[redacted]

From: Maaike Email [redacted]
Sent: 31 January 2025 20:32
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,

I, Mrs Maaike Wall of [redacted], 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.

My grounds for this objection are:

1. The construction of five miles of new road through open countryside is not needed to deliver transportation improvements - for example, similar economic benefits can be achieved by building a version of the scheme first proposed by in 2018 ie building sections of bus lane adjacent to the A1307 and only one mile of new busway.

2. This alternative would avoid building two bridges over the River Granta chalk stream and putting Hobson's Conduit chalk stream into a culvert and would avoid creating a scar in the Gog Magog Hills landscape, one of the most important landscapes in the Cambridge area and also avoid building a new road through a countryside park, to the detriment of its future users and nature.

3. This alternative would also avoid severing fields close to villages making them vulnerable to future development (unsustainable in the area without a reliable water supply) and further harm to the countryside as well as better serving the planned expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and more of the Campus.

4. Cycle routes in this area are already under construction and Stapleford and Shelford are already served by the DNA cycle path.

5. It is questionable how likely residents of Great Shelford will be to use the proposed five mile busway as the bus stop on Hinton Way is on the edge of the villages uphill and there is a very narrow path to access it and no safe cycle route. (There was a cycle route on the original plan but it was lost with no explanation in a subsequent round of consultation.)

I am not anti-development, but it genuinely feels like the consultation was too narrow and that residents' views (and alternative proposals) were not genuinely considered. It seems a shame to go further without proper consideration of the alternatives.

Many thanks for your time in reading the above.

Regards,

Mrs Maaike Wall

Sent from my iPhone

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