD9-01]** the case for a dedicated route to the east of West Cambridge had been questioned as it would likely become redundant once the full CAM network is operational. This would have been a key consideration from a future-proofing perspective. Therefore, whilst the CAM was still CPCA policy Adams Road, was considered as an alternative but was never approved

by the Executive Board. Appendix 2 of this proof **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2]** provides further details of the decision-making process.

Waterworks Site

- 4.7.7 Following representation by CPPF (see Appendix 4 of this proof **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2]**) the alignment which bisected the Waterworks site was diverted to run just to the south-west of the site in order to avoid trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

Coton Orchard

- 4.7.8 With regards to Coton Orchard a possible slight realignment to the north of the current Scheme was proposed by GCP in October 2022 as noted in the Environmental Statement Addendum **[CD1-10.06, Page 14, Figure 2-3]** but not adopted following consultation with Houston Crest Properties Ltd and CPPF.

St Neots Road, Hardwick

- 4.7.9 The initial option selection at this location had, in part reflected the need to accommodate the proposals by the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for a largely segregated CAM as indicated in the CAM sub-strategy **[CD7-38, Page 7, policy CAM-E15]**.
- 4.7.10 There was strong local opposition to the removal of trees on St Neots Road to accommodate an off-line alignment for Phase 2. Consultation Report Appendix J - Individual Consultation Report – Phase Two May 2019 **[CD1-06.11, Figure 11]** shows the variation in levels of support in Hardwick and elsewhere. With the cancellation in 2021 of the CAM proposals, it was recognised that a compromise on-line solution could be adopted as the benefits of the segregated option, did not justify the impacts.
- 4.7.11 Consequently, an on-line option was considered as an alternative with the use of a bus gate to restrict through traffic. This option was presented in **[CD1-06.12]** Consultation Report Appendix K - EIA Consultation Brochure 2022 The bus gate was also strongly opposed by Hardwick Parish Council and the options were further revisited. Following a brief sensitivity test (**[CD13-14]** Hardwick Bus Gate Sensitivity Test) it was concluded that the benefits from the bus gate did not outweigh the impacts of the bus gate and so an on-line arrangement which uses traffic management to prioritise public transport movements but does not restrict access was adopted. When the Executive Board noted the outcome of the 2022 Consultation and approved the decision to proceed to submission it also noted **[CD10-18, Page 10]** the need to further consider this matter. The revised proposals are shown in the Proposed Site Plans **[CD1-16.04, Sheets 6 and 8]**.
- 4.7.12 This section includes provision of an upgraded Non-Motorised User route along St Neots Road to reduce the delays to buses which interaction with cyclists on St Neots Road would cause.

Dry Drayton Link

- 4.7.13 Dry Drayton Parish Council has made strong representation to GCP with regards to access to the Park and Ride **[CD2-REP-02]**. Solutions to improve non-motorised access have been prepared but will be advanced outside the Scheme as it is felt that these extend beyond the TWAO powers.

Madingley Road

- 4.7.14 During Phase 1 optioneering and also the Independent Audit **[CD8-27, Page 10]**, the potential for on-line improvements to Madingley Road was regularly identified **[CD13-01, Page 8, Figure 1.1]**. Whilst provision of interim bus lanes as suggested in **[CD8-27, Page 10]**, was not felt to be viable given the limited space and the likelihood of

these being rendered obsolete once the Scheme opened, the allocation of the limited available space to enhanced cycling facilities was considered to be beneficial given the significant and growing UoC activity in the West Cambridge area. These measures are being advanced outside of the Scheme as noted in the Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3 which was agreed by the Executive Board on 28th September 2023 **[CD10-13, Page 401] and [CD10-14, Page 7]**.

Cambridge Past Present and Future alternative

- 4.7.15 An alternative scheme has been promoted by CPPF and forms part of the objections raised by a number of objectors **[CD2-OBJ-251]**. This is discussed by Mr Loneragan **[CD26-01-APP-W8-1]**.

4.8 Key Stakeholder Engagement

- 4.8.1 The Scheme set out a comprehensive programme for consultation. The programme was adapted over time in response to consultation feedback and as the Scheme design progressed. This included stakeholder engagement with those groups and individuals directly affected by the Scheme, including local authorities and other statutory consultees. The process was documented in a series of reports which have been brought together for presentation as Consultation Report November 2024 **[CD1-06.01]**.
- 4.8.2 The Consultation Report **[CD1-06.01, Figure 3-1]** sets out the key stages of stakeholder engagement and consultation from 2015 to 2022 summarised in Table 4.1 below. The development and progression of the design were anchored with a preliminary route option selection consultation in 2015 and three further stages of consultation in 2017/2018, 2019 and 2022. Consultation included a wide range of consultation initiatives including public exhibitions, working groups and local liaison forums to reach both community and statutory stakeholders.
- 4.8.3 Continued stakeholder engagement continued throughout and beyond the formal consultation stages. Forums and working groups were set up with key stakeholders and organisations to enable continuous and collaborative dialogue to inform the ongoing design.
- 4.8.4 This process ensured all stakeholders had an opportunity to comment as the design progressed. All feedback was carefully considered as part of the design. Consultees were divided into community and statutory stakeholders (statutory stakeholders are defined as Schedule 5 and 6 stakeholders detailed in the Consultation Report **[CD1-06.01, Section 3.3]**). The following sections set out how these stakeholders were identified and outlines how the consultation was carried out.

Community Engagement

- 4.8.5 The Scheme identified a wide range of community stakeholders in the early stages of the consultation programme in 2015. This was expanded as consultation progressed and new stakeholders were added as needed through desktop research and community engagement. A stakeholder list was set up and maintained internally throughout the project.
- 4.8.6 Community engagement comprised public events, one-to-one meetings, site visits and presentations. It included comprehensive engagement with those groups or individuals that might be directly affected by the Scheme, as well as those individuals with a more general interest in the Scheme. Consultation with these stakeholders has been ongoing throughout Scheme development from 2015 to 2022. It will also continue post-submission of the TWAO.
- 4.8.7 Many of these meetings with stakeholders were undertaken through the local parish councils (Bourn, Caldecote, Comberton, Coton, Dry Drayton, Hardwick and

Madingley), Cambourne Town Council, West Central Area Committee and North Newnham Residents' Association, and GCP-hosted forums (Local Liaison Forum and West Area Community Forum), each of which were consulted at key stages of the Scheme.

Formal Consultation STAGES

4.8.8 The Scheme carried out four formal stages of public consultation as outlined in Table 4.1 below which focused on the key stages of Scheme development.

Table 4.1: Formal Consultation Stages

Round	Purpose
Better Bus Journeys consultation 2015	Exploring whether people want better bus connections - six high level route options. The Scheme was divided into Area 1 and Area 2 with three options for each.
Phase 1 consultation 2017 - 2018	Consulting on the area between Cambridge and Madingley Mulch roundabout – various on-road/ off-road options including Park & Ride alternatives at Madingley and Scotland Farm.
Phase 2 consultation 2019	Consulting on the area between Madingley Mulch roundabout and Cambourne – various options including Park & Ride alternatives at Madingley and Scotland Farm.
EIA consultation 2022	Consulting on preferred alignment - Cambourne to Cambridge (with route options at Hardwick) looking at environmental impact.

4.8.9 The aim of the formal consultation was to provide the whole community with information about the proposals at the time and to gather feedback. The consultations were well-publicised and well-attended. As part of the formal consultation, letters and/or emails were sent to a wide range of groups and individuals with information on the Scheme and an invitation to the public exhibitions. This included letters to MPs, local councillors, and landowners. Letters were also sent to the key statutory stakeholders outlined in **[CD1-06.01, Section 3.3]**.

4.8.10 Local Liaison Forums

4.8.11 GCP set up a Local Liaison Forum (LLF) in 2016. It was recommended by the City Deal Board to engage with local residents on the Scheme and to provide a forum for regular dialogue between the project team and members of the local community. It provided an opportunity to keep interested parties informed about the Scheme and a vehicle to involve interested parties in Scheme development.

4.8.12 The project team held regular meetings and workshops with the LLF group and a Technical Working Group of LLF members. The LLF provided feedback which was taken into consideration as part of the evolving Scheme design. Further information on the LLF is provided in Consultation Report November 2024 **[CD1-06.01, Page 27]**.

4.8.13 The project team continued to work with the Forum until 2019. Activities included workshops which presented a range of matters regarding:

- Modelling and appraisal of the transport schemes;
- On road optimisations and quick wins on the northern route;
- Wider economic impacts; and

- Environmental scoring.

4.8.14 Following a decision taken by the GCP Executive Board on 11 October 2018 **[CD10-04, Page 5]**, the LLF has now been superseded by the West Area Community Forum, part of a location-based engagement approach across Greater Cambridge bringing together an agenda covering all GCP and related schemes in the area. The Forum discussed CtoC during (6/6/2022) and after (7/11/2022) the last scheme consultation.

4.9 Statutory Consultation

4.9.1 Statutory Stakeholders

4.9.2 **[CD5-17]** Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2006 (the Rules) set out the procedure for submission of a draft order under the TWA. Schedule 5 of **[CD5-17]** identifies the organisations that must be served with a copy of the application and supporting documents. Schedule 6 of the Rules identifies those organisations that must be notified. Both Schedule 5 and Schedule 6 parties were consulted at all rounds of consultation.

