



Department for Transport

Victoria Redman
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP
3 Temple Quay
Temple Back East
Bristol
BS1 6DZ

Natasha Kopala
Head of the Transport Infrastructure Planning
Casework Unit
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

Our Ref: TWA/24/APP/03
Your Ref: KJG1/ACR3/470360.1

8 September 2026

Dear Ms Redman,

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992: APPLICATION FOR THE PROPOSED CAMBOURNE TO CAMBRIDGE GUIDED BUSWAY ORDER AND DEEMED PLANNING PERMISSION

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State for Transport (“the Secretary of State”) to say that consideration has been given to the report of the Inspectors (“the Panel”), Richard Clegg BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI and Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip (Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC (“the Panel’s Report”).
2. The Panel held a 22-day Inquiry into the application made by your client Cambridgeshire County Council (“the Applicant”) on 16–19, 23–26 and 30 September; 1, 14–17 and 21–22 October; and 5, 11–13 and 20–21 November 2025 for:
 - a. the proposed Cambridgeshire County Council Cambourne to Cambridge Guided Busway Order (“the Order”) under sections 1 and 5 of the Transport and Works Act 1992 (“the Act”).
 - b. a direction for deemed planning permission, subject to conditions, under section 90(2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development which would be authorised by the Order; and
 - c. a certificate under section 19(1)(a) of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 in respect of the compulsory acquisition of open space land.
3. Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the Panel’s Report. All “PR” references in this letter are to the specified paragraph in the Panel’s Report.
4. This decision has been allocated to, and made by, Lord Hendy of Richmond Hill CBE (Minister of State). While this decision has not been taken by the Secretary of State in person, by law, it must be issued in the name of the Secretary of State. All references to the Secretary of State are therefore to the Minister of State acting on behalf of the Secretary of State.
5. The Order would authorise the construction, maintenance and operation of a guided busway between Cambourne and Cambridge; intermediate bus-stops along the route; an emergency and maintenance access track; a travel hub building and park and ride site at

Scotland Farm, Dry Drayton; bridges over the M11 and Bin Brook; access roads; temporary compounds; the stopping-up, diversion and creation of public rights of way; highway crossings; drainage works and attenuation and infiltration ponds. Together, these works are referred to in this letter as “the Scheme”.

6. The Order would also permit the compulsory acquisition of land for the proposed works and ancillary purposes; the temporary stopping-up of highways; provisions relating to streets; powers to survey and investigate land; powers to carry out works in the highway; the right to use private roads for the purposes of construction; powers to carry out works to streets including their temporary diversion; and the acquisition of replacement land for exchange open space land.

Summary of the Panel’s Recommendations

7. The Panel recommended that the Order should be made, subject to modifications, and that the deemed planning permission should be granted subject to conditions as set out in Annex 1 to the Panel’s Report (PR 21.1).

Summary of Secretary of State’s Decision

8. For the reasons given in this letter, **the Secretary of State has decided to make the Order with modifications and to grant deemed planning permission, subject to conditions** set out in Annex A to this letter.
9. In a separate letter being issued today, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government has decided to grant the Open Space Certificate required to implement the Scheme.

Secretary of State’s Consideration

10. The Secretary of State has complied with the Public Sector Equality Duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In doing so, she has had due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
11. Careful consideration has been given to all the submissions made by, or on behalf of, all parties. The Secretary of State’s consideration of these and of the Panel’s Report is set out in the following paragraphs.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) was updated in August 2026, after completion of the Panel’s Report. References to the NPPF in the Panel’s Report are therefore to the December 2024 ¹version. This letter also refers to the December 2024 version. However, the Secretary of State has considered the August 2026 version and is satisfied that the changes do not materially affect the assessment of the Scheme or alter her decision.
13. The Secretary of State has noted the Panel’s comments at PR 1.10 and PR 1.11 regarding the mode of the guided busway and that although the Environmental Statement (“ES”) included reference to a kerb guided design, the Scheme illustrated on the drawings and the Applicant’s Statement of Case, and, with few exceptions, the evidence presented in writing and at the Inquiry, was predicated on the proposed busway being a road-based sensor guidance mode (vehicles that can operate on a road and are guided wholly or mainly by means of sensors on the vehicles). The Panel have considered the proposal on this basis and have stated that, were one of the other modes to be selected over a road-based sensor guidance system, they are not confident that sufficient evidence has been

¹ [\[ARCHIVED CONTENT\]](#)

presented or evidence comprehensively examined at the Inquiry to support those other modes, and there would be the potential for prejudice to the interests of other participants in the Inquiry. The Secretary of State has likewise considered the Scheme on the basis of a road-based sensor guidance system and has amended the Order to reflect this.

