DfT Ref: TWA/25/APP/01

Document Ref: CD27-01 APP-W2-01

The Cambridge South East Transport Order

Cambridgeshire County Council

Transport and Works Act 1992

Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004

Inquiry into:

THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT ORDER

PROOF OF EVIDENCE of

Jo Baker BSc(Hons), MSc, FCILT, FCIHT, ACGI

of Greater Cambridge Partnership

In respect of Strategic Need for the Scheme

On behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council

10th November 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: DPI/E0535/25/7

CONTENTS

Section **Page**

1. INTRODUCTION ... 3
1.1 Qualifications and Experience ... 3
Matter 1: The aims and objectives of, and the need for, the Scheme. ... 5
Matter 2: Whether all statutory procedural requirements have been complied with. ... 5
Matter 3: The main alternative options considered by CCC and the reasons for choosing the preferred option set out in the Order. ... 6
The cost of the Scheme and overall benefits. ... 6
Matter 4c: The potential disruption to, and effects on the safety and wellbeing of users of, non-motorised routes such as cycleways, footpaths and bridleways. ... 6
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). ... 6
Matter 6c: Whether there are likely to be any impediments to CCC implementing the Scheme, including the availability of funding. ... 6
2. THE CITY DEAL AND GOVERNANCE ... 7
2.1 Greater Cambridge Partnership ... 7
2.2 The Combined Authority ... 7
2.3 Accountable Body ... 8
2.4 Greater Cambridge Development Corporation ... 8
2.5 Governance Changes ... 9
3. NEED FOR THE SCHEME ... 10
3.1 Strategic objectives ... 10
3.2 Transport Context and Constraints ... 10
3.3 Economic Context and Constraints ... 13
3.4 The Cambridge Phenomenon and City Deal ... 14
3.5 Opportunities ... 14
4. SCHEME DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING CONSULTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES) ... 16
4.1 Introduction ... 16
4.2 Consideration of Alternatives ... 16
5. THE PREFERRED OPTION ... 24
5.2 Approach to Bus Guidance ... 24
5.3 Safety ... 25
5.4 Funding ... 26
5.5 Francis Crick Avenue ... 26
5.6 Procurement ... 26
5.7 Change Request ... 27
6. KEY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ... 28
6.1 Statutory Stakeholders ... 28
6.2 Public Consultation ... 28
7. COMPLIANCE ISSUES ... 32
Human Rights Issues and Compliance with the ECHR ... 32
8. REPRESENTATIONS MADE RELEVANT TO MY EVIDENCE ... 33
8.3 Failure to Consult ... 34
8.4 Blue Light Access ... 34
8.5 Impact of CAM Cancellation ... 34
9. CONCLUSIONS ... 40

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 Urban Traffic Control Major Scheme, and the 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 Docklands Light Railway and Jubilee Line, Light Rail Transit proposals for Leeds, Bus Rapid Transit 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 the Cambourne to Cambridge Busway.

1.2.2 Since 2020 I have been contracted by the Greater Cambridge Partnership as the Senior Project Manager responsible for the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and more recently Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) with responsibility for all aspects of the development of the Scheme.

1.2.3 My evidence will cover the background to the proposed CSET guided busway (the Scheme), explaining its context within the Greater Cambridge City Deal, and the lengthy process of consultation and option selection which led to the preferred option which is the subject of this application.

1.2.4 In this context my evidence will cover the extensive consideration which was given to an on-road alternative during this process.

1.3 Scope of Evidence

1.3.1 The topics I address in this proof of evidence are set out below 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

Item	Statement of Matters Text	Coverage through Proof of Evidence	Coverage through Proofs of Evidence of others
1	The aims and objectives of, and the need for, the Scheme.	I explain the background to the Scheme and the policy context within which it sits.	Ms McDade [CD27-01 APP-W10-01] provides further details on the various planning policies which prevail, and Ms Diamant [CD27-01 APP-W3-01] summarises the Outline Business case which addresses this matter.
2	Whether all statutory procedural requirements have been complied with.	I describe the statutory and policy framework governing assessment and decision making.	
3	The main alternative options considered by CCC and the reasons for choosing the preferred option set out in the Order.	I summarise the option selection process and the main factors leading to the preferred option, and the process followed in the development and consideration of alternatives.	Mr Connelly [CD27-01 APP-W4.01] describes the BW4B alternative option Mr Parsons [CD27-01 APP-W7-01] describes the relevant impact of the Preferred and BW4B options Ms Diamant [CD27-01 APP-W3-01] outlines optioneering undertaken through the Outline Business Case.

Item	Statement of Matters Text	Coverage through Proof of Evidence	Coverage through Proofs of Evidence of others
4c	The potential disruption to, and effects on the safety and wellbeing of users of, non-motorised routes such as cycleways, footpaths and bridleways.	I set this issue in the context of wider policy across the County.	Mr Connelly [CD27-01 APP-W4-01] addresses the specific safety of users of non motorised routes.
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 describe Compliance with ECHR and public benefits of the Scheme.	
6c	Whether there are likely to be any impediments to CCC implementing the Scheme, including the availability of funding.	I explain the basis of the funding available to the GCP to enable the delivery of the Scheme.	

1.4 Matter 1: The aims and objectives of, and the need for, the Scheme.

1.4.1 In relation to Matter 1, I explain the context of the Scheme as a part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal **[CD9-02]** and the process which has led to the application prepared by the GCP being submitted to the DfT on behalf of the Applicant, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC).

1.4.2 Also, in relation to Matter 1, I 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.

1.4.3 Specifically, I explain how the Scheme overcomes the transport constraints and how the Scheme complies with transport policy.

1.4.4 I also explain how the Scheme allows the economic opportunities to be realised.

1.5 Matter 2: Whether all statutory procedural requirements have been complied with.

1.5.1 In relation to Matter 2, I explain the governance structure which has been followed in preparation of the application.

1.5.2 From a transport planning perspective, the Assurance Framework follows the appropriate Government requirements such as HM Treasury Green Book **[CD11-21.01**] and DfT Transport Analysis Guidance **[CD13-13.00].**

1.5.3 I also refer to the affidavit and other evidence of compliance with the various processes required by the TWAO Rules **[CD4-17]** and **[CD4-18].**

1.6 Matter 3: The main alternative options considered by CCC and the reasons for choosing the preferred option set out in the Order.

The cost of the Scheme and overall benefits.

1.6.1 I address Matter 3: the rationale for the preferred option and the alternatives considered.

1.6.2 I summarise the option selection process and the main factors leading to the preferred option, and the process followed in the development and consideration of alternatives during that process.

1.6.3 I introduce the preferred option, and I also explain how the Scheme is to be delivered including the approach taken to vehicle guidance.

1.7 Matter 4c: The potential disruption to, and effects on the safety and wellbeing of users of, non-motorised routes such as cycleways, footpaths and bridleways.

1.7.1 I address Matter 4c from the perspective of the wider approach taken for non-motorised modes.

1.8 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).

1.8.1 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 **[CD4-11]).**

1.8.2 I have also noted that this assessment has been reviewed and accepted by the GCP Executive Board and Full Council of the CCC.

1.9 Matter 6c: Whether there are likely to be any impediments to CCC implementing the Scheme, including the availability of funding.

1.9.1 I summarise the funding and procurement for the proposals. In this way I address, in the context of Matter 6c, whether there are likely to be any impediments to CCC implementing the Scheme, including the availability of funding.

1.9.2 I have explained that the Funding Statement **[CD1-08]** issued in support of the TWAO sets out the sources of funds for the project. This comprises a combination of loan and grant finance with outstanding funds to be offset through a combination of land transactions, Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy funding.

1.9.3 As such the finance of the Scheme is not a barrier to delivery and no other impediments have been identified.

Responses to objections and representations

1.9.4 I have addressed a number of issues raised by Objectors in their Statements of Case. Responses to objections are addressed in **Section 8** of this Proof of Evidence.

1.10 Summary of Evidence

1.10.1 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.

1.10.2 I 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 confirms that an on-road alternative has been fully considered during the Scheme development process.

1.10.3 The Design of the Preferred Option is covered by Mr Connelly's Proof of Evidence **[CD-27-01 APP-W9-01].**

1.10.4 The Planning Appraisal of the Preferred Option itself is covered by Ms McDade's Proof of Evidence **[CD27-01 APP-W10-01].**

1.10.5 The assessment of the Preferred Option itself is covered by Ms Diamant's Proof of Evidence **[CD27-01 APP-W3-01].**

2. THE CITY DEAL AND GOVERNANCE

2.1 Greater Cambridge Partnership

2.1.1 CCC 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, CCC and South Cambridgeshire District Council. It is a joint committee of the three Councils, established by CCC under section 102(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 **[CD4-01 Page 123]** and by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council under section 9EB of the Local Government Act 2000 **[CD4-12 Page 18].** 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 CCC's constitution **[CD5-19].**

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 [**CD3-01].**

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 [**CD9-06]** that was agreed between government and the partner bodies when the city deal was signed and subsequently updated as necessary.

2.1.6 Further details of the Governance structure are provided in Appendix 1 to this proof **[CD27-01 APP-W2-02].**

2.2 The Combined Authority

2.2.1 In March 2017, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was created by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Order 2017 ("the 2017 Order") **[CD4-36].** The CPCA became the Local Transport Authority for the area **[CD4-36, Article 8].** Article 5 of the 2017 Order **[CD4-36, Article 5]** provides that there shall be a mayor for the area. A mayor was first elected in May 2017.

2.2.2 Whilst the CPCA is the transport authority for the County, the Devolution Deal **[CD9-03, Page 6, clause 2]** within which it operates confirms that:

2.2.3 *"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"*

2.2.4 This is reflected on **[CD26-02, Page 26]** which states:

2.2.5 "*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".

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

2.2.7 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 **[CD5-01].**

2.3 Accountable Body

2.3.1 CCC acts as the Accountable Body for the GCP. As such, CCC holds funds and oversees payments to delivery partners and suppliers where relevant.

2.3.2 CCC accounts for City Deal funds in such a way that they are identifiable from CCC's own funds and provides financial statements to the Executive Board as required.

2.3.3 All financial decisions are overseen by the CCC Section 151 Officer (S151 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 or their representative attends every Joint Assembly and Executive Board meeting. To ensure transparency and scrutiny they play an active role in providing robust challenge.

2.3.4 Land included in the application for the Scheme falls within the administrative boundary of CCC. As such, and specifically as the relevant Highway Authority, CCC is also a consultee in the application process as defined in the Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2006 **[CD4-18].**

2.4 Greater Cambridge Development Corporation

2.4.1 On 23 July 2026, the Government established the Greater Cambridge Development Corporation as a new statutory delivery body for the area covering the administrative boundaries of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire.

2.4.2 Its role is to work with partners to set out and deliver an ambitious plan for long-term sustainable growth for Greater Cambridge by coordinating the delivery of infrastructure, investment and strategic developments.

2.4.3 It is preparing a study of longer-term opportunities for Mass Rapid Transit in Greater Cambridge and is anticipated to take responsibility for strategic planning but currently has no current direct remit for the delivery of the Scheme.