4.9.3 The Consultation Report **[CD1-06-1, Page 17, Table 3-2]** sets out all groups or organisations that must be served or notified under the Rules. The Scheme has termed these 'statutory stakeholders' for the purposes of consultation. Appendix A, the TWAO Rules 2006 Schedule 5 and 6 Stakeholders Table **[CD1-06-2]** explains why these organisations have been included.

4.9.4 In addition to those in **[CD1-06-1, Page 17, Table 3-2]**, all landowners, tenants and others with a known property interests of any of the land required either permanently or temporarily for delivery of the Scheme were notified in advance of each of the four rounds of consultation. These are termed Property Interest Holders and identified in the Book of Reference **[CD-1.13]**. Mr Franklin's evidence provides details of ongoing engagement with those parties.

4.9.5 Those with a potential interest in land

4.9.6 GCP's land agents CBRE undertook a land identification exercise that identified those with an interest in the land within the Order limits. The focus was on which compulsory acquisition powers could be sought through the Application if private treaty arrangements could not be made with the affected landowners in advance of the Application being submitted.

4.9.7 Contact was made with those identified as having a potential land interest and offers of engagement were made to discuss the Scheme with GCP and its land agent. In addition, letters were issued to those with potential interest in land throughout the stages of consultation to ensure they were aware of project progress and the opportunity to comment.

4.9.8 Working Groups

4.9.9 The Scheme has conducted continuous engagement with statutory stakeholders. This has included invitations to the four formal stages of consultation, written correspondence via letters to local residents including frontage owners of buildings affected by potential street works. Scheme updates online and via email and social media, individual meetings and workshops, presentations and site visits. Feedback was encouraged through the provision of a dedicated email inbox and phone line. All stakeholder feedback has been considered as part of the design process.

4.9.10 In May 2019, two working groups were set up to provide a forum for both statutory and community stakeholders to contribute to the development of GCP transport schemes, including Cambourne to Cambridge. These are described further in **[CD1-06.01, sections 3.3.7 to 3.3.10]**.

Parish Council Meetings

4.9.11 I have visited the affected Parish Councils on a number of occasions, usually to coincide with the formal consultations, and in 2021 following the decision to restart the project. The most recent round of meetings occurred during June/July 2022, but with additional ad-hoc visits upon request from the Parish Council.

4.9.12 Recent visits include the following:

Parish	Date	Comment
Cambourne (Town Council)	7/6/22	
Dry Drayton	7/6/22	Follow up meeting on 11/9/23
Comberton	8/6/22	
Coton	14/6/22	
Hardwick	15/6/22	Follow up meeting on 11/1/23
Bourn	15/6/22	
Caldecote	(7/7/22)	Meeting cancelled by PC but previous meeting took place 2/9/21
Maddingley	7/7/22	

4.9.13 Public participation is also enabled through Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings to which the public can bring questions. This opportunity has regularly been taken up by CtoC stakeholders and objectors such as CPPF.

5. THE PREFERRED OPTION

5.1 The Preferred Option

5.1.1 The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme is described in detail in Mr Lonergan's evidence.

5.1.2 In summary, the proposal is for a busway linking Cambourne to Cambridge, via the proposed developments at Bourn Airfield and West Cambridge, which would complement the existing Cambridge Guided Busway, forming part of an eventual network of radial routes into and across the city centre. This network would support the growth of Greater Cambridge in line with national, regional and local policy and the City Deal.

5.1.3 It is envisaged that in due course vehicles would originate at destinations beyond Cambourne such as Papworth Everard, Cambourne West and any future East West Rail station. Interchange opportunities would also be provided at West Cambridge where buses could proceed north through Eddington towards the Science Park and south towards the Biomedical Campus via the M11. As such this would provide connectivity to opportunity across the city from both existing and development sites to the west of the City.

- 5.1.4 Beyond the eastern end of the scheme buses would proceed from Grange Road through to the city centre and potentially on to destinations such as Cambridge Station and the Biomedical Campus as the U service does now. In this way a variety of destinations can be served.
- 5.1.5 Interim bus stops would be provided at the west and east of Bourn Airfield, Hardwick and Coton. This would ensure that access to destinations served in Cambridge, including the West Cambridge site is enjoyed by residents along the length of the scheme.
- 5.1.6 The proposed Travel Hub at Scotland Farm provides opportunities for residents from the west, notably those from rural areas without public transport, to transfer to public transport and continue their trips. It also allows cycle-bus and cycle-car interchange.
- 5.1.7 An adjacent maintenance track ensures that scheme can be maintained without safety risk or disruption, provides safe evacuation route for passengers in case of emergency. It also provides valuable active travel connectivity comparable with existing CGB as part of a coherent transport strategy. This complements other investment in active travel including the Comberton Greenway and Madingley Road improvements.

5.2 Approach to Bus Guidance

- 5.2.1 The Scheme has been envisaged to form part of a wider network of busways serving the city. As time has progressed since the construction of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, which used physical kerb guidance, transportation innovation has advanced, creating an opportunity to adopt newer technology to create a safer, more efficient public transit system.
- 5.2.2 Developments in technology mean that transport systems can now be guided by non-physical means. This includes the use of simple sensor systems that detect paint or other road markings to direct a vehicle, or more complex sensor systems which read the surrounding environment to direct a vehicle.
- 5.2.3 In 2022, the UK government recognised this opportunity and amended Transport and Works (Guided Transport Modes) Order 1992 **[CD5-15]** to include new guided transport technologies in Transport and Works (Guided Transport Modes) (Amendment) Order 2022 **[CD5-16]**. This amendment permits projects like the Scheme to use sensor-based guidance systems that provide vehicle guidance without physical guideways.
- 5.2.4 Full details of the guidance technology and vehicle design for the Scheme have not been fully defined at this stage of the project. It is intended that the buses will use technological guidance based on the use of sensors rather than physical guidance but will be compatible with both the existing busway (buses can be equipped with both sensors and guidewheels) and also able to operate in the centres of Cambourne, Cambridge, and any other destination served. It is important buses can continue through the city to destinations such as the biomedical campus.
- 5.2.5 It is envisaged that the project will implement Global Positioning System (GPS) based Intelligent Speed Assistance Technology - which has already been implemented on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway since 2023 to limit speed in safety zones - to maintain optimal speeds for both safety and passenger comfort. A safety driver would always be present and have the ability to override and take manual control of the vehicle if required at all times.
- 5.2.6 Through a combination of advanced Radio Detection and Ranging (Radar), Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR), Global Positioning Systems (GPS) and Camera technology the vehicles will navigate their environment with precision, constantly monitoring their surroundings and position relative to other road users. This approach

takes advantage of some of the technologies already widely deployed for some years in many production vehicles as lane keeping assist.

- 5.2.7 In preparation for the roll-out of the busways, GCP has been engaged for some years in the Government funded Centre for Connected and Autonomous Vehicles programme running a series of projects building upon the 2021 Cambridge Autonomous Shuttle Trial and most recently a bus service carrying passengers between the Madingley Road Park and Ride, Eddington development and West Cambridge campus which was operational in summer 2025. GCP has also had regard to practical examples, such as the CAVForth Pilot Scheme in Scotland which has adopted similar technology to that proposed for the Scheme on bus lanes with mixed traffic.
- 5.2.8 These vehicles have the potential to run in a fully autonomous mode but for the time being the expectation is that the driver will still control vehicle speed and have the ability at any time to override the control systems should any incident require it.

5.3 Safety

- 5.3.1 Mr Lonergan **[CD26-01-APP-W8-1]** will address the safety of the design in his evidence. From a strategic perspective, the position of the County Council is as follows.
- 5.3.2 It is recognised and documented that there were failings in the safety processes associated with the existing Cambridge Guided Busway and important to note that this scheme differs from that one in two very important regards.
- 5.3.3 Firstly, as outlined by Mr Lonergan the design is completely different in that buses will be able to take avoiding action should a pedestrian or cyclist stray onto the busway, and that physical separation is provided between the maintenance track and the busway at all locations that design speeds exceed 30 mph. All intersections and other scheme elements on highway are subject to road safety audit.
- 5.3.4 Secondly, that a clear health and safety risk assessment process has been put in place for all aspects of the scheme which are not on adopted highway and therefore subject to road safety audit. There is no specific design guidance for busways other than for the physical construction of concrete kerb guidance in Britpave - Guided Busway Design Handbook 2017 **[CD9-04]**.
- 5.3.5 Therefore, reflecting lessons learned from the CGB, the applicant is following the process defined in Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 (ROGS) **[CD5-19]** for design as an accepted approach which provides the best proxy for busway.
- 5.3.6 Hazard Workshops were undertaken by a health and safety team with input from the design team and challenge from wider range including staff with experience of existing CGB and supervised by an Independent Competent Person. A hazard log is maintained to inform ongoing design.
- 5.3.7 The intention is to use conventional type approved production vehicles with guidance adaptations similar to those already deployed on the CavForth trial or similar trials supported by the UK Government CCAV programme.
- 5.3.8 These new sensor-based guidance systems offer a significant safety advantage over traditional kerb-guided systems. Unlike the existing Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, where vehicles are locked into a fixed path, these new vehicles can perform emergency manoeuvres using the full width of the carriageway when the safety driver over-rides the guidance system and in an emergency could, as a last resort, even leave the busway. This crucial improvement means drivers can actively avoid obstacles or people on the busway, rather than relying solely on braking to prevent

collisions. Forward facing cameras can also detect potential obstacles providing an additional layer of safety over and above driver observation.