14. Where not otherwise stated in this letter, the Secretary of State agrees with the findings, conclusions and recommendations as set out in the Report and the reasons given for the Secretary of State's decision are those given by the Panel in support of the conclusions and recommendations.

Procedural matters

15. The application for the Order was made on 12 November 2024. A Pre-Inquiry meeting was held on 24 June 2025. The Inquiry sat for 22 days between September and November 2025 and accompanied site visits were undertaken (PR 1.4). In total, 336 representations were received: 309 objected, 16 supported the application and 11 made other representations. Of the objectors, 13 were statutory objectors (PR 9.1). Following notice of the Inquiry, three interested parties made representations. Of those, two were represented at the Pre-Inquiry meeting and subsequently gave evidence at the Inquiry, with one supporting and one objecting to the application. A further written objection was also submitted during the Inquiry (PR 9.2). By the close of the Inquiry, eight objections had been withdrawn, six of which were from statutory objectors (PR 9.3).
16. In making the application, the Panel was satisfied that the Applicant had complied with the publicity requirements of the Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2006 ("the 2006 Rules"). This included publishing and displaying notices giving information about the application and how to make representations. It was recorded that some notices had been removed by the Applicant's contractor one day before the closing date for objections. The Department for Transport was advised of this minor non-compliance with Rule 14 of the 2006 Rules and confirmed that no further action was required, noting that the Applicant would not resist the late submission of objections arising from the removal of the notices (PR 1.5).
17. The Applicant advised that it had not fully complied with the requirements of Rule 13(6)(b) of the Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004 in relation to the posting of notices of the Inquiry (PR 1.7). The Panel noted that the Applicant had taken additional steps to publicise the Inquiry, including notification via its website, direct communication with interested parties, and wider publicity. Given those steps and the duration of the Inquiry, the Panel concluded that no prejudice arose and that it was not necessary to adjourn the Inquiry (PR 1.8).
18. The Applicant submitted a number of revisions to the draft Order, Book of Reference and works and land plans both before the Inquiry opened and during the Inquiry before it closed. These reflected agreed changes with affected parties and amendments to land requirements, including corrections to drafting, updates to land interests and amendments to protective provisions. The Panel was satisfied that the changes did not materially alter the scope of the Order and that their consideration would not prejudice any party (PR 1.12–1.15).
19. The Secretary of State received correspondence from Clare Hall on 21 November 2025, after the Inquiry closed, concerning the proposed wording of the planning condition which restricts night-time and shoulder bus movements. Although rule 20(4) permits documents received after the close of the Inquiry to be disregarded, the Secretary of State considered it appropriate to have regard to this correspondence in the circumstances of this case. The Secretary of State does not consider that further consultation was required before doing so. The correspondence concerns the drafting of a planning condition relating

to matters which were before the Inquiry, including the parties' position on the need for, purpose and scope of, this condition. The Secretary of State's consideration of the wording of this condition is set out below at paragraph 55. The Secretary of State also received an email on 4 September 2026 from a member of the public including information obtained on that date through a request made under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. The Secretary of State has considered this information, relating to a commercial agreement between the Applicant and Clare Hall, and concluded that it is not material to the Secretary of State's decision and has, therefore, not been considered further.

20. The Application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement ("ES") and supporting environmental information. The ES was subsequently supplemented by three addenda providing additional environmental information. The Panel concluded that an Environmental Impact Assessment had been carried out in accordance with the 2006 Rules and that the ES, together with its addenda, provided an adequate basis for assessing the environmental effects of the Scheme (PR 6.1–6.8). The Secretary of State agrees with that conclusion.

