

Objection to Transport and Work Act Order to the Department for Transport for a new busway to the southeast of Cambridge

I, Gillian Pett of [REDACTED] am writing to make a formal objection to the “Application for a Transport and Work Order to the Department for Transport for a new busway to the southeast of Cambridge”, as submitted by the Cambridge Greater Partnership on 9th January 2025.

The proposed busway will run through Green Belt at the edge of the village of Stapleford. It will provide little or no benefit to village residents and moreover cause damage to the green open space around the village, further urbanising the area. It is unnecessary when a similar version of the scheme (a bus lane running alongside the A1307), first proposed by the GCP (Greater Cambridge Partnership) in 2018 would achieve very similar transport and economic benefits. The cost of this scheme is more than £100,000,000 in excess of the on-road scheme, and this at a time when public money needs to be spent wisely. It will also allow further encroachment into the green space surrounding the village by creating pockets of land for further development detrimental to the village and environs. There will be frequent disruption to traffic along Hinton Way, one of the main routes for traffic from villages south of Cambridge towards the hospital and biomedical campus as well as other sites in Cambridge, because of the frequency of the planned buses and traffic signals. This will relocate congestion to the neighbouring villages.

The proposed length of the busway is about 5 miles. This does not warrant building 2 large and very visible bridges over the River Granta, creating a scar on the landscape and putting the Hobson's Conduit chalk stream at risk. Chalk streams provide a rare ecosystem and are important for their ecological value. Most of the country's chalk streams are in the south of England, notably in East Anglia

- **Pollution and sewage from agriculture and industry can damage water quality and biodiversity. Water draining off nearby roads and buildings, or runoff, also has a negative impact.**
- **Urban infrastructure development can destroy or fragment the habitats.**

The environmental damage to the countryside will be considerable and irreversible. The chalkland over which this busway will be built is a specifically important area for wildlife. The proposed plan is contrary to many of the policies outlined in the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, as well as the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The bridges, urban style bus stops, and surrounding facilities and car parking will generate light pollution detrimental to wildlife and the surrounding area at the high point of the area, thus visible for some distance.

The proposal for a shared pedestrian, cycle and bridleway alongside the busway does not mitigate the damage to the environment. It will be unsafe and ineffective. Users of electric cycles and scooters are very likely to use this proposed path

travelling at speeds which would be a hazard to slower moving pedestrians. Horses will provide another risk to pedestrians.

Public opinion from the 2016 consultation exercise showed a preference for on road solutions, but despite this the Greater Cambridge Partnership went on to develop an off-road plan. The 2018 consultation produced a split vote between 3 options showing no demonstration of public support for the off-road busway, The on-road bus lane alongside the A1307 was the most favoured route

This proposal is significantly damaging to the environment and the existing Green Belt to the south of Cambridge. There is an alternative route alongside the A1307 which would provide the same and more benefit to the congestion on the route into Cambridge. This proposal is inappropriate because it threatens the aim and purpose of the green belt but argues no very special circumstances to warrant it. It threatens and reduces the green belt and conflicts with the purposes of the Green Belt. It also encourages 'urban sprawl' by leaving pockets of land which are likely to be targets for housing development, further damaging the green open spaces surrounding the village. This area deserves to be protected. I strongly object to this proposal for the above reasons.

Gillian Pett