2.5 Governance Changes

2.5.1 In response to the English Devolution White Paper (16 December 2024) **[CD4-34]** it is likely that the local government 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 GCP 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.

2.5.2 From a transport planning perspective, regardless of any change in governance, the Assurance Framework will remain unchanged and will continue to follow the appropriate Government requirements such as HM Treasury Green Book **[CD11-21.01]** and DfT Transport Analysis Guidance **[CD13-13.00].**

2.5.3 No decision has been made by Government to date. As such, devolution and potential reorganisation is not discussed further.

3. NEED FOR THE SCHEME

3.1 Strategic objectives

3.1.1 The formal proposal for the Scheme is set out in detail in the original Outline Business Case (OBC) **[CD1-19]** which has been refreshed via the following five supplementary addenda which address changes to the Scheme, Government guidance and the level of information available:

(a) Strategic Dimension **[CD1-20];**
(b) Economic Dimension **[CD1-21];**
(c) Financial Dimension **[CD1-22];**
(d) Commercial Dimension **[CD1-23];**
(e) Management Dimension **[CD1-24].**

3.1.2 The OBC sets out 5 Objectives for the Scheme.

Objective 1 - Improve connectivity to employment sites in South East Cambridge and central Cambridge

- Provide improved access to the Granta Park, Babraham Research Campus, Addenbrooke's Hospital, CBC and a number of other employment sites in South East Cambridge; and
- Increase modal options for commuters travelling to and from employment sites in South East Cambridge and Central Cambridge by delivering High- Quality Public Transport (HQPT) and improved walking and cycling routes for users.

Objective 2 - Support the continued growth of Cambridge and South Cambridge's economy

- Deliver journey time savings for commuters travelling by public transport to job opportunities in South East Cambridge and Central Cambridge;
- Improve journey time reliability for users of the A1307 corridor; and
- Provide the transport infrastructure necessary to sustain economic growth.

Objective 3 - Improve road safety for all users of the A1307 corridor

- Reduce the number of accidents at identified accident clusters along the corridor;
- Reduce the number of speed related incidents along the corridor; and
- Improve the safety of crossing movements for cyclists, pedestrian and equestrians.

Objective 4 - Relieve congestion and improve air quality in South East Cambridge

- Encourage use of sustainable transport nodes for journeys through South East Cambridge and into Central Cambridge;
- Enhance quality of life by relieving congestion and improving air quality in South East Cambridge; and
- Relieve pressure at network pinch points.

Objective 5 - Improve active travel infrastructure and public transport provision in South East Cambridge

- Deliver a HQPT offer between Cambridge and Haverhill;
- Increase frequency of public transport services during peak periods;
- Reduce severance for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians; and
- Increase uptake of sustainable transport modes for commuter journeys.

3.2 Transport Context and Constraints

3.2.1 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'. **[CD9-01, Page 7].**

3.2.2 Despite this success there are existing constraints which put in doubt the future growth and success of Greater Cambridge.

3.2.3 The main constraints in transport terms include the following:

- Roads in Central and South East Cambridge are already experiencing congestion, which is resulting in delays and poor journey time reliability for both car and bus users. The highest traffic flows along the A1307 are recorded just south of the CBC.
- With the projected population growth along the A1307 corridor in the next two decades as foreseen in the adopted Local Plans, exacerbated by the potential additional growth anticipated in the emerging draft of the next Local Plan, and the expansion of the CBC and other institutions in South East Cambridge, travel demand along the A1307 is expected to substantially increase. Without attractive and reliable alternative public transport options, this increase in travel demand will likely lead to higher private vehicle volumes and worsening congestion.

3.2.4 These constraints are recognised in a series of policy documents, as outlined below:

3.2.5 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 **[CD9-07],** a sub-strategy of the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan **[CD8-08]** aligning with and informing the Local Plans for Cambridge **[CD8-01]** and South Cambridgeshire **[CD8-02].**

3.2.6 The transport policy objectives of the TSCSC are as follows **[CD9-07, Pages 2-7 and 2-8]:**

(a) To ensure that the transport network supports the economy and acts as a catalyst for sustainable growth.
(b) To enhance accessibility to, from and within Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (and beyond the strategy area).
(c) To ensure good transport links between new and existing communities, and the jobs and services people wish to access.
(d) To prioritise sustainable alternatives to the private car in the strategy area and reduce the impacts of congestion on sustainable modes of transport.
(e) To meet air quality objectives and carbon reduction targets and preserve the natural environment.
(f) To ensure that changes to the transport network respect and conserve the distinctive character of the area and people's quality of life.
(g) To ensure the strategy encourages healthy and active travel, supporting improved well-being.
(h) To manage the transport network effectively and efficiently.

3.2.7 The Scheme is strongly aligned with a number of policies outlined in the TSCSC. The Scheme will seek to cater for the increased travel demand within Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire by:

(a) Enhancing the transport network through provision of a new dedicated public transport route and a new Travel Hub facility as well as improved walking and cycling routes; and
(b) Thereby improving access to opportunity whilst encouraging a shift to more sustainable transport modes.

3.2.8 The Scheme will also contribute to improved road safety as indicated in the Economic Case **[CD1-19, Page 249]** and **[CD1-21, Page 26].** Reducing the proportion of journeys undertaken by car should reduce the number of congestion related incidents along the A1307 corridor. The provision of new public transport routes will reduce the reliance on private vehicle trips to cater for new travel demand, resulting in benefits to the environment and air quality. There are further opportunities for the public transport routes to be serviced by a modern, 'clean' fleet.

3.2.9 The Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) **[CD8-09]** is the Combined Authority's long-term strategy to improve transport in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The LTCP aims to address big transport issues like climate change, pollution, inequality, and public health. It aims to support growth in jobs, the economy, and housing growth while also protecting and improving the environment.

3.2.10 The LTCP **[CD8-09**] was approved on 29 November 2023 by the Combined Authority's Board. The goals of the LTCP **[CD8-09, 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.

3.2.11 The 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.

3.2.12 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport – Supporting Bus Strategy 2023 seeks to achieve the following **[CD8-11, 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.

3.2.13 The Scheme contributes directly or indirectly to all of the aims of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport – Supporting Bus Strategy **[CD8-11]** by creating a new element in the bus network, served by new low emission vehicles, with high-quality infrastructure.

3.2.14 More recently a Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy **[CD9-26]** has been developed by the CPCA. Whilst not yet finalised or adopted, the Interim Draft includes the following as a part of its Short-Term Strategy

3.2.15 "Completion of high-quality public transport and segregated active travel corridors between Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the A11 (Cambridge South East Transport) **[CD9-26 Page 52]";**

3.2.16 The Greater Cambridge Development Corporation is preparing a study of Mass Rapid Transit for Greater Cambridge. That study is due to report later in 2026.

3.2.17 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. A more detailed analysis of the planning policy context and the status of the emerging plan is set out in Ms McDade's proof **[Section 5 of CD27-01 APP-W10-01].**

3.3 Economic Context and Constraints

3.3.1 Ms Diamant **[CD27-01 APP-W3-01**] discusses the economic appraisal of the Scheme in detail but headline matters of economic context are summarised below.

3.3.2 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review Final Report (CPIER) 2018 produced by the Cambridge and Peterborough Independent Economic Commission (CPIEC) found evidence, **[CD9-05, 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.

3.3.3 Despite this success there are existing constraints which put in doubt the future growth and success of Greater Cambridge.

3.3.4 The CPIER **[CD9-05, 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".

3.3.5 Furthermore, the CPIER **[CD9-05, 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"

3.3.6 Similarly**,** The Case for Cambridge 2024 **[CD9-01, 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.

3.4 The Cambridge Phenomenon and City Deal

3.4.1 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 **[CD9-02, 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."

3.4.2 Subsequently, the City Deal for Greater Cambridge was complemented by the wider Devolution Deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough in 2016. The Devolution Deal covers similar topics to the City Deal albeit at a more strategic level [**CD9-03, Page 3]**, including:

3.4.3 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 connect passengers and freight between Cambridge, Peterborough, our network of market towns and the rest of the country.

3.4.4 These issues were identified as a national priority by the then Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, Michael Gove, in 2023 whose Vision for Cambridge as reported **[CD11-30]** foresaw 150,000 new houses with a Development Corporation to ensure the necessary infrastructure could be delivered.

3.4.5 The Case for Cambridge 2024 expanded on these issues stating **[CD9-01, 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"

3.4.6 Following the General Election, the new Government 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 **[CD9-16].** Once again, transport was clearly identified as a priority for the incoming Government, with the objective described in the following terms:

"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"

3.4.7 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.

3.5 Opportunities

3.5.1 Ms McDade discusses the planning background in more detail in her Proof of Evidence **[CD27-01 APP-W10-01].**

3.5.2 However, in summary, as set out in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) **[CD8-01]**, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) **[CD8-02]** and Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals (Emerging Plan) 2021 **[CD8-26],** the opportunities for growth in Cambridge are significant.

3.5.3 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 development across both areas up to 2045.

3.5.4 Since the Statement of Case **[CD3-01]** was produced, the Regulation 19 version of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan has been issued [**CD8-26.01**]. This proposes the allocation of land for 4,500 houses and 35,000 sqm of employment at Grange Farm adjacent to the proposed Travel Hub with a further 1,000 homes and 525,000 sqm of employment at the CBC by the north end of the Scheme. The majority of this growth is not considered in the core Outline Business Case **[CD1-19]** or Addendum **[CD1-20 to CD 1-24]** but thereby gives confidence that the assumptions which inform the business case are conservative.

3.5.5 Ms McDade [**CD27-01 APP-W10-01]** discusses the Local Plan in her proof.

4. SCHEME DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING CONSULTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES)

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 In this section of my proof I explain the historic development of the Scheme, including engagement undertaken on a number of alternatives before the preferred option is selected. I also summarised the key decisions which were made under the necessary governance processes. Compliance with the statutory processes required by the Transport and Works Act for submission of the application is confirmed in the affidavit **[CD1-26.09]** and the various notices required **[CD1-26.01 to CD1-26.08]**, as well as in the Compliance Note **[CD21-24].**

4.1.2 The paragraphs below provide a summary of the process followed. Importantly they record the extensive consideration which has been paid to the provision of an on-line option throughout the process of Scheme development. Details of the appraisal are contained within the OBC **[CD1-19 to CD1-25]** and OAR **[CD1-15.02]** and set out in Ms Diamant's evidence **[CD27-01 APP-W3-01].**

4.1.3 Section 3 [Page 10] of this Proof of Evidence sets out the need for the Scheme which informed the parameters of the Scheme, objectives of the Scheme and thereby the options considered in this Section.

4.2 Consideration of Alternatives

4.2.1 Throughout Scheme development a comprehensive set of alignment options have been considered and evaluated against Scheme objectives. This process is documented in the Outline Business Case [CD1-19].

