

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2025 20:15
To: TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE
Subject: Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway to the southeast of Cambridge Cambridge

Dear Sir or Madam, I live at [REDACTED] I am writing as I wish to make a formal objection to the "Application for a Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a new busway to the southeast of Cambridge", as submitted by the Cambridge Greater Partnership on 9 January 2025. I have considered their submission and the alternatives identified. My grounds for this objection are the following: The construction of 5 miles of new road through open countryside is unnecessary to deliver improvements in transport. Most importantly similar transport and economic benefits can be achieved by building a version of the scheme first proposed by the applicant in 2018. This would involve building sections of bus lane adjacent to the A1307 and 1 mile of new road (busway). It is therefore unnecessary and perverse to continue with the suggested scheme.

There is a viable alternative would could avoid some of the major limitations of this scheme and at a lesser cost. The alternative would avoid:

- *
building two bridges over the River Granta chalk stream and putting Hobson's Conduit chalk stream into a culvert.
- *
creating a scar in the Gog Magog Hills landscape, one of the most important landscapes in the Cambridge area.
- *
building a new road through a countryside park, to the detriment of its future users and nature.
- *
separating fields close to villages making them vulnerable to future development and further harm to the countryside.

This alternative would better serve the planned expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and serve more of the Campus.

Cycle routes in this area are already under construction and include the Linton Greenway which will connect Cambridge to Babraham, Granta Park and Linton; and the Sawston Greenway that will connect Cambridge to Sawston. Stapleford and Shelford are already served by the DNA cycle path.

I wish my objection to be considered under the necessary legislation and processes.

Yours faithfully,

Ann RadmoreCBE