Aims, objectives, and the need for the Order

21. The Secretary of State notes that most objectors, including Cambridge Past, Present & Future ("CPPF"), Coton Parish Council ("CPC") and the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, accepted the need to improve public transport connectivity between Cambourne and Cambridge (PR 10.20–10.22). However, other parties, including Friends of the Cam ("FoTC") and the Campaign to Protect Rural England – Cambridge & Peterborough Branch ("CPRE-C&P") raised objections regarding the extent of the transport need identified by the Applicant, the assumptions underpinning future growth forecasts, the extent of the benefits claimed for the Order, and whether those benefits justified the costs and environmental impacts of the proposed development (PR 17.29, PR 17.35, PR 18.125).

22. CPPF and CPC further argued that alternative transport solutions, including on-road bus priority measures, the in-highway solution and other public transport interventions such as East West Rail ("EWR"), could achieve the Scheme's objectives with less harm and at lower cost (PR 12.1–12.45). FoTC and CPRE-C&P also questioned the appropriateness of the growth assumptions underpinning the Order, arguing that Greater Cambridge cannot sustainably accommodate the level of development anticipated and that housing and employment growth should be distributed more widely across the country (PR 17.29, PR 17.35).

23. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that the Scheme is required to support the sustainable growth of Greater Cambridge through the provision of reliable public transport infrastructure along the A428/A1303 corridor between Cambourne and Cambridge (PR 10.7). The Applicant states that continued housing and employment growth, increasing congestion, poor public transport reliability and limited opportunities for walking and cycling are creating significant pressures on the transport network which the Scheme is intended to address (PR 10.4, 10.17–10.19).

24. The Applicant further submits that the objectives of the Scheme are to improve accessibility in support of the economic growth of Greater Cambridge, deliver a sustainable transport system connecting Cambourne and Cambridge, and contribute to an enhanced quality of life through reduced congestion and improved air quality (PR 10.5). The Applicant states that the Scheme would help unlock planned housing and employment growth, including at Bourn Airfield, Cambourne West and West Cambridge, whilst supporting wider environmental and social objectives through modal shift, active

travel provision, biodiversity net gain and support for a low-carbon economy (PR 10.6, PR 10.11–10.15, PR 10.185).

25. The Applicant contends that the need for the Scheme is strongly supported by national, regional and local policy. The Applicant notes that the adopted development plan strategy, the City Deal, the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, the Case for Cambridge and the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan all depend upon the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure to support planned growth in the area (PR 7.2 - 7.14, 10.10 - 10.16).

26. The Panel concluded that Greater Cambridge is an area of nationally significant economic importance and that both national and local planning policy support continued growth in the area (PR 20.3 - 20.4). The Panel further concluded that the adopted and emerging spatial strategy is dependent upon the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure to support major planned development at Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield and West Cambridge and that the Scheme would directly facilitate the implementation of these developments (PR 20.4 - 20.6).

27. The Panel found that the Scheme would improve accessibility, support economic growth, relieve congestion, encourage modal shift and provide wider social benefits, and sustainable growth (PR 20.7 - 20.9). The Panel also accepted the Applicant, District Councils and ERW's submission that EWR and the Scheme would be complementary rather than competing forms of transport infrastructure. The Panel concluded that the busway would support the railway and that criticism of the growth strategy carries little weight in the context of the established local and national policy supporting growth in Greater Cambridge (PR 20.10 and 20.11). The Panel therefore concluded that the aims and objectives of the Order are consistent with relevant transport and planning policies and that there is a need for a scheme capable of achieving a marked change in transport usage with associated social benefits (PR 20.12).

28. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's findings, conclusions, and the submissions on this matter both from the Applicant and other parties. She agrees with the Panel that the Order's aims and objectives are consistent with relevant transport and planning policy and that there is a clear need for improved public transport connectivity between Cambourne and Cambridge to support the sustainable growth of Greater Cambridge. The Secretary of State further agrees that the Scheme would support the delivery of planned development, improve accessibility and contribute towards addressing existing and future transport pressures along the A428/A1303 corridor. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

Alternatives, and benefits considered

Alternatives

29. The Secretary of State notes that a large number objected to the Scheme on the basis that there were deliverable alternatives to achieve the same objectives and serve the same need with less environmental harm or other detriments (PR 10.25). The Applicant submitted that there was no substantive challenge to the Applicant's record of its option selection and consultations. Contrary to some objectors' submissions, the Applicant maintains it did consider both the principle and detail of an on-road route (PR 10.30-31). The same was submitted in relation to the re-alignment of the off-road busway at Coton, and the use of Adams Road and the Rifle Range Track (PR 10.72 and 10.73). The Applicant's position on the merits and limitations of the alternative advanced by CPPF and CPC is set out between PR 10.53 and 10.71. In essence, they submit that this alternative has been given close consideration, and was found to have significant design, safety, feasibility and deliverability issues, as well as added impacts on designated

heritage assets (PR 10.68). The Secretary of State notes that the District Councils endorsed the options analysis undertaken by the Applicant as thorough and lawful, adopting the evidence of the Applicant in relation to the CPPF and CPC alternative (PR 11.21).

30. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that the principle of providing significant public transport improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge is consistent with, and fundamental to, the adopted and emerging spatial strategy for Greater Cambridge (PR 7.2, PR 20.13). The Applicant states that the preferred Order is the product of an extensive process of option development, assessment and consultation, during which a wide range of on-road and off-road alternatives, route alignments and Park and Ride locations were considered (PR 20.15–20.22). The Applicant further states that the preferred option of a predominantly segregated guided busway with a Park and Ride facility at Scotland Farm was selected following consultation exercises and detailed assessment of its ability to meet the Schemes objectives, support planned growth, limit visual and ecological impacts, improve accessibility and provide the greatest overall transport benefits (PR 20.19–20.23).

31. The main alternative was an on-road option advanced by CPPF and CPC. They accept the principle on need and objectives, but contend that the proposed guided busway has not been justified by the evidence, submitting that the Applicant has overstated the benefits of the Scheme (PR 12.2). Their alternative is an in-highway scheme along the A1303 between the A428 junction and Queens Road, could serve the Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West developments whilst meeting the requirements of adopted and emerging planning policy. They contend that this alternative would achieve the objectives of the Order with less environmental harm, at lower cost, within a comparable timeframe and with reduced impacts on heritage assets (PR 12.32–12.43). This alternative approach is supported by a number of objectors, including the Mayor, CBAG, FoTC, CPRE Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Party and Pesticide-Free Cambridge (PR 15.15–15.17, 18.100, 18.104).

32. Cambridge Connect proposes an alternative route using or running alongside the north side of the A428 corridor. Those objectors argued that such a route would avoid impacts on Hardwick, Madingley Hill, Coton Orchard and other environmentally sensitive areas affected by the Scheme. They further contended that, when combined with improvements at the Girton Interchange, the alternative could provide faster and more direct bus connections to destinations north and south of Cambridge, whilst avoiding congestion on Madingley Road (PR 18.93 - 18.97, 18.138).

33. Some parties, including the Mayor, considered that a tram or light rail system would provide greater passenger-carrying capacity and represent a more appropriate long-term transport solution for the Greater Cambridge area (PR 10.74, PR 18.84, PR 18.101, PR 18.126). The Secretary of State further notes that objectors questioned the need for the Scheme in light of the proposed EWR connection between Cambourne and Cambridge, arguing that it would provide a direct connection between Cambourne and Cambridge and reduce demand for the proposed busway, such that the benefits attributed to the Scheme would be diminished (PR 10.54, PR 17.18–17.19, PR 18.28, PR 18.125).

34. The Panel concludes that there has been an extensive and iterative process of considering options to improve public transport links between Cambourne and Cambridge and that the preferred option has evolved through consultation, environmental assessment and stakeholder engagement (PR 20.15–20.22, 20.54). The Panel finds that the preferred option is consistent with the adopted and emerging spatial strategy and would support the implementation of major development sites within the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor

and have the potential to achieve the objectives of improved accessibility, sustainable transport and economic growth (PR 20.23).