4.2.2 As such, the route alignment that has been taken forward for the Scheme has been subject to an extensive process of optioneering and refinement, which has been developed over the course of several years. Concepts have evolved from a long list of wider themes and strategies for the corridor to short-list options through rounds of refinement to bring forward the interventions. These were chosen as they were considered the best performing and most appropriate to meet the objectives set out for the Scheme [CD1-19, Page 126]. Rounds of public consultation have taken place in line with key decision points and sifting of these options which helped to inform the evolution and design of the Scheme to its current state.

4.2.3 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 [CD13-14].

4.2.4 In summary, in order to identify a preferred option, shortlisted options were appraised from multiple perspectives, utilising three mechanisms:

4.2.5 Mott MacDonald's in-house Multi-Criteria Assessment Framework INSET, (Investment, Sifting and Evaluation Tool) a quantitative and more detailed qualitative assessment of the shortlisted options was undertaken to aid in the identification of the preferred option. A detailed account of this process can be found in the Options Appraisal Report **[CD1-15.02 Page 20].**

4.2.6 Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) calculation and Value for Money (VfM). A detailed account of this process can be found in the Economic Case of this OBC.

4.2.7 Consultation Feedback: based on public consultation held during the autumn of 2019. A summary of the consultation process and the subsequent feedback can be found in the Management Case of the OBC.

4.2.8 It was concluded that the preferred option was the best performing in terms of both route alignment and Travel Hub site, performing best both under the INSET appraisal process, which assessed options against a total 92 criteria under 7 themes, and at public consultation.

4.3 A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge - Preferred Options Report (February 2017) [CD12-03]

4.3.1 The decision to initiate a "study of the A1307 Corridor to include bus priority/A1307 additional Park and Ride" was made by the Executive Board (EB) on 28 January 2015 **[CD5-02].**

4.3.2 The early development of options commenced in 2015/16, where the Scheme was initially defined as the Three Campuses to Cambridge project. A Draft Concepts Report **[CD12-13]** was reviewed by the EB on 3 March 2016 where it was agreed to discount either reopening of the railway or creation of a busway all the way to Haverhill **[CD5-03] and [CD5-04]** on the basis that the options could not be delivered through available funding and would not deliver value for money.

4.3.3 Initial optioneering outcomes were presented within the A1307 Haverhill to Cambridge Preferred Options Report [**CD12-03**] published in February 2017 and reviewed by the EB on 8 Marc 2017 **[CD5-05].** Whilst the options report was accepted the EB requested that further public consultation was delayed until a series of workshops had been held involving the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) to review and develop the high-level options previously generated. The early work on the Scheme focussed on appraising a variety of high-level option themes for the South East Corridor. These included:

- Park and Ride (P&R) including redevelopment of the existing Babraham Road P&R site or a new site at the A11 near Fourwentways.
- Bus Rapid Transit including several on- and off-highway routes between CBC and a new A11 Park & Ride or bus priority measures.
- Walking and cycling routes including on- and off-highway paths from Granta Park and a new P&R facility at the A11 to the CBC and Linton.
- Various other interventions, including public realm, bus stop accessibility and road safety improvements.

4.3.4 Prior to public consultation, several options were discounted. This included the potential of reopening of the railway line along with several road options (which included the dualling of the A1307 and a Linton Bypass) as they were considered to be outside of the scope of the study.

4.3.5 A P&R study was completed in Section 3 of the report [**CD12-03, Pages 27-45**], which affirmed the need for the Travel Hub at the A11 as opposed to the current location at Babraham.

4.3.6 The draft preferred option report recommended the following Scheme options were taken forward for further development and assessment:

- Widening of the existing A1307 carriageway to create a new on-highway westbound bus lane between the existing Babraham Road P&R site and Addenbrooke's Hospital, coupled with widening of cycleways within the northern verge to improve connectivity to the P&R site for NMUs. Junction improvements at Worts Causeway junction to create a bus only bypass lane and changes to Granham's Road junction to facilitate right turning movements [**CD12-03, Page 106**].
- A new bus only road to improve bus connectivity with the CBC site and reduce bus journey times to Cambridge station and Central Cambridge [**CD12-03, Page 107**].
- Installing a section of busway within the A1307 central reserve on approaches to the junction and through the central roundabout island to create a 'Hamburger' bus priority Scheme [**CD12-03, Page 108**].
- Widening of the existing A1307 carriageway to create a new on-highway westbound bus lane from Hinton Way roundabout to Babraham Research Campus [**CD12-03, Page 108**].
- Enlargement of the central island on approach to The Gog Farm Shop junction, seeking to improve road safety by creating a staggered layout and reducing vehicle speeds on approach [**CD12-03, Page 109**].
- A new P&R site to the south of the A1307 either west or east of the A11 junction in addition to the existing Babraham Road P&R facility. The existing facility would become more Addenbrooke focussed with additional cycle parking capacity to support use of the facility as a park-and-stride location from where users can walk onto the CBC campus.

Either option could potentially be coupled with junction improvements at Babraham High Street crossroads and/or A11 services access [**CD12-03, Page 109**].

- Implementation of new cycleways along the existing public footpath alignment to enhance off-road cycle and pedestrian access crossing the A11, connecting the village of Babraham with Great Abington as well as key employment sites at Babraham Research Campus and Granta Park. Ramps could be appended to the existing stepped footbridge to improve access for all and equalities compliance. This would also potentially connect to the proposed A11 P&R site [**CD12-03, Page 110**].

4.4 A1307 Study - Options Report Addendum (November 2017) [CD12-04]

4.4.1 As noted above, in March 2017 the EB asked for a series of workshops to be held involving the LLF to review and develop the high-level options previously generated. The results of this work have been recorded in section 2 within the Options Report Addendum, which was published in November 2017 [**CD12-04, Pages 16-22**].

4.4.2 Established as part of the City Deal structure, the LLF, details on which can be found in the LLF Terms of Reference **[CD21-02],** was convened in January 2017 to be a community forum for GCP to refer to as an interface between the community and its major infrastructure projects. The LLF provided support in the development of options through several workshops which sought to review the options presented in the February 2017 initial options report [**CD12-04**]. Additional options that were proposed from members of the LLF were re-tested to check whether they had been discounted prematurely.

4.4.3 The first LLF workshop was held in April 2017. The aim of this workshop was to identify any missing opportunities for sustainable transport interventions along the A1307 corridor and for LLF members to raise any queries about the work which had been undertaken to date. This identified an early set of schemes from a range of over 200 comments that were filtered and provided a set of new ideas.

4.4.4 A total of 49 options were developed and taken forward to the next workshops. As in the February 2017 Preferred Options Report, early sifting discounted several projects, which were again dismissed. These included:

- the Linton Bypass, which was considered for another study [**CD12-04, Page 18, Section 2.4**];
- rail based options, due to high cost and the delivery timescale exceeding the requirements of this project [**CD12-04, Page 18, Section 2.4**]; and
- several road-based schemes that were not considered relevant to the area or were outside of the scope of GCP to deliver [**CD12-04, Page 18, Section 2.4**].

4.4.5 Following the LLF scoring process, CSRM2 modelling and option prioritisation using the Scheme Appraisal Framework as set out in the Options Appraisal Report (**OAR**) [**CD1-15.02**], three main strategies emerged as the best performing and most supportive of the eight strategy variants that were considered.

4.4.6 Recommended scheme option components that were identified can be found in the OAR [**CD1-15.02, Pages 48-55**]. These formed part of at least one of the strategies listed below:

- **Strategy 1**: Identified as providing a strategic off-road public transport route between a travel hub site located close to the A11 and CBC. This route would aim to provide connectivity to the settlements of Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford, following the alignment of the former Cambridge-Haverhill railway where possible.
- **Strategy 2**: A segregated public transport route following the alignment of the existing A1307, continuing along a new off-road route through current farmland connecting with the existing CBC road network at the southern boundary of the campus, before continuing through the site and on towards Cambridge city centre via the existing guided busway.
- **Strategy 3**: From Babraham Road P&R site, Strategy 3 would continue along the A1307, accessing the CBC using the existing road network. This route would then follow Robinson Way through the CBC site and onwards towards Cambridge city centre via the

existing guided busway. Strategy 3 would broadly follow the same route between Little Abington and Babraham Road P&R site as in Strategy 2.

4.4.7 The results of this, in combination with consultation with the LLF, identified a preference for proceeding with Strategy 1 as the preferred option. While it was considered the highest cost, this option was also expected to be the most likely to have the greatest beneficial impact on travel patterns. While it was envisioned that there would be an interface with the emerging Cambridge Autonomous Metro system (CAM) initiative, this was considered an additional opportunity over and above the benefits the Scheme itself already offered.

4.4.8 The outcome of the work with the LLF was approved by the EB on 22 November 2017 **[CD5-06]** where a further consultation exercise was agreed. The outcome of that consultation and the adoption of an off-road strategy was agreed on 11 October 2018 **[CD5-08].**

4.5 Shelford Railway Alignment

4.5.1 The autumn 2019 consultation [**CD1-05.08**] considered an alignment that follows the disused Shelford Railway Line. This alignment runs via the former Haverhill railway through Shelford. A comparative assessment of this option was undertaken with the shortlisted options [**CD1-05.16**]. The results concluded that options incorporating the former railway alignment would be less desirable than those which do not. This was for several reasons which included the high number of residential and commercial properties that would need to be acquired, lack of full segregation, incompatibility with CAM requirements (which were relevant at that point in time), longer journey times, greater impacts on noise for residents, higher cost and additional approvals required. Therefore, this option was not taken further.

4.6 Outline Business Case (OBC) (2020) [CD1-19]

4.6.1 The EB agreed a further consultation on 27 June 2019 **[CD5-11].** Optioneering was further refined to develop the 2020 OBC **[CD1-19].** This was conducted through revisiting routes across the entire corridor and looking at a large number of combinations to determine the optimum elements of a mass transit route to connect a travel hub at the A11 with the CBC. Further initial identification and sifting of route alignment options led to the production of 231 option packages [**CD1-19, Page 155].**

4.6.2 The preferred option was developed through a 3-stage process, each stage sifted out from a variety of options to eventually settle on a preferred option that would be taken forward for planning approval.

4.6.3 Assessment of these strategies at the Strategic Outline Business Case[1] **[CD1-19]** stage found that Strategy 1 was the preferred strategy, and therefore it was expected that going forward all potential options would be based on alignment with Strategy 1. However, a review of the assessment process was undertaken at this stage to confirm that this decision was the best outcome.

4.6.4 Details of the alignment options considered can be found from within the OBC [**CD1-19, Pages 149 to 155**]. These included a mix of on- and off-road running options.

4.6.5 141 of the 231 options were sifted out under a gateway assessment, leaving 90 options being brought to the next stage [**CD1-19, Page 156**]. These options underwent a Multi-Criteria Assessment Framework (MCAF) analysis using a bespoke tool, the INSET, developed in line with DfT Guidance [**CD1-15.02, Page 13**].

[1] The Strategic Outline Business Case [**CD1-19**] sets out the need for intervention (the case for change) and how this will meet strategic aims and objectives (the strategic fit). It provides suggested or preferred ways forward and presents the evidence for a decision.

