

Residents are in favour of improved public transport but strongly opposed to this new infrastructure which offers little benefit. I'll start with the issues closest to the estate before representing the main thrust of residents' opinions on the scheme as a whole.

1 Flood risk has always been a big concern for residents, many of whom have experienced severe flooding on the Gough Way estate. However, the Environment Agency has withdrawn its objection and there seems little we can add on this topic, other than to say that an on-road route would avoid the costly additional design elements required to raise the level of the route above flood levels, in the form of the Bin Brook bridge and embankment.

2 & 3 Junction with Grange Road, and Rifle Range track Firstly I'd like to say that GW residents oppose **any route joining** the road network anywhere along Grange Road (if you look at CPPF busway page you'll see a photo of many of us on a protest march against all the off-road route options). In drawing attention to the deficiencies of the Rifle Range track junction it's not to say that other junctions onto Grange Road would be equally problematic for different reasons.

The Rifle Range track joins the existing road network:

- at the narrowest point of Grange Road
- opposite a school's pedestrian pupil entrance
- where there is very poor visibility onto Grange Road.

On the Rifle Range track and at the junction itself there appear to be significant safety concerns:

- the track is very narrow between the rugby ground and Clare Hall buildings so much space is there for segregation of buses and pedestrians/cyclists on this stretch
- the track is a well-used and much-loved route into immediate open countryside for residents and students – for dog walking, for a quick lunchtime break, for running etc
- King's School rugby pitch is accessed via the track so groups of children will need to cross the road at the busway junction and walk alongside the busway – will they be safe?

The document CD14-03 Road Safety Audit Response Sheet lists the risks identified at the junction under points 1.20 to 1.24, ranging from buses "overrunning the travel path" at the turn and colliding with pedestrians on the pavement, to restricted visibility and narrow carriageway on Grange Road leading to risk of collisions with vehicles and/or pedestrians/cyclists. Is there really space to design in the required safety measures? Is this section fenced?

This is of particular concern considering recent pedestrian and cyclist deaths on the existing busway.

Grange Road itself is heavily-used by cyclists, including young children still learning to ride confidently, going to schools on Grange Rd or Newnham Croft Primary School, as well as into the centre for secondary schools. Not to mention students and commuters, and parents with children in trailers, bike seats etc going to the two nurseries on Grange Rd and Barton Rd. The applicant is proposing up to 10 additional services per hour, plus the existing U1&U2 services presumably? 14 buses per hour is more than Grange Rd needs or can cope with. It is not a main travel corridor, unlike A1303 Madingley Road, and any assumed improvements are beyond the scope of the application and may not happen.

4 Congestion of onward routes Buses will only be able to turn right (southwards) onto Grange Road, which is already heavily congested at peak hours going towards Barton Road. Further on, Silver Street is certainly not suitable for the proposed increase in buses: quite apart from the need to push through the crowds of tourists who congregate on the bridge (in the roadway), it is not wide enough for two-way traffic and cycles and vehicles have to wait to pass.

We are all familiar with the frequent gridlock on Fen Causeway, Lensfield Road and Hills Road. The last time I tried to take the bus from Grange Rd to the station it took over 40 minutes – I can walk there faster than that.

The CtoC buses might make the journey as far as Grange Road a little bit faster, but their onward journey from Grange Road into the city does nothing to alleviate congestion in the city, and will be no quicker than existing standard buses.

5 Residents oppose the carbon consumption involved in the construction of the busway, and **the wanton destruction of the countryside**. 5,000 tonnes net saving is not much of a reduction in carbon emissions over 60 years. The application assumes a reduction in car use but without any proposals to limit car use in central Cambridge, this might not happen. The Environmental Statement (CD1-09 non-technical summary, section 18) admits the project's carbon saving is a 'minor benefit', although sustainable transport, and reducing congestion and improving air quality are two of the overarching aims of the scheme.

The busway should use the existing route corridor, rather than building a new concrete road (and it is a road, albeit with restricted access) which destroys valued habitat and countryside. This also avoids the additional cost of the two new bridges. The visual impact of the Bin Brook bridge is a particular concern to Gough Way residents, as is the destruction of trees and natural landscape including the orchard.

6 Overall high cost and poor value for money

- The scheme will ultimately suffer from the same difficulties as existing on-road buses as soon as it reaches Grange Road, so it is not effective
- It does not integrate well with wider transport strategy and schemes such as EWR and bus franchising

- It has a low cost-benefit ratio: no matter how much tweaking and adding value using arcane methods, it is still rated poor under DfT
- It offers no solutions to city centre congestion and does not fit the CPCA Bus Strategy (2023) which aims to deliver a fully integrated bus **network**, which recognises the need to improve the **whole journey, including links with other public transport services**, not just one section
- Cambridge is expanding in multiple nodes, because there's no space at the centre. Transport **networks** need to reflect that, rather than continuing to funnel everyone into the overburdened city centre via inflexible fixed infrastructure.