35. The Panel agreed with the Applicant that the alternative scheme promoted by CPPF & CPC raised significant concerns regarding safety and deliverability, particularly in relation to the arrangements proposed at the M11 overbridge. Whilst recognising that the alternative would avoid or reduce a number of environmental impacts, the Panel concluded that the alternative as presented was unsatisfactory due to the arrangements for the M11 overbridge and, irrespective of any other considerations, accorded it little weight on this factor alone. (PR 20.44–20.48).

36. Other alternatives, including proposals advanced by the mayor and other objectors were found to be either insufficiently developed or didn't provide a preferable solution to the Scheme (PR 20.49–20.53). The preferred scheme is considered capable of improving reliability, encouraging modal shift, supporting active travel, complementing EWR and contribute towards the delivery of the Development Plan strategy (PR 20.23, 20.54, 20.59). Against these findings, the Panel was satisfied that proper consideration has been given to alternatives and that there is a clear rationale for the preferred guided busway option (PR 20.60).

37. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's findings and conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that the Applicant undertook a thorough and proportionate assessment of reasonable alternatives and that proper consideration was given to alternative transport solutions during the development of the Scheme. The Secretary of State further agrees that the preferred option would best support the adopted and emerging spatial strategy, facilitate planned growth and deliver the transport benefits sought by the Scheme. The Secretary of State is satisfied that there is a clear rationale for the selection of the preferred option and therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

Benefits

38. The Applicant submitted that the Scheme would deliver substantial transport, economic and wider public benefits. They identified existing and forecast congestion on the A428/A1303 corridor, planned housing and employment growth to the west of Cambridge, poor public transport reliability and limited opportunities for walking and cycling as key drivers for the Order (PR 10.4). The Applicant further submitted that the guided busway would provide quicker and more reliable journey times, increase the frequency of services between Cambourne and Cambridge, support modal shift away from private car use and improve access to key employment destinations including West Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus (PR 5.2, 20.28).

39. The Applicant's benefits case also relies on support for the delivery of planned growth, including at Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West, and the generation of wider economic benefits through improved labour market access and land value uplift associated with dependent development (PR 10.185). The District Councils aligned with the Applicant on benefits, noting that transport connections facilitate in-person encounters which drive innovation (PR 11.10 – 11.13). The Applicant also identified benefits arising from the active travel route, air quality improvements, biodiversity net gain and carbon reduction, together with the role of the Order in supporting the adopted and emerging spatial strategy for Greater Cambridge (PR 10.185).

40. Objectors challenged the extent of the benefits claimed by the Applicant. CPPF & CPC argued that the Applicant had overstated the journey time and reliability benefits of the Order and relied on transport modelling which did not adequately reflect post-pandemic travel patterns or the potential effects of EWR (PR 12.5–12.16, PR 18.125).

Concerns were also raised that the Scheme would not address congestion east of Grange Road and that benefits for journeys into central Cambridge and other destinations could therefore be limited (PR 15.17, 17.10, 17.17, 18.125).