4.6.6 In addition, 11 potential Travel Hub locations were identified and assessed in combination with various options for the busway. This work is summarised in the Options Appraisal Report **[CD1-15.02 Page 65 onwards].**

4.6.7 This exercise resulted in five routes – Purple, Pink, Brown, Black and Blue (shown in **[CD1-15.02 Pages 103 and104]** being assessed within the 2020 OBC.

4.6.8 Further work, including calculation of Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the shortlisted options, was undertaken to support and reconfirm the findings of the INSET assessment. The final INSET results identified the Brown Route as the preferred option for the Scheme. The Brown Route, which is broadly similar to the current proposed Scheme, takes a direct alignment across fields towards the A11 which includes a second crossing of the River Granta. It ends at the Travel Hub located to the south west of the Fourwentways junction between the A1307 and A11. With an INSET score of 1.08, it outperformed other options in terms of transport benefits, deliverability, social impacts and alignment with Scheme objectives. Further details of the results of these findings are presented within the OAR of the OBC issued in 2020 [**CD1-15.02**].

4.7 Preferred Option

4.7.1 The OBC was endorsed by the EB on 25 June 2020 **[CD5-13].** At that time the EB confirmed the decision to commence the TWAO application process. The Preferred Option is described in detail by Mr Connelly **[CD27-01 APP-W4-01]** and discussed further in Section 5.

4.7.2 On 1 July 2021, the EB agreed "the submission of a Transport and Works Act Order application to secure the necessary planning and consents for the scheme". **[CD5-14 Page 15]**

4.8 Consideration of Alternative Subsequent to agreement of Preferred Option

4.8.1 Several additional route options were recommended by consultees during the consultation process. These were considered and assessed to determine how they perform against the Scheme objectives in comparison to the 'preferred option'. This process continued after the agreement of the OBC and decision to submit a Transport and Works Act Order Application.

4.9 Pink Route Variant

4.9.1 Following stakeholder meetings with Babraham Residents in November 2020 during Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultation, a query was raised by the residents regarding why a route alignment option running between the Brown and Pink Routes presented in the 2019 public consultation was not being considered [**CD1-05.10, Page 41**].

4.9.2 The Pink Route Variant (PRV) was therefore assessed as a potential route alignment to replace the Brown Option. This PRV was similar to the shortlisted Pink Route which crossed the River Granta in the same location immediately to the west of the A11 trunk road river crossing. However, the PRV takes a direct route between the Travel Hub and High Street, following an existing field boundary and avoiding land owned by Pampisford Estate, requiring a tighter curve radius relative to the original Pink Route. The PRV was assessed against the Brown Route to determine if there was any merit in adopting the PRV instead of the Brown Route alignment as the preferred route to avoid land acquisition complications around the Pampisford Estate. Further details are presented in the Pink Route Variant Alignment Further Assessment [**CD1-25.12**]. Overall, the Brown Route performed better than the PRV in terms of cost (£905,000 cheaper in construction costs and £2.042 million lower in total cost), Value for Money (a 9%-higher-BCR), and environment (lower embedded carbon and impact on biodiversity) [**CD1-25.12 Pages 9 and 10**]. Therefore, this option was not progressed.

4.10 Impact of Stapleton Retirement Village

4.10.1 Following the approval of a Retirement Village in Stapleford, and with the agreement of the EB on 30 June 2022 **[CD5-16]** a further variation to the Scheme was consulted on in 2022. This realigned the route to the north and the east to avoid the Retirement Village. The proposed bus stop remained more or less in the same place but realigned to reflect the revised alignment of the scheme.

4.10.2 The realignment of the Scheme to avoid the Retirement Village was approved by the EB on 28 Sept 2023 **[CD5-17]** at which meeting the decision to seek approval from CCC to submit a TWAO Application was reiterated.

4.11 On-Road / Off-Road Option Validation Exercise (2022)

4.11.1 In 2022, a review of on-road versus off-road running options was undertaken [**CD1-25.07**]. The aim of this exercise was to revisit previous optioneering work that had been conducted, considering both the options generation process in 2017 (highlighted above) and the 2020 OAR. By following a similar methodology to these earlier appraisals, this exercise sought to check that an updated option evaluation exercise supported the results of the previous optioneering work and that the off-road route remained the preferred option.

4.11.2 This validation exercise was undertaken following the cancellation of the CAM project and receipt of representations from local campaign groups to the Executive Board. The review revisited the strategies previously highlighted and considered these through a modified MCAF. The MCAF closely follows the INSET methodology previously used to inform the 2020 OAR but is not identical.

4.11.3 Criteria were selected based on the five-dimension business case template and scored by relevant technical experts based on available information at the time of assessment. This information was sourced from existing documentation including the 2020 OBC [**CD1-19**], the Environmental Statement (ES) [**CD1-10.02**] and design drawings [**CD1-12**] and informed by professional knowledge and judgement.

4.11.4 The scoring of growth-aligned criteria, which has been emphasised throughout the evolution of the Scheme, showed the merits of the off-road option in delivering the strategic outcomes as well as providing a stronger position on the economic benefits associated with high quality transport infrastructure. The MCAF also showed the off-line option would result in greater adverse environmental impacts and land related complexities. The scores assigned to criteria were weighted in line with the approach taken through the INSET appraisal in 2020 which emphasised the significance of objectives related to growth, given the expectation of enabling growth for CBC and the wider Cambridge bio-science industry through delivering enhancements along the A1307 corridor.

4.11.5 The offline route demonstrated a strong alignment with the objectives as it is expected that it will have the greatest benefit in terms of reducing bus journey times, increasing bus patronage, improving bus journey time reliability and alleviating future private vehicle demand for those using the A1307 to reach Cambridge. Therefore, it performed significantly stronger in meeting the ambitious targets for economic growth of the CBC and Cambridge's fast-expanding science, technology and engineering innovation industries.

4.11.6 While the multi-criteria review of the on-road / off-road option provided a cross-sectional view of the options and the likely impact, this assessment did not reflect the actual extent to which longer-term benefit will be delivered as a result of economic and population growth forecast for the south east of Cambridge beyond the end of the Local Plan period. Cambridge and the CBC are expected to far outgrow the estimates that have been developed under the adopted Local Plan [**CD8-02**] and therefore current model forecasts do not demonstrate the expansion in terms of available employment opportunities in key sectors beyond the Local Plan. Therefore, this document provided a backing to further explore this phenomenon which has now been evidenced in the Future Growth Technical Note [**CD1-25.01, Page 35**] by referencing further committed developments and longer-term growth post-2041. This has

demonstrated the significance of the Scheme in achieving the objectives that have been set out by GCP to achieve high levels of economic, employment and housing growth in Cambridge and across the wider Cambridgeshire region.

4.12 Submission of TWAO Application

4.12.1 The EB agreed on 2 October 2024 that the TWAO submission should be submitted subject to the approval of CCC.

4.12.2 The decision to submit was ratified at a Full Council meeting on the 22 October 2024 **[CD6-01]**.

4.12.3 Following submission on 9 January 2025 a confirmatory motion was passed at Full Council meeting on 11 February 2025 **[CD6-02.21].**

4.13 Consideration of Alternatives Subsequent to Submission of TWAO Application

4.13.1 Whilst no further changes have been made to the alignment of the Scheme subsequent to the Application, other than some changes to the layout of the Travel Hub, and the junction on the A1307, and some minor amendments, all shown in **[CD 24-07]** and discussed on Page 29 of this Proof, some further option assessment has been undertaken to verify the decisions made to date. Specifically that addressed the issue of the comparison of off-line and on-line solutions.

4.14 On-Road Option Technical Note (ORTN) (2025) [CD12-12]

4.14.1 The Applicant's evidence-based assessment of all the potential options for the Scheme identified the preferred option as the best performing option to take forward to this Application. However, there have been continued calls from local campaign groups to assess an on-road alternative design along the A1307 to CBC in place of offline options in general and the Scheme in particular.

4.14.2 Notwithstanding the extensive optioneering process already described, the Applicant has noted the objections received to the Application and the interest in an alternative, suggested by Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) [**CD12-05**] and more recently championed by the BW4B campaign and Cambridge Past Present and Future (CPPF) **[CD3-23.2].** In order to address those objections, the Applicant completed a further quantitative appraisal to review the performance of the on-road option compared to the Scheme. This work was undertaken in early 2025 and has appraised the latest position on that alternative as follows:

- The ORTN has modelled the on-road scheme using the CSRM2 model following the same approach for modelling of the Scheme and following guidance from CCC's modelling team.
- A review and comparison of environmental impacts between the on-road and off-road options was completed as part of the 2025 appraisal [**CD12-12**]. The results showed that while it is acknowledged that the Scheme will have more adverse environmental impacts, Mr Parsons **[CD27-01 APP-W7-01 Pages 7,8]** explains that in some respects such as biodiversity the Scheme performs better than the On-road and in others the impacts are similar.
- Land Ownership and Planning conflicts were identified in **[CD12-12, Pages 32-37]**, primarily along the section between Dame Mary Archer Way and the A1307. There are instances of land within this section which have already been allocated, including a parcel with outline permission for 'clinical land' at one site off discovery drive. The suggested location of the Babraham Express Bus Layby is also situated within land allocated to the Babraham Research Campus Masterplan.

- The alternative would also conflict with the emerging Phases 3 and 4 of the CBC masterplan; accommodating a busway through the centre of this substantial campus development would undermine the growth ambitions of the CBC. The Applicant has been informed by the landowners of the CBC that as part of the recent Reserved Matters planning application for 2000 Discovery Drive and 3000 Discover Drive, the return leg of Discovery Drive has been futureproofed to accommodate the potential Southern Access Road that links CBC Phase 2 to Babraham Road. This alternative proposal would appear to conflict with the illustrative emerging plans for CBC Phases 3 and 4.

4.14.3 Overall, the results of this assessment demonstrate that the Scheme performs considerably better than an on-road option on key operational performance indicators, including: reduction in total vehicle mileage (indicating greater mode shift from car to buses) bus journey times; and bus patronage. It also performs marginally better than the alternative option in absolute terms on journey times for general traffic along the A1307.

4.14.4 Subsequent to this appraisal, the GCP prepared a planning application for an Active Travel improvement to the junction of Haverhill Road and the A1307. This was withdrawn following the advice that the proximity to Wandlebury Country Park and its population of bats, including barbastelle bats, would result in the risk of harm to bats if the junction were to be lit. As discussed by the GCP Executive Board [**CD5-23 Pages 104,105**], the principal concern that there should be no new lighting would be a barrier to an on-line busway as it was considered a requirement to active travel improvements.

