TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992 ("TWA"): THE PROPOSED CAMBRIDGE COUNTY COUNCIL AND GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE ORDER

Rebuttal Evidence

James Littlewood, Chief Executive of Cambridge Past, Present & Future

On behalf of

Cambridge Past, Present & Future and Coton Parish Council

Cambridge Past, Present & Future
Wandlebury Country Park
Cambridge
CB22 3AE

Coton Parish Council
Coton village Hall
56 High Street
Coton
CB23 7PL

1. Rebuttal evidence: CD26-01-APP-W10-1

1.1 The rebuttal evidence in this section pertains to Ralph Lewis's Proof of Evidence [**CD26-01-APP-W10-1**] submitted by the Applicant.

Ministerial Letter

1.2 At §5.3.22-5.3.30 of his proof, Mr Lewis assesses the Ministerial letter from Matthew Pennycook MP and concludes that he has given it a high weight of significance in his assessment. However, the letter is, as Mr Lewis describes, 'of political intent', it is not backed up by any plan or any resources to deliver any development and accordingly it should be given very little weight in any assessment. To evidence why, in late August 2025 the government announced that it has withdrawn a grant of £277m which had been offered to Cambridge to enable the creation of a significant new housing and commercial development on brownfield land in North East Cambridge, a development that was a key component of the Emerging Local Plan and on which £80m had already been invested. As a consequence of the government's decision, this development will no longer proceed. The action of government in this instance is at odds with the Ministerial letter from Matthew Pennycook MP and highlights that political intention alone should not be a basis for judgement on planning matters.

1.3 Nevertheless, as has been set out in the evidence of Mr Johnstone, Mr Leigh, Mr Woodfield and Ms Hurst, the CPPF Alternative would also meet the requirements of the Ministerial letter from Matthew Pennycook MP, and in particular that it is more environmentally responsible than the Applicant's scheme and because it represents a significantly better BCR and therefore value for money for the government.

Adopted Local Plan Policies

1.4 At §5.7.9 of his proof, Mr Lewis states that the Applicant's scheme 'avoids intrusion into key local features such as Madingley Wood and Coton Countryside Reserve.' This is not correct, the applicant's scheme will pass through Cambridge Past, Present & Future land which the charity wishes to incorporate into Coton Countryside Reserve, this is evidenced by the land ownership map submitted in my proof of evidence [**CD26-10-W1-1 page 3**].

Response to Delivery Mechanisms and Technology

1.6 At §10.1.19 of his proof, Mr Lewis assert that the maintenance and emergency track is required for essential maintenance of lighting. However, there is no lighting proposed for the

busway. Lighting is proposed for the bus stop at Coton and possibly some road junctions, but these can all be accessed via the road network.

Witness Declaration

1.7 The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this inquiry in this rebuttal evidence is true, and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.