5.4 Funding

5.4.1 City Deal

5.4.2 The £500 million City Deal is the core funding source for the scheme. This is addressed in Financial Case of the Outline Business Case and Outline Business Case Addendum which is discussed by Mr Whitehouse. Final scheme costs will be covered in Financial Case of the Full Business Case and subject to review by Joint Assembly and approval by Executive Board.

5.4.3 The Funding Statement **[CD1-07]** issued in support of the TWAO sets out the sources of funds for the project. These are confirmed at each stage (SOBC, OBC, FBC) of the Green Book process by the Executive Board and the overall budget allocation is documented in the Quarterly Reports received for review by the Board.

5.4.4 Following a successful Gateway Review of the City Deal, the full £500 million City Deal funding has now been released by Government. Day to day management of the City Deal funds is the responsibility of the Executive Board under the oversight of the Section 151 Officer as defined in **[CD10-10]** which covers the delegation from the County Council to the Executive Board . A forward programme of spend is submitted to the Executive Board quarterly for review and updated as necessary. The last significant update was the Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3 which was agreed by the Executive Board on 28th September 2023 **[CD10-08]** and **[CD10-09]**.

5.4.5 S106 Funds

5.4.6 Section 106 Funds are held by CCC for the scheme. To date, contributions of approximately £40 million (subject to indexation) have been agreed for the Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield and West Cambridge developments respectively documented in **[CD4-08, CD4-09, CD4-10]**.

5.4.7 Additional sites adjacent to the scheme were identified in Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals (Emerging Plan) 2021 **[CD6-04]** and so further S106 funds may be forthcoming but are not a pre-requisite for the scheme to proceed.

5.5 Procurement

5.5.1 Procurement will follow CCC procurement requirements and compliance with relevant legislation, specifically the Procurement Act 2023.

5.5.2 The potential options for procurement are set out in detail in Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project - Commercial Case **[CD1-20.01]** and will be documented further in the Commercial and Management Cases for the Full Business Case which will be subject to scrutiny by the Joint Assembly and approval by the Executive Board in due course.

5.5.3 Early market engagement has been undertaken and in advance of scheme consent the applicant will pre-select a list of suitably qualified suppliers, A formal commercial procurement will be undertaken once consent is secured.

6. TRANSPORT ISSUES

6.1 Does the scheme overcome the transport constraints?

- 6.1.1 The scheme provides a largely segregated route between Cambourne and Cambridge. Whilst some sections are not segregated, the majority of the route including sections such as the connection from Madingley Mulch to West Cambridge, which is most prone to congestion, are segregated.
- 6.1.2 The scheme is not segregated as it passes through the West Cambridge campus, and the physical works terminate at the entrance to Cambourne and Cambridge where the built environment constrains opportunity.
- 6.1.3 As such the scheme achieves its objectives and this is discussed in detail in Mr Whitehouse's evidence by means of reference to, the Outline Business Case **[CD1-20]**, OBC Addendum **[CD1-21]** as well as our Statement of Case **[CD23-01]**.

6.2 Does the scheme comply with transport policy?

- 6.2.1 Local transport policy is defined in The Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) **[CD6-09]** which is the Combined Authority's long-term strategy to improve transport in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. All future transport projects for this area will be guided by the plan including projects by local councils and partners like the Greater Cambridge Partnership. The plan was adopted in November 2023.
- 6.2.2 The scheme is compliant with the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan **[CD6-09]** as discussed in further detail in Appendix A – Strategic Case Addendum 2024 in **[CD1-21.01, Page 19]**.
- 6.2.3 The LTCP seeks to address the following Mission Statement **[CD6-09, page 11]**

"The transport network must put improved health at its core, it must help create a fairer society, it must respond to climate change targets, it must protect our environment and clean up our air, and it must be the backbone of sustainable economic growth in which everyone can prosper.

And it must bring a region of cities, market towns and very rural areas closer together. It will be achieved by investing in a properly joined-up, net zero carbon transport system, which is high quality, reliable, convenient, affordable, safe, and accessible to everyone. Better, cleaner public transport will reduce private car use, and more cycling and walking will support both healthier lives and a greener region. Comprehensive connectivity, including digital improvements, will support a sustainable future for our region's nationally important and innovative economy"
- 6.2.4 The CtoC project contributes towards provision of an integrated public transport network in the region with improvements also to active mode infrastructure. The objective of the CtoC scheme is to improve connectivity and job accessibility between Cambourne and Cambridge as well as the developments along the corridor. Furthermore, the scheme aims to encourage mode shift to sustainable modes of transport by making public transport more frequent and reliable. These objectives are in line with **[CD6-09]** as it addresses the challenges identified in the plan.
- 6.2.5 The goals of the LTCP **[CD6-09, page 12]** are to provide improvement in six key areas of productivity, connectivity, climate, environment, health and safety. Delivering an integrated transport system is noted as pivotal to successfully meeting the vision and goals of the plan. As discussed in Appendix A – Strategic Case Addendum 2024 **[CD1-21.01, Pages 19,20]** the CtoC scheme contributes towards delivering elements of an integrated transport system recognised in the LTCP by providing:

- Productivity and Connectivity: Integrated and seamless interchanges between modes to improve sustainable transport connectivity and provide improved access to public transport along the corridor;
 - Health and Safety: Safe and attractive walking and cycling infrastructure; and
 - Climate and Environment: Accessible, affordable, reliable, and frequent public transport supporting economic growth and through modal shift contributing to lower levels of air pollution and carbon emissions.
- 6.2.6 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport – Supporting Bus Strategy 2023 seeks to achieve the following **[CD6-11, Page 9]**:
- A comprehensive bus network, better connecting people to places across all parts of the region and beyond;
 - A doubling of bus passengers (based on 2019/20 levels) by 2030. Less traffic and congestion by attracting car users to buses;
 - A more affordable network, with simplified fares and capping across the network;
 - A more understandable bus network, services, and fares, with clear information at all stages of a journeys and easy ticketing;
 - A transition to new, low emission vehicles, providing all the benefits of modern bus travel;
 - Better bus infrastructure, including bus shelters and widespread real time information coverage;
 - Buses are part of a fully integrated and planned transport system;
 - Faster and more punctual journeys by bus, delivered with more, effective bus priority measures to ensure that these help rather than hindering traffic movement;
 - High quality passenger waiting facilities; and
 - Good quality services with high levels of satisfaction amongst customers.
- 6.2.7 CtoC contributes directly or indirectly to all of the aims of **[CD6-11]** by creating a new element in the bus network, served by new low emission vehicles, with high quality infrastructure.
- 6.2.8 Policy Compliance**
- 6.2.9 As outlined above, the scheme is compliant with the current transport strategy as adopted by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
- 6.2.10 It contributes to 3 of the 6 goals of The Local Transport and Connectivity Plan **[CD6-09]**: Productivity and Connectivity; Health and Safety; and Climate and Environment.
- 6.2.11 It contributes directly or indirectly to all of the aims of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport – Supporting Bus Strategy 2023 **[CD6-11]**.

7. ECONOMIC ISSUES

7.1 Does the scheme allow the economic opportunities to be realised.

- 7.1.1 The Outline Business Case **[CD1-20]** is discussed in detail by Mr Whitehouse in his evidence. Some of the headline issues will also be covered by Mr Freeman and Mr Kelly.
- 7.1.2 To summarise, at a strategic level, the scheme is aligned with the purpose of the City Deal which is to enable the growth of Greater Cambridge. In planning terms there are 3,000 houses at Bourn directly contingent on scheme but the full development at Bourn and Cambourne West is proceeding on the basis of the scheme whilst the consent for the West Cambridge masterplan also reflects the scheme.
- 7.1.3 There is potential for between 2,000 and 10,000 additional houses north of Cambourne as indicated in Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals (Emerging Plan) 2021 **[CD6-04, Page 32]**, and Greater Cambridge Local Plan Transport Evidence Report Preferred Option Update 2021 **[CD6-05, Page 215]**. That envisages 1,950 houses by 2041 with additional growth to come thereafter and potentially contingent upon a Cambourne railway station as well as CtoC. There would also be associated employment. Neither feature in the core OBC but provide confidence that eventual growth will be higher rather than lower. This matter is covered in **[CD9-32]** and will be discussed by Mr Whitehouse **[CD26-01-APP-W6-1]**.
- 7.1.4 There is wider potential for a much larger number of houses for Tempsford and Cambourne if EWR proceeds and in which case CtoC would provide first-last mile connectivity and increase the overall capacity and resilience of this end of the Oxford to Cambridge corridor.
- 7.1.5 In addition to these major sites there are other development opportunities such as an additional business park north of Highfields Caldecote in the emerging local plan if the scheme proceeds, as well as smaller housing sites.
- 7.1.6 For all of these developments, which may see Cambourne become not only the largest settlement in South Cambridgeshire but one of the largest settlements in Cambridgeshire, CtoC will provide essential connectivity to education, healthcare, employment and other opportunities. As housing supply is increased in these new development areas, CtoC will ensure that opportunity is afforded to those on whose work is vital to the overall growth of the City but who cannot find housing in much of the City or its necklace villages.
- 7.1.7 As a bus-based scheme CtoC can readily evolve to serve new developments as they come on-line, ensuring connectivity can be in place from day 1. Rail-based solutions as proposed by some objectors are highly inflexible, struggle to penetrate urban areas, and cannot easily respond to growth. Whilst EWR will provide access to CBC and CB1, the historic rail network means that access to the City Centre provided by EWR will remain poor and, of course, destinations such as West Cambridge cannot be served by rail.
- 7.1.8 If the growth that is recognised at national, regional and local level as being a priority is to happen then it needs to be done in the most climate friendly way. Building a busway is not carbon neutral in isolation but enables modal shift which over time offsets embodied carbon. The only alternative to enable growth of the scale envisaged would be road building which would be damaging and also could only exacerbate congestion in the city centre.

8. HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES

8.1 Compliance with the ECHR

- 8.1.1 Whilst the CtoC Scheme may have an impact on individuals, the County Council as applicant, as well as the GCP as promoter, has taken all necessary steps to ensure that this impact is lawful. Further, the significant public benefits that will arise from the CtoC Scheme, as set out in the documents which comprise the OBC **[CD1-20]** and **[CD1-21]** outweigh any harm to those individuals. The Draft Order **[CD1-02]** strikes a fair balance between the public interest in seeing the CtoC Scheme proceed (which is unlikely to happen in the absence of the CtoC Order) and the private rights which will be affected by the making of the order. Namely the scheme, if it proceeds, will enable the delivery of many thousands of new homes, whilst it will result in the demolition of no residential properties, and land take through compulsory purchase from only a few private individuals of a modest proportion of land owned by them. As such the overall benefit to society can be clearly demonstrated.
- 8.1.2 The case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition powers included within the draft CtoC Order has therefore been demonstrated in the OBC **[CD1-20]** and **[CD1-21]**. The Land included over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought as set out in the Draft Order **[CD1-02]** is the minimum necessary to ensure the delivery of the CtoC Scheme. The CtoC Scheme has been designed to minimise harm whilst achieving its publicly stated objectives. In this respect the interference with human rights is both proportionate and justified.
- 8.1.3 The recommended procedures have been followed for both the consultation on the CtoC Scheme and for the determination of the compulsory acquisition powers included in the draft CtoC Order. Throughout the development of the CtoC Scheme, persons with an interest in the land have had a full opportunity to comment on the proposals, both in a statutory and non-statutory capacity, and we have commissioned CBRE as property agents to endeavour to engage with land interests.
- 8.1.4 Feedback from stakeholders including those with land interest has been given due regard in both the initial design of the scheme and in iterative design changes throughout the life of the CtoC Scheme. Examples of design changes are provided within the Consultation Report November 2024 **[CD1-06.01]**.
- 8.1.5 An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared as Technical Report 4 Community and Human Health/Land Use and Land Take **[CD1-11.04, Appendix TR4.1]** and this forms a part of the Environmental Statement which will be discussed by Mr Saunders **[CD26-01-APP-W3-1]**.
- 8.1.6 From a Governance perspective this matter has been given due consideration by the Full Council of the County Council who approved and ratified submission of the TWAO Council Minutes, 21 March 2023 **[CD11-02, Item 128]** and Council Minutes, 11 February 2025 **[CD11-04, Item 261]**.

9. ALTERNATIVES

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 Matter 3 requires consideration of two points

- The rationale for the preferred option and the alternatives considered.
- The cost of the scheme and overall benefits.

9.1.2 Mr Whitehouse **[CD26-01-APP-W6-1]** will cover the second point. The first point is considered below.

9.1.3 As discussed in Section 5, the overall vision and objectives for the CtoC project were defined in the Outline Business Case.

9.1.4 Typically for a transport scheme, the choice can be summarised as follows:

- Do Nothing
- Improve the Existing Infrastructure
- New Infrastructure

9.2 Do Nothing

9.2.1 Currently there is a modest bus service from Cambourne to the City discussed further in Technical Report 12 - Traffic and Transport **[CD1-11.12, Page 23]**, running mainly in mixed traffic and subject, therefore, to congestion and disruption. As noted in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport – Supporting Bus Strategy 2023 **[CD6-11, Page 4]** *“The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough bus network has generally declined over the period since 1986, although areas of partnership including the Cambridgeshire Busway and Cambridge Park & Ride network have delivered improvements”*.

9.2.2 In Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport – Supporting Bus Strategy 2023 **[CD6-11]** the Combined Authority has signalled its intention to use the Mayoral powers to introduce bus franchising to establish an operational regime comparable to London and Manchester but this is not yet in place. As well as managing timetables and fares the franchise would enable the Mayor and Combined Authority to ensure service levels are maintained.

9.2.3 As such there is a lack of alternatives for local residents. The current 4 service terminates in the city centre and does not provide onward travel or directly serve the Maddingley Road Park and Ride or West Cambridge campus.

9.2.4 Active Travel does and will play an important role, and in and around Cambridge the use of cycling is well above the norm. But this will only ever meet the full range of needs of a proportion of travellers.

9.2.5 Inaction will mean that for many the private car is the only option. This will lead to further congestion, declining air quality and reduced access to economic opportunity.

9.2.6 Almost all the scheme objectors recognise the need for improvements in public transport, and the need to enable economic growth clearly requires intervention. For example:

- Coton Busway Action Group **[CD23-08-1, Page 2]**
- Coton Orchard **[CD23-06, Page 1]**

- CPPF and Coton Parish Council **[CD23-18-1, Page 1]**
- Clare Hall College **[CD23-17, Page 4/5]**

9.2.7 In this instance, doing nothing would clearly not deliver the vision or objectives of the scheme.

9.3 Improve the Existing Infrastructure

- 9.3.1 Since Transport strategy and high level programme for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) **[CD7-07]** in 2014 it has been recognised that public transport rather than highway intervention is the strategy for the A428/A1303 corridor. Highway improvement would require widening of the A1303 past Madingley Wood and the American Cemetery which would be costly, disruptive, and damaging. Mott MacDonald – Technical Note on Madingley Road Quick Wins Options Outline 2019 **[CD13-07, Page 8]** illustrates the limited cross-section available. Widening the Madingley Road to a dual carriageway which would also require it to be upgraded to dual carriageway standard of alignment would require major landtake and highly significant impact, not least on the Madingley Wood and American Cemetery. For this reason such a solution has been discounted.
- 9.3.2 CPPF and others have promoted an improvement to bus provision on the existing road. The latest iteration of the CPPF proposals Cambourne Cambridge Alternative 6e **[CD23-18-02]** envisages a single inbound bus lane which, as Mr Lonergan will explain, and is demonstrated in CPPF Alternative Scheme – Engineering Assessment **[CD9-31]** fails to meet essential design, safety, and environmental standards and would likely not receive technical approval from the Highway Authority. This option is, as has been discussed in Section 4 of my evidence, equivalent to Option A considered in the 2017/8 Consultation Report Appendix E – Phase One Consultation Leaflet **[CD1-06.06]** as well as OAR1 **[CD1-20.07]**.
- 9.3.3 The alternative, which has been periodically discussed would be to make the Girton Interchange all-movements. This would simplify some highway movements but has repeatedly not been selected by National Highways for inclusion in their forward Road Investment Strategy. Even were the Girton Interchange to be widened it would not resolve access into Cambridge itself. Within the city the road network is congested and parking limited. As such further traffic growth cannot be accommodated.
- 9.3.4 Such interim improvements would, as was stated by CPPF in an earlier version of the paper prepared by Edward Leigh *“In-Highway Proposals for High Quality Public Transport Scheme”* (February 2021) **[CD7-10, Page 1]** provide: *“‘quick win’ interventions an effective and low-cost interim solution while the details of longer-term infrastructure schemes, such as East West Rail, the CAM network and the Girton Interchange, are worked out”*. Four years on the CAM network (which in any case included a segregated CtoC) and Girton Interchange are not proceeding and EWR remains unconsented and is now unlikely to be delivered in a form or timescale required to deliver the adopted Local Plans.
- 9.3.5 Overall, improvements to the existing infrastructure alone would not provide the sustainable solution envisaged.

9.4 New Infrastructure

- 9.4.1 The question, therefore, is to determine the form of an intervention. The process which has been followed was discussed in Section 4 of my evidence. This section discusses some of the alternatives proposed by objectors.
- 9.4.2 A major highway improvement would be incompatible with planning and transport policies such as “Shifting travel choices to more sustainable modes of transport, including public transport, walking, and cycling, away from car use” as noted in

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan 2023 **[CD6-09, Page 18]**. The alternative, therefore, would be a public transport intervention a conclusion which, as discussed above, is largely accepted by objectors.

- 9.4.3 The decision to develop bus-based solutions dates back to **[CD7-07]** which informed the Local Plans and also the City Deal itself. As Cambridge already had a busway at the outset of the City Deal the decision was to develop further busways to enable interoperability and ensure buses coming from Cambourne could use the busway to access destination such as CBC as indeed the U services do now.
- 9.4.4 Therefore LRT was never a practical option. Moreover the City Deal funding was never of the order which would have been required to deliver four radial LRT routes even if the challenges of the City Centre could somehow be overcome.
- 9.4.5 This position was reinforced by work undertaken relatively early on in the City Deal programme on affordable mass transit which concluded in Affordable Mass Transit for Cambridge and the Wider Region **[CD9-33, Page 12]** and in the Greater Cambridge Mass Transit Options Assessment Report **[CD9-34, Pages vi, ix and xii]** that rubber tyred vehicles would be optimal. Whilst the Mayor was not positive about the existing busway, his proposals for the CAM Metro as set out in the SOBC for CAM **[CD9-37, Page 69]** were intended to utilise the busways and a similar approach based on the affordable mass transit approach. Both these studies recognised the challenge of the medieval city centre and difficult for any rapid transit system in passing through this. The approach adopted for CAM was to utilise tunnels but this was proven during the development of the CAM to be extremely expensive and issues around tunnel portals, ventilation shafts and the construction of stations were never resolved.
- 9.4.6 Overall therefore, whilst LRT has some merits, not least in terms of capacity, it is not compatible with existing infrastructure, and any solution which would be feasible in technical terms would be likely to require tunnelling solutions which would not achieve the budget or timescale of the City Deal.
- 9.4.7 Should a decision be made to adopt an LRT solution in the future, the busways proposed by GCP, including CtoC could potentially be adapted to carry trams, but the challenges of negotiating the city centre, and the costs of an LRT solution would remain.