41. CPPF & CPC argued that the Applicant had overstated the economic benefits of the Scheme by overstating the extent to which housing delivery at Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield is dependent upon the Scheme and by relying on optimistic assumptions regarding land value uplift, house prices and future growth. They contended that the resulting Benefit Cost Ratio is highly sensitive to those assumptions and that the economic case for the Scheme is therefore uncertain and speculative (PR 12.17–12.22). Coton Busway Action Group and other objectors similarly questioned the credibility of the economic case and disputed whether the benefits relied upon by the Applicant had been robustly demonstrated (PR 17.27, 18.126).
42. The Panel concluded that there was a clear rationale in support of the preferred option (PR 20.60). The Scheme was accepted to deliver transport benefits by responding to existing congestion, improving timeliness and reliability and increasing public transport opportunities between Cambourne and Cambridge. Although the Scheme would not relieve congestion or improve journey times east of Grange Road in the City Centre, the Panel found that the transport benefits would be capable of contributing to the modal shift which is crucial to the Development Plan's spatial strategy, noting also the active travel route enabled by the emergency and maintenance track, which they afforded substantial weight in the assessment of benefits (PR 20.54). The Panel also accepted that the Scheme would facilitate improved access to employment opportunities, including at West Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus, and that improved access to job opportunities and person-to-person contact are benefits which carry substantial weight in support of the Scheme (PR 20.31).
43. The Panel accepts that the transport modelling has been challenged, particularly in relation to post-pandemic travel patterns and EWR but concludes that the Applicant's approach to the use of the CSRM was appropriate and within the range of options envisaged by Government guidance (PR 20.34–20.38). The Panel further concludes that EWR and the Order would be complementary rather than competing schemes and that EWR would not be expected materially to alter the effect of the Scheme in respect of land value uplift (PR 20.38).
44. In relation to value for money, the Panel finds that there is no good reason to exclude Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West as dependent development and is satisfied that the Applicant's approach to land value uplift is sound (PR 20.39–20.43). The Panel notes that variables such as house prices and land value may change and that most sensitivity tests indicated that the Scheme would fall into the low value for money category but concludes that the benefit of land value uplift merits moderate weight (PR 20.42–20.43, PR 20.57). The Panel also concludes that the financial and strategic cases support the Scheme and that the Scheme is fundamental to the infrastructure-led approach underpinning the spatial strategy of the Development Plan (PR 20.58–20.59).
45. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel's assessment of the benefits of the Scheme. She agrees that, notwithstanding the position beyond Grange Road, the Scheme will improve public transport reliability, support modal shift and provide active travel opportunities along the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor. She also agrees that the Scheme would support the delivery of planned growth, improve access to employment opportunities and contribute to the adopted and emerging spatial strategy for Greater Cambridge. The Secretary of State further agrees with the Panel that, although there are limitations and uncertainties in relation to the extent of some claimed benefits, including value for money and the reliance placed on the land value uplift, the benefits of improved

access to employment, person-to-person contact, active travel and support for planned growth should be given significant weight.

Effect of the implementation, operation and maintenance

The effect on EWR safeguarded land

46. EWR advised that careful coordination between the two projects was necessary to avoid conflicts, additional costs and disruption arising from the fact that the proposed busway crosses safeguarded land for the new railway between Croxton and Toft (PR 18.56–18.57). Both the Applicant and EWR were content that the proposal for a mined tunnel would minimise or avoid conflict between the Scheme and their associated works (PR 10.140 and 18.57)

47. The Panel was satisfied that the cooperation between the parties, including the changes introduced by EWR mean that the implementation, operation and maintenance of the Scheme would not prejudice the objective of safeguarding land to enable the delivery of EWR. Equally, they accepted EWR's evidence that the use of a mined tunnel would avoid local road disruption, including of the proposed busway (PR 20.63 – 20.66). The Secretary of State agrees with this assessment.

The effect on residents, pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists

Living conditions and health - air quality

48. The Applicant's ES concluded that the Scheme would not give rise to any significant adverse air quality effects during either construction or operation. Construction effects arising from dust, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀ and NO₂ were assessed as adverse, but negligible and temporary. Operational effects in respect of NO₂, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ would overall be beneficial (PR 10.128). Their overall submission was that the Scheme would deliver an air quality benefit and is therefore acceptable having regard to local and national policy (PR 10.136).

49. The Applicant accepted that a specific resident was vulnerable to the potential effects of dust and particulate matter on health. They outlined that the principal risk would be during construction and had been considered by treating that resident as a receptor. Their dust risk assessment identified a low risk to human health, and the modelled assessment identified a negligible impact. The Applicant has committed to a future risk assessment on that property and mitigation measures are secured by conditions providing for the Code of Construction Practice ("CoCP"), Local Environmental Management Plans ("LEMPs") and flexibility in the location of construction access routes and haul roads, to ensure that any effects are effectively controlled (PR 10.133–10.134). The Applicant further submits that, even if duties under the Equality Act 2010 were engaged, those duties would be complied with (PR 10.136).

50. Objectors argued that additional mitigation and monitoring measures should be secured to address the identified effects (PR 17.46, 19.6). Objectors also raised concerns regarding the potential implications of the Scheme for rights protected under the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010, contending that particular regard should be had to the circumstances of vulnerable residents and persons with disabilities and further modification were required to mitigate risks to health (PR 17.46).

