From: [redacted]
Sent: 08 February 2025 13:01
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

---

To The Secretary of State for Transport.

From

Dr Graham Willis
[redacted]

I am writing 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. The grounds for this objection are the following:

1) The proposed work will destroy greenbelt and historic features.

2) There is no clear economic case for the proposed busway

3)There is no clear environmental case for the proposed busway

4)An alternative route providing the suggested benefits can be achieved by building a version of the scheme first proposed by the applicant in 2018

5) The alternative route is significantly cheaper and would cause far less damage

6) What is the environmental cost and estimated payback of the proposed busway. Namely, the applicant should submit independent figures for the amount of CO2 produced during construction compared to theoretical savings and how long would it take to achieve net zero CO2 on this project. The analysis must include the costs to the public through diversions, disruptions etc and be undertaken before such a proposal can be considered.

7) The extensive developments of the railway south of Cambridge have already caused massive uncontrolled and unnotified disruption to the local community. There was practically no consideration to mitigation of adverse environmental impact of the railway development given. The proposed busway must carry out a full impact assessment on the local community before the application may be considered.

8) The proposal does not account for the human factor. Simply because the busway has a capacity of X passengers per day there is no evidence that it will achieve that estimate. It is clear that any reduction in traffic on the A1307 will reduce the incentive to use the busway. Thus very quickly a point would be reached at which the busway would be underused , the road at a workable capacity , and no gain , only massive costs.

9) No commercial traffic would be able to use the busway. Thus the road would still be heavily used. Commercial vehicles cause more road damage than lighter private vehicles through such mechanisms as Herzian Subsurface stress. As the proposed busway would not reduce the commercial traffic, the existing road would still have a significant maintenance cost.

10) Congestion only usually occurs at peak times, e.g. morning and evening rush hour. It therefore would make sense to encourage local employers to offer flexitime thus spreading the traffic and avoiding the need for a dedicated busway.

11) A much simpler and obvious solution is to provide an effective and integrated bus service along the existing road. This would not require any further construction, other than maybe car parking at terminal points, something which would happen were the busway be given the go ahead. Providing more buses would show

the potential take up of a guided busway. And it follows as clear as day, that if supplying extra buses is not successful, there is no point in building a dedicated bus way. If the extra buses are successful, there is no point in building a dedicated busway. This option must be explored and overseen by an independent organisation before the busway application can be considered.

12) The country cannot afford the cost of the proposed busway. The country is already borrowing heavily, £17bn extra in December 2024 alone. The true cost of this busway is therefore higher than projected.

13) The nearby guided busway overran the budget by several times the initial cost, and the delays were in years. With this record it is simply not acceptable to construct another busway, especially in these dire economic times with a local government claiming to be for the environment.

14) the Local council has recently awarded itself a massive pay rise by working a 4 day week for 5 days pay (i.e. only 80% of the work time). Such regard to public financing suggests that the proposal should not be allowed to go ahead.

15). Where would the busway vehicles be built, If not UK built the proposal result in yet more money lost from the UK economy.

16) There is little if any evidence that the busway would serve the Villages of the Shelfords and Stapleford, it is too far from the residents. This is not an argument for rerouting the bus way, but a clear reason as to why it should be stopped as there is no local gain

17). Cambridge south station is approaching completion. The Addenbrookes campus is a very large employer. The new station is designed to support travel to and from the Addenbrookes campus. The busway proposal should not even be considered until we have several years data on the benefits of Cambridge south station of traffic reduction on the A1307..

18) There is substantial room to improve the traffic management to and from the A1307. For example, the "Addenbrookes" roundabout is not fully traffic light controlled and therefore it is not currently allowed to yellow box the roundabout. Yet any observation at times of increased traffic (rush hour say), shows frequent blocking on the roundabout, vehicles entering the roundabout without an open exit route, thus blocking other vehicles entering or exiting the roundabout. This roundabout is a key if not the key junction on the A1307 in terms of access to and from Cambridge. It would be more than prudent to improve the traffic flow here, say by using smart technology, full traffic lights and yellow box, to improve the traffic flow before any consideration of the proposed busway. This would be significantly cheaper, significantly lower environmental impact , and potentially give benefit to local traffic accessing the A1307 at that point.

19) living in the CB22 post code area my preferred mode of transport in to the city is to cycle (pedal cycle). Yet despite the previous government allocating over £40M for road improvement to South Cambs, the roads are not very suitable for cycling. The A1301, effectively a parallel road to the A1307, is visibly crumbling in and around the city limit. Thus it can be argued the local council is not trying to support more environmentally favourable transport, pushing road users to private cars for the user's safety and comfort, thus increasing private car usage. Local provision for cyclists must be improved before the proposal can be considered.

Sincerely

Dr Graham Willis, [redacted]