East West Rail

- 9.4.8 There is no existing heavy rail alternative to CtoC but East West Rail (EWR) offers a potentially complementary service and has been much discussed by objectors to the scheme.
- 9.4.9 As things stand EWR has just completed non-statutory consultation on the basis that a station will be provided to the north of Cambourne and the alignment cross the CtoC scheme to the north-east of Bourn Airfield.
- 9.4.10 A further Statutory consultation will be required before DCO and at this stage there is no indication whether or not the current alignment will be retained. In any event the scheme is neither consented nor funded which is why it is not reflected in the core OBC in line with TAG requirements.
- 9.4.11 East West Rail and CtoC serve different destinations in the city and CtoC serves the centre of Cambourne and Cambridge as well as Bourn Airfield and West Cambridge. As such the scheme are complementary and CtoC will potentially provide first/last mile connectivity to East West Rail.

- 9.4.12 The EWR Business Case is not yet published but available documentation suggests significant housing growth West of Cambridge which will exacerbate traffic congestion and increase demand for all PT modes substantially strengthening the business case

10. INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER PROPOSALS

10.1 East West Rail

- 10.1.1 Addressing Matter 4a, but as discussed above, East West Rail has not undertaken its statutory consultation and therefore is some way away from DCO submission. As such, whilst East West Rail has published a Route Update which indicates what is described as Preferred Route, and whilst in November 2024 the Secretary of State for Transport has issued safeguarding directions for the land required for the proposed East West Rail, there remains no certainty with regard to the alignment, timescale or certainty of delivery of the project.
- 10.1.2 As the most recently published alignment for EWR crosses the CtoC alignment there is a need to reach agreement on the impact of CtoC on the crossing point between the two schemes as referred to in Matter 4a “the effect on East West Rail land safeguarded for the construction of a new railway between Bedford and Cambridge and the upgrading of existing railway between Oxford and Bedford”.
- 10.1.3 The basis for these is an agreement that, should EWR require a cut and cover tunnel at this location, CCC would be agreeable to a diversion of CtoC to be provided by EWR which would enable services to be maintained whilst the tunnel is constructed.
- 10.1.4 Two further alternatives remain under discussion. One would be that CCC provides passive provision for EWR, at EWR's expense, when CtoC is constructed. This would be dependent on EWR having advanced to a position where its requirements could be sufficiently defined and matters of consent and funding resolved.
- 10.1.5 A final option which remains under consideration would be that EWR opts for a bored tunnel which could be constructed without conflict with CtoC.
- 10.1.6 The parties have been engaging constructively on the interface between the two schemes. Principles for a collaboration agreement have been agreed between the parties, and the collaboration agreement is currently under negotiation. It is hoped that agreement will be reached in this respect shortly. The Applicant would expect that protective provisions for the benefit of the CtoC Scheme are to be included in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) for EWR, and that this will be progressed alongside their DCO application. In due course, further specific agreements may be required once the precise detail of the interface is known. The parties are committed to working together to enable the delivery of both schemes.
- 10.1.7 In the meantime GCP will continue to work with the LPA and EWR about connectivity to any future Cambourne station including the potential to extend CtoC in due course to a future Travel Hub at the station.

10.2 Anglian Water

- 10.2.1 The site of a proposed reservoir in Madingley is in close proximity to the proposed CtoC alignment. It is possible that the reservoir's associated pipelines may need to cross underneath the CtoC Scheme. Anglian Water and GCP are preparing a Statement of Common Ground which sets out the parties' intentions to engage constructively to enable both schemes, if consented, to be delivered and any interfaces to be managed appropriately.

10.3 Bourn Airfield

- 10.3.1 The CtoC scheme crosses Bourn Airfield and as noted in **[CD2 SUP-12]** Bourn Airfield Landowners there is commitment to ensure that the parties can address any potential conflicts. An agreement with the developers of this site is in place and is covered by Mr Franklin in **[CD26-01-APP-W7-1]**.

10.4 Comberton Greenway

- 10.4.1 The Comberton Greenway is one of 12 Active Travel routes connecting Cambridge with surrounding villages. The proposed alignment for this Greenway crosses CtoC south of the West Cambridge campus and then passes through the centre of Coton and onto Comberton.
- 10.4.2 There is a requirement to ensure the safety of the design at the crossing which will be addressed at detailed design.
- 10.4.3 Whilst it has been suggested that the Comberton Greenway would remove the need for a maintenance track, they fulfil different purposes. As it does not run along the CtoC scheme the Comberton Greenway would not help to ensure the safe maintenance and operation of CtoC. In addition, whilst that is not the primary objective of the maintenance track, the Comberton Greenway would not provide Active Travel access to Cambourne.

10.5 West Cambridge

- 10.5.1 An agreement with the developers of this site is in place and is covered by Mr Franklin **[CD26-01-APP-W7-1]**.

11. RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

11.1 Conclusions on Representations by CPPF and others

- 11.1.1 The majority of representations pertinent to my evidence relate to the suggestion that the option development process is flawed on the basis that the applicant has failed to consider the on-road option promoted by CPPF in Cambourne Cambridge Alternative 6e **[CD23-18-2]**.
- 11.1.2 Other representations such as Cambridge Connect **[CD2-OBJ-224, Page 5]** suggest a northern alignment should have been considered, possibly including creation of an all-movements junction at Girton Interchange enabling A428 traffic to head south on the M11, whilst avoiding Madingley Road.
- 11.1.3 Many of those suggesting the on-line solution specifically object to the route through Coton Orchard.
- 11.1.4 The main issues raised relate to the suggestion that the development of the scheme has failed to consider what CPPF suggest is a viable alternative on-road option. This was set out in **[CD23-18-2]**.
- 11.1.5 In reality, there has been an extensive scheme development process which has considered alignments to the north and south of the A428/A1303 and on-line. Despite this a number of objectors including Mr Treacy, Dr Green, Mr Davidson, Ms Postgate, Ms Lucy, Mr Sadler and others have all raised this as an objection, and CBAG have repeatedly promoted this argument citing “The repeated failure of the GCP to appraise credible proposals for alternative routes” as a grounds of objection in their Statement of Case **[CD23-08-1 Page 3]**. As I discuss above in Section 8, in response to Matter 3, and as is documented through the 3 OARs prepared in support to the OBC, a range of alternatives, have been appraised in line with DfT TAG Guidance and that process has been subject to Independent Audit **[CD8-27]** as noted in Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board Findings dated 01 July 2021 **[CD10-01]**.
- 11.1.6 **[CD23-18-2]** is not entirely clear on what is proposed and includes references to solutions such as a central inbound bus lane which could not be easily or safely provided. Moreover it makes incorrect assumptions about the land required which Mr Lonergan will cover in his evidence **[CD26-01-APP-W8-1]**. CPPF have indicated that a further iteration of this proposal will be issued but the content of this is unknown.
- 11.1.7 What is indisputable, however, is that the Phase 1 consultation documented in Consultation Report Appendix E – Phase One Consultation Leaflet 2017 – 2018 **[CD1-06.06 Pages 12,13]** undertaken in late 2017/early 2018 includes an on-road inbound bus lane as well as a tidal bus lane option which was the solution preferred in A Better Bus Route **[CD13-10, Page 3]** issued by the Local Liaison Forum (including CPPF) and many other stakeholders at the time. The on-line solution was optimized after the consultation and the assessment of the on-road and off-road options was considered in great detail in the Outline Business Case **[CD1-20]** which ultimately recommended the off-road solution which forms the basis of the Preferred Route.
- 11.1.8 Whether or not CPPF and others agree with the OBC, the argument that GCP has not considered on-road inbound bus lane is incorrect.
- 11.1.9 Moreover the Independent Audit **[CD8-27]** of the scheme undertaken in 2021 which reviewed the CPPF proposals in their original form as part of a call for evidence specifically considered the process followed and concluded that:
- The scheme is in alignment with national, regional and local policies on the economy and transport
 - Stakeholder engagement has been carried out in a robust manner;

- The business case development followed the HMT Treasury Green Book and the Department for Transport's TAG methodology; and that
 - The appraisal has been carried out in a robust manner and the economic analysis and financial case remain valid
- 11.1.10 As a result of this review process the Independent Audit confirmed **[C8-27, Page 5]** that there was "no reason why the Executive Board of the GCP should not proceed to the next stage in the development of the CtoC scheme".
- 11.1.11 The argument that GCP has failed to consider the on-road inbound bus lane alternative proposed by CPPF is incorrect. Whilst CPPF's proposed route as proposed in their Statement of Case was poorly defined and not safe or deliverable, GCP has very clearly assessed the on-road inbound bus lane as well as the tidal bus lane variant preferred at that time by CPPF, and a range of other alternatives, and that process is extensively documented in the 3 OARs which support the OBC.