5. THE PREFERRED OPTION

5.1 The Preferred Option

5.1.1 The preferred option is a mostly segregated, guided bus route, travel hub and emergency and maintenance access track, which also serves as an active travel path located to the south-east of Cambridge City. It starts at Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC), where it ties into the southern end of the existing Francis Crick Avenue which is a road that will connect the segregated busway to the existing guided busway at the northern end of Francis Crick Avenue. Minor highway improvements are to be made to Frances Crick Avenue to provide for the operation of the Scheme. The route then crosses open countryside within the Green Belt and terminates at a new travel hub facility at the A11/A1307 road junction and southeast of the village of Babraham. There are three proposed intermediate bus stops along the route, at Great Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston.

5.1.2 A more detailed analysis of the business case which led to the recommendation of the preferred option is set out in Ms Diamant's Proof of Evidence **[Section 4 of CD27-01 APP-W3-01].**

5.1.3 A full description of the preferred option is provided in Mr Connelly's Proof of Evidence **[Section 2.2 of CD27-01 APP-W4-01 Page 7].**

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 the Transport and Works (Guided Transport Modes) Order 1992 [CD4-15] to include new guided transport technologies in the Transport and Works (Guided Transport Modes) (Amendment) Order 2022 [CD4-16]. This amendment permits the Scheme to use sensor-based guidance systems that provide vehicle guidance without the need for physical guideways.

5.2.4 Full details of the guidance technology and vehicle design for the Scheme have not been defined at this stage of the project. It is anticipated that the buses will use technological guidance based on the use of sensors rather than physical guidance but will be compatible with the existing busway (buses can be equipped with both sensors and guidewheels) and also able to operate across the wider network in manual mode.

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 [Appendix 2 of this Proof of Evidence] and in 2025 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 (Connected and Autonomous Vehicles) Pilot Scheme in Scotland which has adopted similar technology to that proposed for the Scheme on bus lanes with mixed traffic [CD27-01 APP-W2-02 Appendix 3].

5.2.8 In 2026 bus services using this technology were trialled in the CBC at the northern end of the Scheme, also with funding from DfT.

5.2.9 These vehicles are already running in a fully autonomous mode, in mixed traffic, 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.

5.2.10 For the purposes of the Application the assumption is simply that the vehicles will be self-guided when on segregated busways with a driver being responsible for acceleration, braking, and for steering when on adopted or private highway.

5.3 Safety

5.3.1 Mr Connelly **[Section 2.14 at CD27-01 APP-W4-01]** addresses the safety of the design in his evidence. From a strategic perspective, the position of the Applicant 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 (CGB), and it is important to note that this Scheme differs from that one in two very important regards.

5.3.3 Firstly, as outlined by Mr Connelly the design is materially different in that buses will be able to take avoiding action should a pedestrian or cyclist stray onto the busway, and 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, a rigorous 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 [CD21-10].

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) [CD4-19] for design as an accepted approach which provides the best proxy for the 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 the existing CGB and supervised by an Independent Competent Person. A hazard log is maintained to inform ongoing design.

5.3.7 This process will continue into detailed design and be revisited periodically thereafter to ensure the safe operation of the Scheme,

5.3.8 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.

5.3.9 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 Scheme costs are set out in the Financial Case of the Outline Business Case and Outline Business Case Addendum which is discussed in Ms Diamant's proof [CD27-01 APP-W3-01] Final Scheme costs will be covered in Financial Case of the Full Business Case and subject to review by Joint Assembly and approval by the EB.

5.4.2 CD14-01 sets out the core funding source for the Scheme.

5.4.3 The Funding Statement [CD1-08] 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 EB and the overall budget allocation is documented in the Quarterly Reports received for review by the Board.

5.4.4 Costs associated with the NGT gas pipeline diversion have not yet been confirmed but preliminary estimates are well within the identified continency budget for the scheme whilst it is anticipated that the allowance made for landfill tax will not be required and can be reallocated.

5.5 Interaction with Other Schemes

5.5.1 Maps of Cambridge [CD8-27.03] and South Cambridgeshire (South) [CD8-27.02] appended to Cambridgeshire's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan [CD8-27.01] show the Scheme and its Operation and Maintenance track, which provides a new Active Travel route, in the wider context of the existing and proposed active travel infrastructure serving Greater Cambridge. At its northern end the Scheme connects, via Francis Crick Avenue to the existing network serving the city centre. To the south the Scheme connects to the routes of the Sawston and Linton Greenways which form part of a planning network of improvements to walking and cycling, and, where appropriate, horse riding across Greater Cambridge.

5.5.2 In combination these investments will significantly enhance the ease of movement, safety and wellbeing of users of, non-motorised routes such as cycleways, footpaths and bridleways.

5.6 Francis Crick Avenue

5.6.1 Francis Crick Avenue (FCA) provides connectivity from the existing CGB adjacent to the Astra Zeneca building, to the Addenbrooke's Road Roundabout where CSET works start.

5.6.2 An improvement scheme to FCA is to be provided under a separate contract and permitted development powers (other than consent related to a works compound) and, as such, these works are not likely to be delivered under the Order other than the improvement to the Addenbrooke's Road Roundabout which is to be upgraded under the Order.

5.6.3 A number of objections from organisations based on CBC adjacent to FCA works primarily relate to concerns with regard to FCA. It is anticipated that these matters will be resolved directly and that those objectors will not wish to appear.

5.7 Procurement

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

5.7.2 Options for procurement are set out in the Commercial Dimension Addendum to the OBC [CD1-23, Page 4] 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.

5.7.3 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 exercise will be undertaken once consent is secured.

5.8 Change Request

5.8.1 Following submission of the Application, National Gas Transmission (NGT) issued **CD2-OBJ-370**. GCP continued to engage with NGT but in **CD3-21 OBJ-370 SoC** NGT made it clear that more comprehensive amendments to the Scheme would be required.

5.8.2 As such the public inquiry process was put into abeyance whilst GCP worked with NGT to seek a suitable technical solution. That work has been completed and has informed a Change Request [**CD 24-01]** which requests a series of amendments to the proposals to address identified safety needs along with an assessment of the implications for the Environmental Statement, BNG Assessment and other application documents. These proposals do not alter the alignment of the busway, although some changes are proposed to the layout of the Travel Hub including access from the A1307.

5.8.3 The Red Line boundary of the Scheme is proposed to be varied but this has been agreed with the landowner **[CD 24-01 Page 18**] as well as NGT [**CD24-01 Page 11]**.

5.8.4 During the period of abeyance, GCP continued to work with other objectors, and this enabled some further amendments to be made, addressing concerns raised, amongst others, by the Pembertons, Hobsons Conduit Trust, Corpus Christi College

5.8.5 Following the acceptance of the Change Request [CD 24-01] a number of scheme documents have been amended including the following:

- Draft Order [CD1-02.02a]
- Explanatory Memorandum [CD1-03.02]
- Environmental Statement Addendum [CD1-10-02.01]
- Works and Land Plans including Longitudinal Sections [CD1-11.01.01]
- Cross Sections for Proposed Works [CD1-11.02.01]
- Rights of Way and Traffic Regulation Plans [CD1-11.04.01- CD11.06.01]
- Scheme Location Plan [CD1-12.01.01]
- Proposed Site Plans [CD1-12.04.01- CD1-12.07.01]
- Proposed Site Sections [CD1-12.07.01]
- Construction Compounds [CD1-12.09.01]
- Book of Reference [CD1-13.01a]
- Design and Access Statement [CD1-17.02]
- Transport Assessment Addendum [CD1-18.01.01]

6. KEY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

6.1 Statutory Stakeholders

6.1.1 The Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2006 (the Rules) [CD4-18] set out the procedure for submission of a draft order under the TWA. Schedule 5 of the Rules [CD4-18, Page 57] identifies the organisations that must be served with a copy of the application and supporting documents. Schedule 6 of the Rules [CD4-18, Page 66] identifies those organisations that must be notified. Both Schedule 5 and Schedule 6 parties were consulted at all rounds of consultation.

6.1.2 The Consultation Report [CD1-05-1] 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 [CD1-05-2] explains why these organisations have been included.

6.1.3 All landowners, tenants and others with a known property interest in 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 [CD27-01 APP-W11-01] provides details of ongoing engagement with those parties.

6.2 Public Consultation

6.2.1 A comprehensive set of consultation activities have been conducted throughout the development of the Scheme. These have helped to shape the design options that have been taken forward for this Application. The consultation process and further details on the consultation activities that were undertaken is outlined in Chapter 3 of the Consultation Report [**CD1-05.02, Pages 13-17**]. This included five formal stages of consultation with both key stakeholders and the local community from 2016 to 2022, as well as ongoing stakeholder engagement throughout Scheme development, through individual and group meetings and written consultations.

6.2.2 The purpose of these consultations was to ensure statutory bodies, landowners, members of the public and other stakeholders understood the Scheme and the potential environmental effects. It provided them with a series of opportunities to comment on the proposals at key stages of development and for the project team to ensure these responses were considered as part of Scheme design and construction planning. A list of the Schedule 5 and 6 stakeholders can be found in Appendix B of the Consultation Report [**CD1-05.03**].

6.2.3 Each round of consultation was well publicised to ensure a wide range of individuals and organisations had the opportunity to comment. It was also iterative; issues raised informed the Scheme development and were carefully considered as part of each subsequent round of consultation. Engagement with stakeholders and the wider community has been undertaken, is ongoing and will continue up to and during the Inquiry.

6.2.4 Five formal rounds of public consultation were conducted, as outlined below:

Table 2 Summary of Consultation Rounds

Consultation Rounds	
Round 1 – 2016 [**CD1-05.04-CD1-05.05**]	**Purpose**
A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge Consultation 2016	An initial round of public consultation was undertaken between 16 June and 1 August 2016 to seek feedback on some initial concept options for sustainable transport infrastructure improvements in the A1307 corridor.
Round 2 – 2018 [**CD1-05.06-CD1-05.07**]	**Purpose**
Cambridge South East Transport Study Consultation 2018	Three high-level strategies for more reliable and sustainable public transport options for journeys between Cambridge and the area to the south east were taken to public consultation. This consultation also presented details of 17 shorter-term proposals for bus priority, junction improvements, walking and cycling measures and road safety improvements along the A1307 between Haverhill and Cambridge, common to all strategies and to be delivered in Phase 1 of the Scheme, with the longer-term public transport improvements presented as the three strategies to be delivered in Phase 2 (i.e. CSET2).
Round 3 – 2019 [**CD1-05.08-CD1-05.09**]	**Purpose**
Cambridge South East Transport – Better Public Transport Project Consultation 2019	The consultation presented travel hub options, proposed stops and shortlisted route alignments for the Scheme. Following the 2019 public consultation, the Executive Board approved the Brown Route as the preferred option.
Round 4 – 2020 [**CD1-05.10-CD1-05.11**]	**Purpose**
Cambridge South East Transport Phase 2 EIA Consultation 2020	The consultation presented information on the proposed Scheme design, highlighting refinements since the previous consultation and providing justification for those changes. It identified potential environmental impacts, both positive and negative, set out the proposed measures for mitigation of adverse impacts and provided an opportunity for all stakeholders to comment and give their views on the proposals.
Round 5 - 2022 [**CD1-05.13- CD1-05.14**]	**Purpose**
Cambridge South East Transport Phase 2 Proposed Route Change in Stapleford Consultation 2022	After the 2020 consultation, proposals for a retirement village in Stapleford were approved on appeal by the Government's Planning Inspectorate. Therefore, amendments had to be made to the proposed route and the location of the Stapleford bus stop, to avoid the retirement village. A targeted consultation was held in Stapleford where two route change options were presented.

