

Coton Busway Action Group

With reference to CD 26 01 Joe Baker's Proof of Evidence P 40

Paragraph 11.2.3 Incorrect. CBAG did not challenge the decision to focus on connecting Cambourne to Cambridge merely the destinations within Cambridge. GCP's proposal for CtoC connects Cambourne to Grange Road. Grange Road is populated by private schools and college buildings, not major sites of employment or education for six formers. CBAG merely emphasizes that the Science Park, Biomedical Campus and central Cambridge are the main employment areas. Hills Road and Long Road are the major six form College locations. CtoC as presented does not serve any of these destinations well. There was a lack of forward planning regarding expansion of the Biomedical Campus. This would be better served by the CPPF alternative, enabling buses to turn right down the M11 to the Biomedical Campus from Madingley Road avoiding the City Centre. The Science Park would be better served by a bus service travelling up the A428 to the A14 directly or a service travelling to the Madingley Road park and ride through Eddington to the Science Park. Traversing the City Centre is not a good route to the Science Park.

Paragraph 11.2.4 I would merely reiterate that the route planned by the GCP shows a lack of foresight as to major employment destinations and has not been updated accordingly.

Paragraph 11.2.5 as above

Paragraph 11.2.6 There is no misconception that a consultation is akin to a referendum process merely that consultations should be fair and meaningful.

Paragraph 11.2 .7 There is no misinterpretation here. There were five options given on the Rectory Farm bridge in the Atkins report although two options did not require widening there was one option to accommodate just a pedestrian and cycle path adjacent to the existing bridge given at a cost of £2.26 million.

Paragraph 11.2.9 Regarding tidal flow. CBAG has not stated that it supported tidal flow. CBAG was illustrating a further example of misrepresentation by the GCP. In the 2017 consultation large overhead gantries were illustrated outside the American Cemetery as a schematic of what a tidal flow busway might look like. Overhead gantries can be landscaped to fit with rural surroundings. They can be cantilevered and could have been sited on the opposite side of the road away from the American Cemetery. They need not have been sited directly outside the entrance to the American Cemetery. However, GCP chose the worst possible example to put in the worst possible situation in the consultation document. Why would they do that? Mr. Baker quotes guidance from 2019 to justify the illustration. The guidance may have been the same in 2019, but this document was produced in 2017. For information, new environmentally sensitive designs for gantries are being rolled out in 2025/2026.

Paragraph 11.2.10/11 I accept Mr. Baker's explanation but the document was not clearly displayed on the GCP website.

Paragraph 11.2.12 CBAG still assert that an optimized inbound on-road bus lane down Maddingly Hill/A1303 has never been properly assessed.

Paragraph 11.2.13 CBAG continues to assert that an inbound optimized on-road bus lane has never been properly appraised; only options which would cause considerable harm to the American Cemetery, SSSI or houses to the south have been proposed. Maximum lane width for vehicles, pedestrians and cycle ways have been proposed by the GCP rather than optimizing the carriageway width to fit the landscape.

Paragraph 11.2.15. The independent audit commissioned by the GCP did not provide an appraisal of an optimized inbound on-road route.

Paragraph 11.2.16 CBAG continues to maintain that the GCP has never appraised an optimized on-road inbound busway; only schemes seemingly set up to fail.

Paragraph 11.2.17 the independent audit was not set up to appraise an optimized on-road inbound busway down the A1303. An optimized inbound bus way down the A1303 has never been formally appraised by the CPCA.

Dr Marilyn Treacy
Coton Busway Action Group.