11.2 Issues Raised by CBAG

- 11.2.1 In their Statement of Case **[CD23-08-1]**, CBAG provide detailed comments on the process. In line with a number of objectors, CBAG's central argument on Page 3 is misleading, alleging that the comparison of the preferred route against an on-line alternative has never been undertaken whereas this was undertaken extensively in the OBC and the process verified through Independent Audit. CBAG provide a timeline of evidence and allegation, much of which is misleading or incorrect. Their Statement of Case refers to a series of documents all submitted within **[CD23-08-2]**.

- 11.2.2** CBAG's allegations are addressed in the chronological format adopted in **[CD23-08-1]**.

2014

- 11.2.3 It is unclear why CBAG wishes to challenge (Page 3) the decision that the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme should focus on connecting Cambourne and Cambridge as that was the brief for the project.

- 11.2.4 However, assuming the accuracy of the data presented by CBAG at the time, the City Centre (45%) was in any event the most popular destination with 31% of demand to the Science Park. As has always been the case, buses to the City Centre will have the option to proceed to the Biomedical Campus as the U bus does now whilst there is the option for CtoC buses to leave the route at West Cambridge and proceed to the Science Park via Eddington.

2015

- 11.2.5 Again on **[CD23-08-1, Page 4]**, CBAG appear to take issue with the decision that the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme connects Cambourne to Cambridge.

- 11.2.6 There is also a misconception that consultations are akin to a referendum process. Whilst GCP has sought to amend the scheme over the years to reflect stakeholder views, the DfT TAG process **[CD8-25, Pages 4 and 5]** and Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) Guidance **[CD8-26]** requires a wide range of impacts to be considered in determination of a preferred option.

2016

- 11.2.7 The Atkins report Rectory Farm Bridge Options **[CD9-36]** has been misinterpreted by CBAG on page 4/5 of their SoC. As is made clear in its conclusions **[CD9-36, Page 16]** of the report, of the two options which did not require widening, option 1 would lead to increased congestion and option 2 could lead to increased risk of accidents. As such neither represented a suitable solution.

- 11.2.8 In the event, further appraisal work including an on-line solution was undertaken and so no decision was made at that time in any event.

2017

- 11.2.9 In **[CD23-08-1, Page 6]** CBAG refer to a “seemingly totally inappropriate tidal bus route with huge gantries very prominently positioned outside the American Military Cemetery”. In fact the tidal flow solution was supported by the Local Liaison Forum as documented in “A Better Bus Route” **[CD13-10]** as presented to the February 2017 LLF meeting. The requirement for provision of gantries was in accordance with Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6 - Traffic Control 2019 **[CD9-20, Page 155 et seq.]**.
- 11.2.10 CBAG also suggest that “the 2017 LDA Design report, which suggested special circumstances were needed for the off-road route, was not displayed on the GCP’s website until 2019” and that this was evidence that “Selective use of data and non-transparent scoring consistently supported the GCP’s choice”.
- 11.2.11 This assertion is incorrect. LDA produced Green Belt reports in 2017 and 2019. The first was appended to the 2017 Planning Appraisal which is included in Green Belt Assessment Outline Business Case – Appendix U **[CD1-20.27 from Page 34]** but was originally published as Appendix L1C of the End of Stage Report **[CD9-35]**. The second is also included in Green Belt Assessment Outline Business Case – Appendix U **[CD1-20.27, from Page 137]**.

2018

- 11.2.12 GCP rejected the proposal of a further panel to assess CtoC as scheme development is based upon a defined process which has already considered a wide range of options. This has been borne out by the Independent Audit which was eventually established as well as two further reviews undertaken for CPCA/GCP by ARUP **[CD9-01]** and for CPCA by Jacobs **[CD9-29]**.

2019

- 11.2.13 The on-road quick wins paper Mott MacDonald – Technical Note on Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport 2019 **[CD13-07]** referred to by CBAG **[CD23-08-1, Pages 7/8]** was prepared by Mott MacDonald, one of the UK’s largest and most experienced civil engineering consultants based on an understanding of UK Design Standards such as DMRB. Conversely CPPF, CBAG and others have promoted a report prepared by a relatively newly qualified transport economist with no evident engineering expertise or experience.

2020

- 11.2.14 The issue of the CPCA intervention is misinterpreted by CBAG **[CD23-08-1, Pages 8/9]**. In reality, CPCA and GCP asked ARUP to review the scheme in 2018 and CPCA then asked Jacobs to review it in 2020. ARUP **[CD9-01]** concluded that the GCP process was robust whilst Jacobs **[CD9-29]** compared the GCP preferred route favourably with alternative options CPCA were considering.

2021

- 11.2.15 The Independent Audit was commissioned in response to a decision made on December 10th 2020 by the Executive Board **[CD10-06, Page 7]** in response to a November 19th 2020 Joint Assembly **[CD10-05, Pages 5/6]** request to restart the scheme. As CBAG note **[CD23-08-1, Page 9]**, “the 2021 audit did not explicitly champion an inbound on-road proposal and came down in favour of the off-road route” and, as such the Executive Board finally approved the preferred route.

- 11.2.16 At this point, CBAG, CPPF and others started to campaign on the basis that GCP should “fully appraise, side by side, the off-road route and the CPPF on-road inbound bus lane”. Given that the OBC does exactly that it remains unclear why this argument has prevailed for so long.

2023/4

- 11.2.17 Once again, central to the argument is the incorrect suggestion that the on-road option has never been assessed. This is clearly not the case, being the core of the work undertaken for the OBC (refer to **[CD1-20.07, Page 65]** for example), which was subject to further review by CPCA and Independent Audit as discussed above.

11.3 Impact on Coton Orchard

- 11.3.1 The potential impact on Coton Orchard is the other major theme running through many objections and is reflected in Matter 4c. This will primarily be addressed by the evidence of Mr Ellis, Mr Alder, Ms Reason etc but some facts are pertinent to the development of the scheme.
- 11.3.2 During the scheme development stages of the project, the issue of the Orchard was rarely raised and specifically during the Stage 1 consultation when on-line and off-line options were considered it was not a significant issue for stakeholders such as Coton Parish Council and CPPF.
- 11.3.3 Coton Orchard Ltd had previously informed GCP on June 5th 2020 **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2, Appendix 3]** of their objection on commercial grounds. Namely:
- “the exact path is not clear but, from the images circulated by GCP, the preferred route appears to bisect the fruit orchard portion of our property, making land management highly impractical, if not impossible.
 - Development of the site has been slow and considered due to our desire to work with the environment and comply with the covenants. A 10-year plan for the company includes expansion of the garden centre and farming buildings onto the main site the proposed busway is routed through.”
- 11.3.4 Subsequently when Houston Crest permitted a survey of the trees and the issue of Veteran Trees became a matter of debate, an alternative alignment which would avoid the oldest trees was prepared. This was shared with CPPF and Houston Crest Properties as the affected landowners. CPPF rejected the alternative as being more damaging to its land interests and Houston Crest Properties at the time made it clear it objected to all options. This is documented in the ES Addendum **[CD1-10.06]**.
- 11.3.5 In any event, no alignment has been identified, other than on-line widening, which could avoid the Orchard and serve West Cambridge given the adjacent juxtaposition of Coton Village, the CPPF Coton Reserve, and the Barton Road Rifle Range. **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2, Appendix 6]** provides a plan illustrating the geography of the area and the specific constraints caused by the immediate proximity of the Orchard, Reserve and Rifle Range.
- 11.3.6 To the north of the A1303 lie the American Cemetery, Madingley Wood SSSI and the 800Wood. **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2 Appendix 6]** also includes an aerial photograph showing that there is no space between the A428 and A1303 that avoids these constraints.
- 11.3.7 The use of a northern route along the A428 was previously discussed in **[CD13-13]**.

11.4 Impact on American Cemetery

- 11.4.1 The impact on the American Cemetery has been raised by a number of parties and reflected in Matter 4e. For example, CPRE have suggested **[CD23-19-1, Page 1]** that the scheme is in some way disrespectful to the US Military Cemetery at Madingley Road. The reality is that Technical Report 7 - Heritage & Archaeology (including Historic Environmental Desk Based Assessment) **[CD1-11.07.1, Page 87]** confirms that the scheme has no impact on the Cemetery whereas the CPPF alternative would require construction past the Cemetery and, if the impact on properties south of Madingley Road is to be minimized, would require the loss of land and planting within the Cemetery frontage.
- 11.4.2 In reality, the American Cemetery provided a letter of support on 28 October 2019 which is appended to the Consultation Report **[CD1-06.16, Appendix O]**. Specifically the US military indicated that it would support solutions which would:
- Reduce noise pollution by taking steps to reduce commercial traffic along the A1303.
 - Protect the meadow-grass (the verge) and border shrub by avoiding expansion (road construction) on the A 1303.
 - Sustain public accessibility to Cambridge American Cemetery by avoiding road construction on the A 1303.
 - Increase Health & Safety along the A1303 by reducing the speed limit, installing a pedestrian cross walk, and reducing commercial traffic.
- 11.4.3 The GCP proposal complies with all of these points to a greater or lesser degree whereas the CPPF alternative would lead to road construction of the A1303 and potentially the loss of the verge and border.
- 11.4.4 Whilst some objectors point to a public question read out by the then Superintendent of the Cemetery at a GCP Executive Board meeting in 2021, that involved him reading a public question submitted by a member of Coton Parish Council on behalf of Coton and Madingley Parish Councils and CPPF as well as himself, and no formal objection was made by the American Battle Monuments Commission then or now.