6.3 Key consultation outcomes

6.3.1 The aim of the formal consultations was to enable stakeholders to participate in the Scheme evolution and 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 consultations, letters and/or emails were sent to a wide range of groups and individuals with information on the Scheme and invitations to public exhibitions or online meetings. This included contacting MPs, local councillors, landowners and the key statutory stakeholders to keep them informed and invite them to take part in the consultation.

6.4 Key changes to the Scheme

6.4.1 Following the five consultation stages, option assessment stages and continuous engagement, points raised by consultees and ongoing engagement with key stakeholders informed design refinements of the Scheme. These refinements include:

- A new scheme design for FCA. Buses will now run on the existing carriageway and the roundabout will be enlarged with a northbound bus cut through.
- A revised proposal for the existing path to Nine Wells LNR, which will provide access from the Emergency and Maintenance Access Track and under the proposed Hobson's Brook structure.
- An alternative alignment around the Stapleford Retirement Village.
- The spans of the Stapleford and Babraham River Granta structures have been reduced. The height of the Babraham structure was also reduced, minimising the footprint of the approach embankments and the visual impact of the Scheme.
- The drainage strategy and design required additional conveyance swales to be positioned alongside the Guided Busway to convey water to the identified outfalls within the drainage strategy.
- Guided Busway speed limits have been revised at junctions with the existing highway network from 20mph to 30mph, to preserve journey time benefits.
- Where the Guided Busway runs alongside the railway line, high containment vehicle protection has been specified following an updated Vehicle Incursion Risk Assessment and Road Restraint Risk Assessment update.

6.5 Local Liaison Forum

6.5.1 GCP set up the LLF for the Scheme in 2017. It was recommended by the GCP Executive Board to engage with 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.

6.5.2 Its members included representatives of parish councils, local district and county councillors as well as representatives from local residents' associations and other local organisations. LLF meetings are summarised in the Statement of Community Involvement in Appendix A **[CD1-05.02, Page 33].**

6.5.3 The project team held regular meetings and workshops with the LLF group. The LLF provided feedback which was taken into consideration as part of the evolving Scheme design.

6.6 Working Groups

6.6.1 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.

6.6.2 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 **[CD1-05.01, sections 3.3.7 to 3.3.10]**.

6.7 Parish Council Meetings

6.7.1 GCP have attended Parish Council meetings on an ad hoc basis since the beginning of the project. Several meetings were attended in autumn 2020 to highlight the forthcoming EIA consultation, to provide an update about the progress of the Scheme as well as forthcoming activity and planned progression to completion.

6.7.2 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 CSET stakeholders and objectors such as CPPF.

6.8 Consultation on Change Request

6.8.1 As discussed in [CD24-01] a number of minor amendments were made post submission and discussed in a Change Request submitted on 8 October 2026 and subsequently accepted by the Inspectors.

6.8.2 The first amendment responded to a concern raised by National Gas Transmission, and had a modest impact on Chieveley Park Farms. The other two amendments specifically addressed concerns made by Hobsons Conduit Trust, the Pembertons, Corpus Christi and Deal Land. All are limited in scale and do not alter the alignment of the proposed busway.

6.8.3 Change 1 is the only change which increases the Order limits. It has been made with the express, written consent of the relevant landowner (Cheveley Park Farms), and has been made in collaboration with, and agreed by, the owner of the affected utility, National Gas Transmission (NGT).

6.8.4 Change 2 has been made to respond to concerns raised by Hobson's Conduit Trust, who were consulted on the change in advance of submission of the Change Request, as were the relevant landowners (the Pembertons) as well as the adjacent tenants (Prologis).

6.8.5 Change 3, which reduces the Order limits, has been made in response to and with the consent of the affected landowners (Corpus Christi and Deal Land).

6.8.6 None of the changes reduce the effectiveness of the mitigation or remove benefits which would otherwise be delivered by the Scheme. Neither do they give rise to new or different environmental effects from those assessed and reported upon in the Environmental Statement.

6.8.7 The Applicant also considered whether consultation with statutory bodies or interest groups should be undertaken before the Change Request was submitted. Greater Cambridge Planning Services were consulted on all three changes in their capacity as local planning authority, and no concerns were raised by them.

6.8.8 In respect of Change 1, both Historic England and the County's Historic Environment Team were consulted on the proposals in relation to potential impacts of the underground utility diversion on archaeological features, and neither raised any concerns. In addition, the Public Rights of Way team at the County Council were also consulted on the potential temporary impacts to public

rights of way and, again, no concerns were raised. The new junction arrangements for the Travel Hub on the A1307 are in close proximity to the A11, for this reason, National Highways and the County Council in its capacity as local highway authority were also consulted on this change, and no concerns were raised.

6.8.9 In relation to Change 2, HCT was consulted on the changes which were made to address its specific concerns which they subsequently confirmed they support [**CD23-03]**. The only other potentially affected party for Change 2 is Network Rail, which used a track running to a temporary compound to the south of the proposed busway during construction of the Cambridge South station. This track is proposed to be re-aligned as a result of the relocation of the ecology ponds. The Applicant consulted Network Rail on this re-alignment.

6.8.10 Network Rail confirmed it has no objection to the change, on the basis that it no longer required the use of the temporary compound (and therefore the track) following completion of construction works for the Cambridge South station.

7. COMPLIANCE ISSUES

7.1 Human Rights Issues and Compliance with the ECHR

7.1.1 Whilst the CSET Scheme may have an impact on individuals, CCC 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 Scheme, as set out in the documents which comprise the OBC [**CD1-19 to CD1-24]** outweigh any harm to those individuals. The Draft Order[**CD1-02.02a]** strikes a fair balance between the public interest in seeing the Scheme proceed (which is unlikely to happen in the absence of the CSET Order) and the private rights which will be affected by the making of the Order. Namely the Scheme, if it proceeds, will enable the growth of South-East Cambridge including delivery of employment land and 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.

7.1.2 The case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition powers included within the Draft Order has therefore been demonstrated in the OBC **[CD1-19 to CD1-24].** The land included over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought as set out in the Draft Order **[CD1-02.02a]** and shown on the Works and Land Plans [**CD1-11**] is the minimum necessary to ensure the delivery of the Scheme. The 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.

7.1.3 The recommended procedures have been followed for both the consultation on the Scheme and for the determination of the compulsory acquisition powers included in the Draft Order. Throughout the development of the 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 CBRE has been commissioned as property agents to endeavour to engage with land interests.

7.1.4 Feedback from stakeholders including those with a 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 Scheme. Examples of design changes are provided within the Consultation Report November 2024 **[CD1-05.01 Page 79]**. Further changes made post submission which also respond to stakholdes are discussed in the Change Request **[CD24-01].**

7.1.5 An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared [**CD1-16.01]** and this forms a part of the Environmental Statement **[CD1-10.01]** which will be discussed by Mr Parsons **[CD27-01 APP-W7-01].**

7.1.6 From a governance perspective this matter has been given due consideration by the Full Council of CCC which approved and ratified submission of the TWAO, as shown in the Council Minutes of 22 October 2024 [**CD6-01.11]** and the Council Minutes of 11 February 2025 **[CD6-02.21].**

7.1.7 Some additional land has been added to the Scheme boundary to enable the completion of the NGT diversion. That will comprise buried works which means the landowner's right to enjoyment of their land is not compromised post completion and, in any case, the landowner has confirmed their agreement to this [**CD24-01 Page 18].**

7.2 Compliance with Legislation

7.2.1 All relevant legislation pertaining to submission of the TWAO application and public inquiry has been complied with other than some minor delays in service of specific documents which were discussed at the PIM. An affidavit summarising activity leading to submission is provided as **[CD1-26.09]** and a further note summarising preparation for the public inquiry including the change request has also been prepared **[CD21-24].**

8. REPRESENTATIONS MADE RELEVANT TO MY EVIDENCE

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This section seeks to provide a direct response to those representations relevant to my Evidence.

8.2 Representations by CPPF, BW4B, Magog Trust and Hobson's Conduit Trust [CD2-OBJ-440]

8.2.1 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 properly consider the on-road option promoted by Cambridge Past, Present and Future, Better ways for Busways, Magog Trust and the Hobson's Conduit Trust (HCT) **[CD3-23.2 OBJ-440 BW4B Alternative Proposal]**. This is also referenced in Mr Kingsley **[CD3-03 OBJ-64]**, Mr Reeve **[CD3-14 OBJ-04]** and Mr Gardener's **[CD3-13 OBJ-02]** Statements of Case. HCT suggest this **[CD2-OBJ-435 Page 12].** Mr Turnbull-Jones **[CD3-041 OBJ- 09]** also argues similarly**.** It is also referred to in a late Objection **[CD2-OBJ-468]** from J Bryant.

8.2.2 BW4B suggest **[CD3-23.1 OBJ-440 Page 2]** that the Applicant has failed to consider their proposals properly in the light of the cancellation of the CAM and other changes.

8.2.3 The main issues raised relate to the suggestion that the development of the Scheme has failed to consider what BW4B suggest is a viable alternative on-road option.

8.2.4 In reality, the decision to proceed with the Scheme has followed an extensive optioneering process over several iterations, from generating overall themes, development of alternative options and routes through to selection of a preferred Scheme. Options considered were subject to detailed multi-criteria assessment, public consultation exercises and informed by strategic modelling.

8.2.5 The decision to proceed with the Scheme as a preferred option was a result of its strength in delivering against the stated Scheme objectives compared to alternative options, especially supporting economic growth opportunities. This process included evaluation of on-road options in 2017, 2020 and in 2022 when these options were discounted in favour of the preferred Scheme. Nonetheless, following submission of the Application for the TWAO, a further detailed appraisal of the on-road alternatives produced by SCT and championed by CPPF was undertaken by the Applicant to quantify its key performance metrics for direct comparison with those for the preferred Scheme. This assessment followed the same approach as the Economic Dimension Addendum [CD1-21] which has allowed for a direct comparison between the Scheme and the on-road alternative option.

8.2.6 The argument that GCP has failed to consider the on-road alternative proposed by BW4B is incorrect. Whilst BW4B's proposed route as proposed in their Statement of Case [CD3-23.2 OBJ-440], and based on earlier work from Smarter Cambridge Transport [CD12-05] was loosely defined and not safe or deliverable, GCP has very clearly assessed the options, and that process is extensively documented in the OAR [CD1-15.01 Page 43-51] which support the OBC.

8.2.7 Mr Gardner takes issues with the extent of evaluation of the on-road option and suggests errors in the overall approach but fails to set out the basis for his concerns. As Ms Diamant [CD27-01 APP-W3-01] and Mr Shipley [CD27-01 APP-W5-01] explain, the modelling and appraisal process has followed DfT requirements and is robust whilst Mr Gardner has not offered any evidence to the contrary.