11.5 Lack of Engagement

- 11.5.1 Clare Hall has suggested that there has been a lack of engagement. On technical matters, the GCP Director of Transport met with the President of Clare Hall in late 2022 followed by a meeting, arranged at the request of the latter, on 16/12/22 between the GCP Project Manager and Pulsar Transport who were appointed by Clare Hall as adviser. Pulsar followed up with two sets of clarification questions to GCP on 3/1/23 and 6/2/23, both of which received responses. No further questions or requests were received until 2025. Matters such as land ownership, were not raised as concerns by Clare Hall so were not discussed at that stage.
- 11.5.2 Clare Hall also suggest that they should have formally been consulted as a landowner. Whilst they suggest that there may be incorrect data in Land Registry, the Book of Reference is compliant with both Land Registry and the LIQ returned by Jesus College. As Jesus College indicated that Clare Hall had a "Communication Easement" over the land, but no freehold interest, a subsequent LIQ was issued to Clare Hall but not returned. Mr Franklin will cover this matter further in his evidence.
- 11.5.3 Consultation Process**
- 11.5.4 Mr Davidson takes issue with the overall process in **[CD23-12-1]**. It is unclear as to why he believes a consultation was "run twice" because GCP did not like the results.

There was a consultation at SOBC and OBC stage and then for the EIA. At OBC stage the consultation considered first the section east of Madingley Mulch and then the section to the west.

- 11.5.5 Mr Davidson also suggests that consultation should operate somewhat akin to a referendum. In reality consultation is simply one element of scheme appraisal. As discussed above, the appraisal process itself was compliant with DfT guidance and subject to independent audit which found it to be robust.
- 11.5.6 Mr Sadler also suggests that there is no basis for decision making and that engagement has been ineffective. He alleges in **[CD23-15, Page 2]** that he has “seen no explanation at any stage why the off-road route was chosen over the more practical on-road corridor, especially for the critical section between Madingley Mulch and the M11”. As stated elsewhere, this issue was addressed extensively in the OBC and was the subject of much debate during the Independent Audit **[CD8-27]**.
- 11.5.7 The suggestion that GCP ignored community suggestions is incorrect. The tidal flow solution considered in OAR1 **[CD1-20.07]**, and the alternative considered in Technical Note on the Northern Alignment **[CD13-13]** were both previous solutions supported by CPPF. The most recent CPPF proposals have broadly reverted to an option considered in the OBC and do not represent a novel solution. Whilst these suggestions have not been assessed as the best performing solution, considerable effort has been made to ensure they were considered.

11.6 Safety of the Scheme

- 11.6.1 Questions have been raised, notably by Houston Crest Properties Ltd, in **[CD23-06]** regarding safety issues on the existing Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. Those issues are well documented and have led to a prosecution by the HSE as well as challenges in the construction process. For the above and other reasons the CtoC scheme is intended to use technological rather than physical guidance and the design will be significantly different to the original CGB. The use of swales between the busway and maintenance track, as clearly shown in consultation materials, will provide physical separation which is not present for the existing scheme. Where this cannot be achieved speeds will be limited. Moreover the proposed design will enable safety drivers to take avoiding action, over-riding the guidance system, which cannot be done on the existing scheme where buses are constrained to the guideway.
- 11.6.2 Houston Crest Properties Ltd have also challenged the safety at crossing points. These have been assessed and discussed with landowners at most locations. Where the scheme crosses Coton orchard such discussion has not taken place because Houston Crest Properties Ltd have declined to engage despite offers of discussion such as a letter of Jan 30th 2025 **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2, Appendix 3]**. GCP remains at the disposal of Houston Crest Properties Ltd to discuss the matter.
- 11.6.3 Gough Way Residents Association **[CD23-05]** challenge the provision of a junction between the Rifle Range and Grange Road. This location is constrained but a preliminary design has been developed in line with and will continue to be subject to the stages of the Road Safety Audit process. The assumption is that buses will turn to the south, following the route of the U service. There is more space at Adams Road for a junction but that location is more complex because of the prevalence of cycles heading across to Burrells Walk, and buses using that route would have to pass the constrained section of Grange Road to the north of the Rifle Range.
- 11.6.4 Overall, the development and design of the scheme has also been informed by a robust safety review process based on Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 (ROGS) **[CD5-19]** and the oversight of an Independent Competent Person. Where the scheme interacts with adopted highway a road safety audit has been undertaken.

11.7 Design Matters

11.7.1 Anglian Water Reservoir

- 11.7.2 Houston Crest Properties Ltd have queried **[CD23-06]** the risk of conflict with the reservoir proposed by Anglian Water. As is conventional, both schemes have identified a red line boundary which at this stage indicates the potential for conflict. As indicated in **[CD2-OBJ-271, Page 1]** Anglian Water Services Limited & Cambridge Water have submitted a holding objection noting that this issue is being addressed and Anglian Water state the following:

“The Project Promoters, Anglian Water and Cambridge Water, are submitting this holding objection to allow further more detailed discussions to continue in relation to the protection of existing assets and in relation to the proposed Fens Reservoir project and the proposed Grafham to Rede pipeline scheme spur to Madingley to ensure that if consented the schemes can be successfully delivered. The Project Promoters are confident based upon discussions to date that agreement can be reached thereby allowing the removal of this holding objection”.

11.7.3 Use of Grange Road and City Centre Access

- 11.7.4 Gough Way residents **[CD23-05]** and Ms Lucy **[CD23-13-1]** challenge the efficiency of the route onwards from Grange Road to the city. In reality all routes through the city centre are subject to congestion as discussed in CCC SoC **[CD23-01, Page 16]**. Wider issues of city centre access will need to be addressed through the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy.

- 11.7.5 The meaning of other GWRA comments on this matter **[CD23-05, Page 2, Point 4]** remain opaque. Haslingfield lies to the south-west of Cambridge on a completely different corridor south of the A603 with no relevance to CtoC. Comments by GWRA regarding the U1 and U2 are unclear as these services do not serve points west of West Cambridge but do serve West Cambridge. Ms Lucy suggests that the scheme ends in a quiet residential area which is also not clear as the Grange Road area is primarily an educational area. There are residential streets in the vicinity, such as Adams Road, but these are avoided by the current proposals.

11.7.6 East West Rail

- 11.7.7 East West Rail has submitted a holding objection relating to the risk of conflict between the two scheme but notes in their SoC **[CD23-09-1, Paragraph 5.2]** that *“EWR Co, Cambridgeshire County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership have been working together in the development of their respective projects. This constructive engagement continues with a view to agreeing suitable arrangements to manage the interface between the two projects and enable EWR Co’s holding objection to be withdrawn.”*

11.7.8 Cadent Gas

- 11.7.9 Cadent Gas have submitted an objection **[CD23-11]** related to liabilities associated with their utility plant and equipment. Following further negotiations Protective Provisions are being progressed and it is anticipated that these will be in place by the time of the public inquiry.

11.7.10 Land Requirements

- 11.7.11 PX Farms assert **[CD23-14]** that the area of land identified for acquisition is greater than that which is reasonably required for the Park and Ride and travel hub building on the basis that the travel hub incorporates provision of a revenue generating scheme from the provision of energy to electric vehicles outside of the expressed aims and objectives of the project. This is incorrect. In reality the need to provide electric vehicle

charging points is defined in Planning Condition 23 required by the LPA in the Request for Deemed Planning Permission **[CD1-14]** and is not intended to be a revenue generation scheme albeit that the facilities provided would need to be self-financing. We are aware PX Farms have aspirations to install electric vehicle charging on the site and are engaging in order to identify any potential scope for collaboration in this regard.

11.7.12 Conflict with Planned Construction

11.7.13 Clare Hall **[CD23-17]** raise concerns over the scheme design. One issue is the route alignment and the suggestion that this impedes the ability of Clare Hall to deliver on future development plans. As things stand Clare Hall has no planning permission for future development and no evidence of right of access which the scheme impedes in any way. Should such right of access be demonstrated and required to deliver access to an applicant or consented development site this would be considered in the normal way: GCP has no desire to impede growth but cannot commit to providing access over land to which it is unclear that Clare Hall has any right to vehicular access to a development site which currently has no planning permission .

11.7.14 Clare Hall also suggest that GCP has failed to consider alternatives. In fact, as I discuss in Section 4, the choice between the Rifle Range and Adams Road was first considered early in scheme development alongside the use of Herschel Road and Cranmer Road and this was documented in Skanska: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Bus Journeys Grange Road Access Report **[CD13-09]**. Subsequently GCP consulted on Adams Road and Rifle Range in 2017/8 in Consultation Report Appendix E – Phase One Consultation Leaflet 2017 – 2018 **[CD1-06.06]** and documented the consideration of both in OAR 1 **[CD1-20.07, Page 77]** at which time Rifle Range was selected as the best performing option.

11.7.15 Subsequently the matter was revisited in OAR3 **[CD1-20.09, Page 13]** at the time that CPCA was promoting the CAM scheme which might have rendered the Rifle Range section of CtoC redundant and further consideration given to Adams Road, but that option was never approved by the Executive Board

11.7.16 Ultimately the preferred option remained the Rifle Range based on the appraisal as documented extensively in OAR1. Further details of the decision making process were set out in Environment Statement (Addendum 2 and Clarifications) **[CD1-10.07]** and are provided as **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2, Appendix 2]**.