8.2.8 Mr Turnbull-Jones [CD3-041 OBJ- 09] appears to suggest that as well as failing to consider the on-line alternative, the existing bus service is adequate. This does not accord with the views of multiple objectors including BW4B [**CD3-23.1 OBJ-440 Page 1].**

Failure to Consult

8.2.9 Mr Gardner **[CD3-13 OBJ-02]** suggests that there has been a failure to consult. The basis for this is unclear given that extensive consultation has been undertaken and is documented in the submitted Consultation Report **[CD1-05.01]**. Mr Gardner appears to suggest that consultation has not taken place but offers no evidence to support his assertion. This is clearly incorrect.

8.2.10 Moreover, as indicated in **[CD1-05.01, Pages 30, 39, 40]** on-line options were very clearly considered within the first 2 (2016, 2018) rounds of consultation.

Blue Light Access

8.2.11 Concerns have been raised by CUH and others [**CD3-06 OBJ-466 SoC]** that the proposals might impede Blue Light services. Once the Scheme is operational there should be no direct impact other than that improved public transport will help to manage road congestion. During construction there will be a periodic need for traffic management measures to ensure that works can be delivered safely and efficiently but the maintenance of Blue Light Access at all time will be a paramount priority and the Applicant will ensure that CUH are briefed on any potential impacts. As Mr Connelly will explain [**CD27-01 APP-W9-01 Page 16**], obligations on the Contractor to maintain “blue light routes” around the medical campus will be included as requirements in the CoCP (draft [**CD1-10.07, Page 33**]) and CEMP (draft [**CD1-10.08, Page 21**]) for the delivery of the construction works.

8.2.12 Moreover should a major incident occur off-site which triggers extensive Blue Light Activity the Applicant will seek to halt any activity which might impede access.

Impact of CAM Cancellation

8.2.13 The Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) was a concept advanced by the CPCA under a previous administration. It was never a committed proposal and the details beyond the principle of a series of tunnels beneath Cambridge connecting to radial routes were never finalised. The concept was never funded and was cancelled after the May 2021 Mayoral elections.

8.2.14 The impacts of CAM on the Scheme were only considered during the 2020 OBC. At the time of the Options Reporting in 2018, CAM was considered an opportunity in addition to the proven benefits of the Scheme. Some benefit was attributed to the future-proofing opportunities of CAM compatibility in the 2020 appraisal [CD1-15.02, Page 120] but this simply reflected the degree of segregation which, of course, remains a valid benefit. The economic appraisal did not consider CAM, which was never a committed scheme, and which was not ever clearly defined.

8.2.15 Since CAM was cancelled, the Scheme options have been re-tested as discussed in [CD1-21] the Economic Dimension Addendum and further in Ms Diamant’s evidence [CD27-01 APP-W3-01] without the Scheme criteria or Scheme benefits associated with CAM being included, the Scheme remains the most suitable option for the A1307 corridor.

8.2.16 As such neither the proposals for the CAM, nor their eventual cancellation were material in option selection.

8.3 Objections by Prologis and Pembertons

8.3.1 With regards to funding, Prologis and Pembertons note that there is an assumption that revenues will cover operational and maintenance costs **[CD3-17 OBJ-430-433, Page 5]** and **[CD3-25.01 OBJ-444 SoC Page 7]** but offer no comment on the veracity of that assumption.

8.3.2 Prologis do, however, suggest that it would be more affordable to undertake works within CBC under licence rather than through permanent acquisition. The Applicant is engaging with Prologis and other CBC partners to resolve such matters through agreement with compulsory purchase representing a contingency position should agreement not be achieved.

8.3.3 Pembertons make the same point considering the Scheme more widely. The same response applies.

8.4 Representations by Fen Line Users Association, RailFuture EA, M Sullivan [CD3-11 OBJ-325, CD3-08 OBJ256 and CD2-OBJ-469]

8.4.1 Both the Fen Line Users Association and RailFuture East Anglia have raised in their objection that an alternative rail solution should be considered, and this has been reiterated by Mr Sullivan.

8.4.2 The option of reinstating the railway to Haverhill is not considered a feasible or affordable option. The potential to re-open the railway line has been explored on several occasions, including during the options development process for the Scheme, **[CD12-14]** however it was consistently dismissed due to its high cost, and inadequate level of associated benefits. It is also noted that the project was rejected during the recent "Restoring your Railway" fund, where the project was not progressed at Ideas Stage 3 **[CD3-08.2 Page 83].**

8.4.3 The cost estimates for the railway line prepared in 2015 **[CD12-14, Page 37]** were already anticipated at around £400m single track and £650m double track offering "Poor" value for money **[CD12-14, Page 38].** Further, its construction would entail significant engineering complexities, especially since all track and permanent way would have to be fully re-installed. Changes to the alignment would have to be made now that buildings and road junctions (such as the A11/A505 junction at Fourwentways) are located on the former route. Reinstatement would require significant compulsory purchase and the resulting environmental damage to land on the route (as the railway would potentially need to be routed through fields on a new alignment) would be equally, if not more, damaging than what is proposed under the Scheme.

8.4.4 The alternative rail option is unlikely to present a more environmentally friendly option compared to the Guided Busway as is suggested. The alternative rail option would require the felling of a large number of trees which have grown along the disused rail embankment since its use as an operational railway. This would result in a loss of habitats, and disturbance and displacement of species utilising these habitats, as well as an impact to the local landscape. The preferred Scheme retains these trees, avoiding the adverse effects that would result from their loss.

8.4.5 Amongst many challenges, the alternative proposals **[CD3-08.2 OBJ-256 P72]** indicate an assumption that level crossings may be reinstated, notably at Sawston. The Office of Rail and Road's "Principles for managing level crossing safety does not support the creation of new level crossings where there is a reasonably practicable alternative **[CD 13-22, Page 11].**

8.4.6 Promotion of rail or light rail solutions would not be an effective alternative given the likely timescale for delivery of solutions which have neither funding nor consent. The option of a rail-based solution was considered thoroughly by GCP at the very outset of the CSET study and numerous different sections of the original line were identified as now posing a barrier to the restoration of services. This review was documented in the Rail Viability Technical Note **[CD12-14 Chapter 3].**

8.4.7 The objectors take issue with the provision of Park & Ride facilities on the basis of consistency with Sustainable Transport Policy. This argument is not convincing, partly because Policy does include reference to Park and Ride and Travel Hubs **[CD8-09, P32]**, and partly because one of

the challenges in the Greater Cambridge area is to develop policy which ensures access for rural residents who do not have direct access to effective public transport.

8.4.8 They also take issue with the lack of delivery of the City Access programme but the case for CSET has been advanced irrespective of whether any specific City Access programme were to be delivered and is complementary to any future City Access policies as there is a clear need to improve public transport to ensure an efficient alternative is in place before implementation of measures to reduce congestion.

8.4.9 Whilst a Congestion Charge was considered and consulted on as the Making Connections initiative, within the wider City Access programme, this was never an agreed policy and so neither the proposals nor subsequent cancellation influenced Scheme development.

8.5 Representations by West Suffolk Council [CD2-REP-07]; One Haverhill Partnership [CD2-REP-03] and Wellcome Genome Campus [CD2-REP-09]

8.5.1 West Suffolk Council and One Haverhill Partnership have requested that the Scheme is futureproofed to provide for onward connectivity. The proposals do not exclude/preclude any future extension, however the connection is not part of the scope of this particular Order.

8.5.2 As discussed above, the decision not to extend the scheme to Haverhill was made by the EB on 3 March 2016 [CD5-04] where it was agreed to discount either reopening of the railway or creation of a busway all the way to Haverhill.

8.5.3 The inclusion of the Grange Farm site in the Draft Local Plan [CD8-05a] is predicated upon the extension of the guided busway across the A11. Whilst this is not committed it would contribute further to the future-proofing of the potential extension to Haverhill and GCP and its partners are supportive of that.

8.5.4 Whilst the funding available and remit of the GCP precludes the extension of the scheme into West Suffolk at this time, GCP would be happy to work with West Suffolk Council and local partners at the detailed design stage to take on board any longer term opportunities.

8.5.5 One Havehill [CD3-07 REP-3 Page 4] challenge the reduction in car parking spaces from 2,000 to 1,250 car parking spaces. The proposed number of spaces reflects the current demand predictions, and are the basis for this application, but there is potential within the footprint of the Travel Hub for further parking ‘if and when demand justifies’, albeit that that would be subject of a further application for planning consent and is not a matter for the current public inquiry.

8.5.6 Likewise, GCP has prepared an SoCG [**CD23-05]** with the Wellcome Genome Campus and recognises the longer term priorities held by the Campus albeit that these are not directly pertinent to this inquiry.

8.6 Objections by Paul Bristow, Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough [CD2-OBJ-454]

8.6.1 The GCP is committed to working closely with Paul Bristow, the Mayor of 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 EB, at the discretion of the Chair of the EB, in accordance with the EB Terms of Reference [**CD5-01**].

8.6.2 The Mayor refers to the decision to adopt bus franchising which was made by his predecessor in February 2025. His complaint/concern is that he “cannot guarantee the Applicant’s assumed bus service levels on CSET will be viable under future bus franchising arrangements operated by the Authority”. The decision on franchising will be taken by the CPCA which has not objected to the Scheme. Specifically, the Mayor does not have the power to either allocate the necessary funds to deliver franchising or, therefore, to determine the service levels for franchising without CPCA approval. As such he cannot make any guarantee either in favour of, or against the Scheme, and at this stage he also cannot confirm what franchising arrangements may or may not be made.

8.6.3 Moreover, provisions in the CA constitution (in relation to avoiding pre-determination **[CD9-57 paragraph 6.1.1(vi) on Page 33]**), require the Mayor to avoid pre-determination of a position as to whether he would franchise a route on the proposed busway. In reality, as concluded by the Inspectors at the CtoC Public Inquiry "it is likely that a pragmatic approach to bus services and routes that may use the busway would be taken in light of the circumstances at the time" **[CD21-15 Page 191].**

8.6.4 Since the February 2025 decision, the CPCA has initiated an Independent Review into franchising within the constraints posed by the Mayor which have been reiterated **[CD26-03 Page 4].**

8.6.5 As a result the paper taken by CPCA to its Transport Committee on 17 June 2026 [**CD12-19]** confirms that because of a lack of funding resulting from those constraints the process will be undertaken in tranches with further work to be undertaken before the scope of a franchise is clear.

8.6.6 Similarly, with regard to the Mayor's assertions relating to Light Rail, a specific concern was raised at the 22 October 2025 CPCA Combined Authority Board **[CD26-1 Page 2]** regarding references to "light rail" in the draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Growth Plan **[CD8-26.01],** with a member considering it premature without clear evidence on feasibility. The Minutes confirm that "the Mayor clarified that light rail was listed only as one potential option within a range of possible transport solutions. He emphasised that improved transport connectivity would drive opportunity across the region supporting both economic and social outcomes".

8.6.7 The Mayor is clear he is "fully committed to delivering better public transport in this southeastern corridor, while also integrating this into a wider regional network" **[CD3-19, Page 3].** The Scheme provides the potential for improved transport connectivity with a scheme which could be delivered this decade. Light Rail remains at the option appraisal stage and was not pursued by either of the previous Mayors, reflecting the extensive work undertaken **[CD12-15 Page 96]** in 2018 for CPCA. There is no likelihood that any new feasibility work could come up with a different position than that taken in 2018 and, as such, the Mayor's response to the CPCA Board is correct that light rail, however attractive as a solution, is simply an option within a range of possible transport solutions of which the preferred option for CSET is the one best placed to deliver growth on the corridor under consideration. Irrespective of what is stated in **[CD3-19, Page 3]** the Mayor has no "plan" to deliver a light rail network for Cambridge, or to "prioritise an extended route on this southern corridor". As he has confirmed to his Board, he simply has committed to consider light rail within "a range of possible transport solutions". As noted in **[CD3-19, Page 6]** light rail was a manifesto commitment which, however commendable, is not an adopted or funded Combined Authority policy.

8.6.8 In reality the Local Growth Plan **[CD8-26.01, Page 87]** refers to Mass Rapid Transit and not Light Rail, the Scheme having been previously identified as the best performing such solution for the corridor. In line with the clarification provided by the Mayor and noted above, light rail is only referred to in the plan as one option for Mass Rapid Transit, and as a potential solution. The CPCA has made no commitment to delivery of Light Rail either in terms of policy or the allocation of funding for delivery.

8.7 Representations made by the British Horse Society (BHS) [CD3-29.1]

8.7.1 The BHS Statement of Case does not offer any opposition to the principle of the Scheme. It focuses on their aspiration that the Scheme should provide for Statutory Bridleways wherever possible and where this is not possible then the Scheme should be future proofed to enable such provision. Given that the Transport and Works Act does not confer any powers to create infrastructure beyond the busway and ancillary works, this cannot be necessarily be achieved. In line with the existing Cambridgeshire Guided Busway and plans for Cambourne to Cambridge, an operation and maintenance track has been proposed in order to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the busway. This track will be available for active travel use, with the provision of access to and from bus stops by pedestrians and cyclists being a priority. Where equestrian provision can potentially be achieved, between Granhams Road and High Street Babraham, representing a significant proportion of the route length, that has been permitted.

8.7.2 At either end of the Scheme, from Granhams Road to the CBC and from High Street Babraham to the Travel Hub there is no viable onwards equestrian route and the Applicant does not wish to promote trips which lead to unsuitable destinations.

8.7.3 The BHS set out requirements for a soft surface equestrian route. The TWAO confers no powers to provide such a route. Any active travel provision can only be provided by means of a combination of the operation and maintenance track, and the swales. Moreover, the swales are intended to provide scheme drainage, and also to ensure a safe lateral separation between the operation and maintenance track and busway to prevent conflict between buses and other travellers and are not intended to be designed for transit.

8.7.4 The BHS make a number of helpful and detailed points about matters such as safe junction design and diversion routes which will be picked up at detailed design and through the road safety audit process as is conventional.

8.8 Representation made by Network Rail [CD3-16]

8.8.1 Network Rail make a number of comments regarding property matters which Mr Franklin [**CD27-01 APP-W11-0**1] will address.

8.8.2 Network Rail also make a more general point with regards to interaction between the Scheme and the railway network. The parties are working collaboratively to ensure any risk of conflict is mitigated.

8.9 Representation made by the University of Cambridge (UoC) [CD3-10]

8.9.1 UoC raise 4 issues in their Statement of Case:

- Access to research buildings/land/facilities for staff, students and visitors is maintained at all times;
- Drainage of land and buildings is not compromised;
- The Granta Backbone Network is not harmed/impacted; and
- Vibration and electromagnetic sensitive research is not harmed.

8.9.2 Pending agreement the Applicant believes the first 3 matters are now resolved. The issue of vibration is addressed in a note produced by Ms Wills in an Appendix to Mr Parsons proof **[CD27-01 APP-W7-02].**

8.10 Representation made by Miranda Fyfe [CD3-17]

8.10.1 Ms Fyfe raises four broad points. She suggests that as buses have lower capacity than trams or trains, they do not justify investment in bespoke infrastructure. A generalisation like this is unhelpful. Value for money is assessed through a Green Book [**CD11-21.01**] and TAG [**CD13-13.00**] compliant business case **[CD1-19 to CD1-25]** and Ms Diamant [**CD27-01 APP-W3-01**] will explain the justification for the Scheme.

8.10.2 Ms Fyfe also queries the level of reduction in journey time. Whilst average journey time may not be decreased hugely, the busway significantly improves reliability and punctuality, whilst the proposals directly improve matters such as information and waiting facilities. Again, Ms Diamant **[CD27-01 APP-W3-01**] will explain the justification for the Scheme.

8.10.3 Finally, Ms Fyfe raises issues about the ability of the Scheme to resolve city centre congestion and, therefore, its ability to disincentivise car usage, and the fact that the Government has not introduced a road pricing scheme. Self evidently a busway from the CBC to A11 will not solve congestion in the city centre. However the Scheme is connected via Francis Crick Avenue to the existing Cambridgeshire Guided Busway which provides access to Cambridge station without a

risk of congestion. Provision of a new busway will self-evidently disincentivise private car use on the corridor, and thereby may help to reduce congestion. However this inquiry relates to a specific proposal and the relevance of the need for wider action in the City Centre or Government-level action on road pricing is unclear. The latter point is one for the Secretary of State, not the applicant.

8.11 Objection by Mr Reeve [CD3-14 OBJ-04]

8.11.1 Mr Reeve repeatedly asserts that CSET is solely a link from the Travel Hub to the CBC. Whllst this is an important function of the scheme, the advantage of a bus-based system is that buses can continue outwards to Haverhill or other destinations and onward via Francis Crick Avenue and the existing Busway to Cambridge station and the city centre. **[CD3-14 OBJ-04 Page 17]** suggests Mr Reeve may be under the impression buses would terminate at the "west side of Addenbrooke's" rather than proceed to the city centre as is proposed.

8.11.2 Mr Reeve also refers to the potential for Babraham Park and Ride to serve the CBC. This is a valid point in terms of present day demand but does not reflect the planned growth in the CBC and elsewhere in the City and the need to plan to accommodate the Local Plan. It also does not reflect the congestion faced by drivers seeking to access Babraham Park and Ride,

8.12 Representation made by Mr Foote [CD2-OBJ-262]

8.12.1 Mr Foote does not object either to the busway or to the proposed route. [CD2-OBJ-257 Page 1].

8.12.2 He has objected to the Order on the basis of the safety of the use of the EMAT by pedestrians and cyclists, and to the Green Belt appraisal. Ms McDade will address the latter point.

8.12.3 With regards to the safety of the EMAT Mr Foote raises concerns about the interaction of electric bikes and scooters and pedestrians and suggests that a segregated pedestrian path be provided. As the TWAO does not confer powers to create active travel facilities over and above those directly ancillary to the busway, the Applicant is unable to provide facilities beyond that needed for operational purposes. The concern around the interaction of electric bikes and scooters and pedestrians is a reasonable point but the proposed track is significantly wider than the DNA Path Mr Foote refers to. The regulation of electric bikes and scooters is a matter for the Secretary of State and the Applicant has no ability to prevent access by vehicles currently permitted to use cycle routes. The Applicant will seek to prevent incursion by non compliant vehicles under the Powers to Make Byelaws sought in the Order.

9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1 Matter 1

9.1.1 In relation to Matter 1, I have summarised the background to the Scheme and the policy context within which it 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, as well as the need for, the Scheme.

9.1.2 In this context, this Proof of Evidence demonstrates that there is a consensus between GCP and a number of major local objectors regarding the need for public transport and that the need is supported by national, regional and local policy **[CD3-23.1 OBJ-440 Page 1] [CD2-435 Page 12].**

9.1.3 In order to deliver the Project Objectives, it is necessary to provide a high quality public transport scheme, which connects key settlements to a major employment hub whilst minimising the impact on protected sites, such is the case for the preferred route.

9.2 Matter 2

9.2.1 I have described the statutory and policy framework governing assessment and decision making processes, thereby addressing Matter 2 and confirming that all statutory procedural requirements have been complied with other than some minor matters which were raised at the Pre-Inquiry Meeting.

9.3 Matter 3

9.3.1 I have addressed Matter 3: the rationale for the preferred option and the alternatives considered.

9.3.2 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 the supporting OAR. Further explanation is provided by Ms Diamant **[CD27-01 APP-W3-01].**

9.3.3 Whilst I note objectors' assertions to the contrary, the process has considered, in detail, the option of on-line bus priority measures and railway reinstatement as well as the potential for extension to Haverhill.

9.3.4 The outcome of the work undertaken is clear and robust and as the original option development, OBC and OBC Addendum were prepared by three different organisations an additional degree of refresh and scrutiny has also taken place over and above third 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.

9.3.5 No comparable alternative to the preferred route has been proposed by those opposing it. BW4B has submitted a proposal comprising some selective on-line improvement along with a new busway onto the CBC and the proposed Travel Hub. Many objectors have referred to on-line improvements to the A1307 as an alternative but have provided no indication as to how they believe these will be delivered over and above the BW4B proposals. Other applicants have suggested that the Scheme should continue on to Haverhill, possibly on the basis of a restored rail line.

9.3.6 The Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the options in terms what might be deliverable but has concluded that there is no better performing alternative. The preferred route does not preclude further extension to Haverhill or other locations at some future date.

9.4 Matter 4c

9.4.1 Matter 4c is primarily addressed by Mr Connelly in regard to the potential disruption to, and effects on the safety and wellbeing of users of, non-motorised routes such as cycleways,

footpaths and bridleways. I provide context as to how the Scheme contributes to improving active travel across the County, leading to a safer and more efficient environment for non-motorised travellers.

9.5 Matter 6b

9.5.1 In addressing Matter 6b, I describe compliance with the ECHR and the public benefits of the Scheme in order to demonstrate that the purposes for which the compulsory purchase powers 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).

9.6 Matter 6c

9.6.1 I have explained that the Funding Statement **[CD1-08]** issued in support of the TWAO sets out the sources of funds for the Scheme, primarily being a loan from Homes England.

9.6.2 The allocation of funding is confirmed at each stage (SOBC, OBC, FBC) of the Green Book process by the Executive Board.

9.6.3 As such the finance of the Scheme is not a barrier to delivery and no other impediments have been identified.

9.6.4 Whilst the Mayor has indicated his personal opposition to the Scheme, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority has not objected to the Scheme which is identified as part of the draft Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy **[CD9-26 Pages 79,133]** drawn up by the CPCA.

10. STATEMENT OF TRUTH

10.1.1 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 institutions. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

List of Appendices

Appendix 1- GCP governance

Appendix 2- Vehicle Technology