11.7.17 Requirement for Maintenance Track

11.7.18 CPPF has challenged the need for the maintenance track. This issue was addressed in CCC SoC **[CD23-01, Pages 45,49]**. Since then the details of the HSE prosecution relating to the County Council have emerged and confirmed the jurisdiction of HSE over busways. As such the provision of a safe route for maintenance, evacuation and other similar purposes is considered paramount to ensuring the safety of operatives, service users and other members of the public such as cyclists who might seek to use the busway if a suitable alternative was not in place. Mr Lonergan discusses this matter further in his proof.

11.8 Other Matters

11.8.1 CPPF has also suggested that GCP should consider routeing buses via the A428, A14 and Histon Road or Milton Road. Such a route would be significantly longer than the proposed route and would entirely fail to serve the West Cambridge campus which is one of the key growth sites served by the scheme.

11.8.2 CPRE has stated that an unnamed “transport engineer” has said “Busways are not an effective way of maximising the use of bus services” **[CD23-19-2, Page 3]**. The source refers to Rouen and Caen which are very different examples. Rouen is a successful

Bus Rapid Transit system (Transport Est-Ouest Rouennais) which uses sensor guidance albeit primarily to improve accessibility at bus stops. Rouen continues to invest in this system which has some similarities to CtoC including the use of sensor guidance.

- 11.8.3 Caen adopted a novel technology “Guided Light Transit” based around central rail guidance which has not proven successful and has been replaced by a conventional tram system in the two French cities which adopted that solution.
- 11.8.4 I append **[CD26-01-APP-W1-2, Appendix 5]** articles dealing with both Caen and Rouen.
- 11.8.5 Conversely there are numerous busways of different types operating in the UK from Manchester to Hampshire, Gatwick, Bristol, Luton or Leeds and new schemes being developed.
- 11.8.6 Friends of the CAM, CPRE and FECRA have raised wider concerns about issues relating to growth and water supply. These concerns are noted but are not considered to be pertinent to this public inquiry. It is a matter of record that the GCP was created by HM Government in order to facilitate growth and that CtoC has been developed for that purpose. The Land Value Uplift achieved by the scheme is central to the business case and reflects the scheme’s purpose. Matters of growth have been, and will be, addressed through Examinations of local plans and the planning applications for associated developments. The CtoC scheme is intended to serve developments already allocated and consented in the most appropriate way. It is likely to also serve additional developments not yet allocated, or consented, but proposed in response to Government Policy: the case for and against such growth will need to be addressed when the next Local Plans are subject to Examination and development sites proposed for consent. Therefore, matters of water supply have been considered during the planning process and will be addressed through the proposed application by Anglian Water for a new reservoir.
- 11.8.7 CPRE have queried whether CPCA has jurisdiction over the scheme and should be the promoter. This matter of subsidiarity is discussed in the Devolution Deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough **[CD7-03, Page 6]** with specific reference to City Deal delivery.

“There is no intention to take existing powers from local authorities without their agreement. The agreement will protect the integrity of local authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough”

“The local authorities of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough recognise and have agreed that the principle of subsidiarity should apply to the discharge of functions by the Mayor and Combined Authority and governance of this devolution deal. This includes the delegation of responsibility from the Combined Authority to individual Councils or appropriate bodies, such as City Deal mechanisms, for delivery”.
- 11.8.8 As such the decision making powers already vested in the GCP partners remain as they were prior to the devolution deal whilst delivery of transport projects is delegated to the GCP for the City Deal.
- 11.8.9 Mr Singleton notes that no timetable data has been provided. The OBC is based on projected route options but the eventual timetable will depend on operator intentions or franchise arrangements and so it would be misleading to provide that level of detail at this stage.
- 11.8.10 Mr Singleton also queries the lack of physical works within Cambourne. As with the centre of Cambridge, the busway proposals provide connectivity between Cambourne and Cambridge. Any further works within Cambourne will form part of the ongoing

development of the town and will be likely to need to be revisited to reflect the opportunities created if East West Rail provides a Cambourne Station.

- 11.8.11 Mr Singleton raised a number of other points related to East West Rail which do not pertain to CtoC and also suggests an alignment to the north of the Orchard which presumably refers to the CPPF alignment discussed by Mr Lonergan.
- 11.8.12 A number of objectors have referred to the termination of the scheme at Grange Road. The physical construction of CtoC extends as far as Grange Road because, as with the existing CGB, there is little opportunity to create busways within the historic city core. This does not mean that there is, or has ever been, an intention that services would terminate at Grange Road. Again, as with the existing CGB, these will proceed through the city centre. Indeed, this reflects the flexibility of a busway over a rail based solution which could not be delivered without major city centre construction which might never be economically or environmentally viable.
- 11.8.13 Many objectors have rightly queried the rationale for building new infrastructure in the face of the Climate Crisis. This is an important point which Mr Saunders will address in his evidence. As things stand, the growth of Cambridge has been clearly identified as being critical to the economic growth of the UK and, as Mr Saunders will explain, the proposed scheme enables that growth in a manner which is served by sustainable transport avoiding net increases in carbon emissions.

12. CONCLUSIONS

12.1 Matter 1

- 12.1.1 In relation to Matter 1, I have summarised the transport strategy, policies and economic context within which the scheme sits and which has guided the development of the scheme and the objectives which it addresses as well as the opportunities which it creates. These explain the aims and objectives of the scheme.
- 12.1.2 In this context and as documented in Section 8 above there is consensus between GCP and a number of major local objectors regarding the need for improved public transport and that need is supported by national, regional and local policy as set out in Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project - Strategic Case **[CD1-20.05]** and Appendix A – Strategic Case Addendum 2024 **[CD1-21.01]**.
- 12.1.3 Finally, to look at the scheme in the simplest possible terms, the requirement in order to deliver the Project Objectives is to provide a high quality public transport scheme which connects 3 major developments and existing settlements which lie to the south of the A428/A1303 whilst avoiding impact on 3 nationally significant sites which lie to the north of, and in two cases adjacent to, the A428/A1303. As such the case for the preferred route, which connects the development sites whilst avoiding the nationally significant constraints is very strong.

12.2 Matter 3a

- 12.2.1 I have addressed Matter 3a: the rationale for the preferred option and the alternatives considered.
- 12.2.2 In doing so I have explained that an extensive scheme development process has been undertaken in line with DfT guidance, and presented in the Outline Business Case and Addendum and in 3 supporting OARs. Furthermore that that process has been subject to Independent Audit.
- 12.2.3 The outcomes of the work have also been subject to two additional reviews on behalf of the Combined Authority.
- 12.2.4 I have explained that during this process the scheme development process has considered a wide range of alternative alignments to the north and south of the A428/A1303 corridor and on-line.
- 12.2.5 Despite assertions to the contrary that process has considered in detail an on-line inbound bus lane similar to that now proposed by CPPF. No other alignment has been identified which could avoid the Orchard and serve West Cambridge given the adjacent juxtaposition of Coton Village, the CPPF Coton Reserve, and the Barton Road Rifle Range.
- 12.2.6 The work undertaken was informed by 4 formal rounds of consultations, as well as a variety of workshops, Parish Council meetings and one to one meetings. Where it has been practical to do so the scheme has seen changes to reflect local concerns.
- 12.2.7 The outcome of the work undertaken is clear and robust and as the SOBC, OBC and OBC Addendum were prepared by three different organisations an additional degree of refresh and scrutiny has also taken place over and above the 3rd party reviews. As such the proposed scheme is based upon a sound assessment of the options and is the solution best able to meet the defined objectives.

12.3 Matter 4a

- 12.3.1 I have also addressed Matter 4a: the effect on East West Rail land safeguarded for the construction of a new railway between Bedford and Cambridge and the upgrading of existing railway between Oxford and Bedford.
- 12.3.2 As I discuss in Section 9.1 there is ongoing dialogue between EWR and CCC with the view to agreement of SoCG. Whilst a final agreement can only be resolved once EWR's requirements are known, the parties are working towards a Collaboration Agreement to cover the interface.
- 12.3.3 Therefore EWR and CCC will be in a position to agree a final interface design without detriment to either party. As such the scheme would have no adverse impact on East West Rail.

12.4 Matter 6b

- 12.4.1 I have summarised the assessment of the balance between scheme benefits and the impacts of compulsory purchase powers. Thereby addressing, in part, Matter 6b: Whether the purposes for which the compulsory purchase powers are sought are sufficient to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected (having regard to the Human Rights Act 1998).
- 12.4.2 I have also noted that this assessment has been reviewed and accepted by the GCP Executive Board and Full Council of the County Council.

12.5 Matter 6c

- 12.5.1 I have explained that the Funding Statement **[CD1-07]** issued in support of the TWAO sets out the sources of funds for the project.
- 12.5.2 This comprised the core funding of £500 million City Deal along with additional Section 106 funds. The allocation of funding is confirmed at each stage (SOBC, OBC, FBC) of the Green Book process by the Executive Board and the overall budget allocation is documented in the Quarterly Reports received for review by the Board.
- 12.5.3 As such the finance of the scheme is not a barrier to delivery and no other impediments have been identified.

13. STATEMENT OF TRUTH

The evidence which I have prepared and provide in this Proof of Evidence is true and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.