51. The Panel accepted that the Environmental Statement identified no significant adverse air quality effects during either construction or operation and that the Scheme would have a negligible impact. The Panel further concluded that mitigation secured through the CoCP, LEMPs and planning conditions would provide an appropriate framework for managing construction and operational effects, including those raised in

relation to a vulnerable resident living near the route (PR 20.67–20.70). The Panel also found that the Scheme would not result in unacceptable harm, would not breach Articles 2 or 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and would not give rise to a breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PR 20.72–20.74). The Panel concluded that the Order would not worsen air quality within the Cambridge City Centre Air Quality Management Area and that any air quality benefits arising from modal shift would be limited and should be afforded limited weight (PR 20.75–20.79).

52. The Secretary of State has considered the Applicant's submissions, the objections received, and the Panel's conclusions on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that there is no evidence that the Order would result in unacceptable harm to the vulnerable resident referred to by the Panel, nor that it would give rise to any breach of obligations under the Human Rights Act 1998 or the Equality Act 2010. The Secretary of State also agrees that, whilst the Order is expected to result in some beneficial air quality effects, those benefits are likely to be limited in scale and should therefore be afforded limited weight in the overall planning balance (PR 20.72–20.79).

Living conditions and health – noise and vibration

53. The Secretary of State notes that PX Farms Ltd and PX Land Ltd raised concerns regarding the potential visual and noise impacts of the Scheme on nearby residential and agricultural occupiers, arguing that insufficient mitigation had been proposed to address those effects (PR 16.2). Other interested party objectors similarly expressed concern that construction activities and increased traffic associated with the operation of the Scheme could adversely affect noise levels, and the living conditions of residents in nearby villages, including Dry Drayton (PR 18.131).

54. Clare Hall objected on several matters including the effects of operational noise (PR 18.37). This objection was withdrawn following agreement with the Applicant (PR 18.39). Clare Hall states that a key element of that agreement was the inclusion of a proposed planning condition restricting night-time bus movements to mitigate operational noise effects on the College (PR 18.38–18.40, 19.5).

55. Clare Hall sent correspondence concerning the proposed wording of the bus movement restriction condition, following the close of the Inquiry. It is noted that condition 30 is intended to mitigate possible significant adverse operational noise effects by restricting bus movements on the off-road busway between 0000 and 0600, and by limiting non-electric bus movements during the adjoining hours on specified sections of the busway. The Secretary of State understands that Clare Hall had concerns that the proposed condition had been amended from the wording drafted when withdrawing their objection. The Secretary of State has had regard to this correspondence, as well as the relevant material before the Inquiry, including the Panel's recommended condition 30.

56. The Secretary of State is satisfied that the Panel's recommended wording is appropriate and reflects sufficiently the wording on which Clare Hall withdrew their objection. In particular, the use of the term "off-road busway" provides a clear description of the part of the route to which the midnight to 0600 restriction applies, and the reference to the section "between the south of Charles Babbage Road and Grange Road" accurately reflects the alignment of the route for the 0600 to 0700 and 2300 to 2359 restrictions.

57. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's recommended drafting and is satisfied that condition 30 appropriately secures the necessary mitigation, which was central to the withdrawal of Clare Hall's objection, having regard to her analysis at 61 below, which addresses the operational effects to which this condition is directed.

58. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that a robust and precautionary assessment of noise and vibration effects has been undertaken. The

Applicant assessed that the worst-case scenario was significant adverse construction noise effects may arise at a limited number of properties, for which appropriate mitigation was secured through the CoCP and LEMP (PR 10.124). The Applicant further submits that operational noise effects would remain below both the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level and the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level such that there would be no unacceptable adverse effects on residential amenity (PR 10.125). The Applicant also submits that no significant vibration effects on residential occupiers are anticipated during construction, although further detailed assessment would be undertaken where vibration-sensitive equipment may be affected (PR 10.126).

59. The Panel concludes that the occupiers of six dwellings would experience significant adverse noise effects during the construction phase, with the occupiers of a considerable number of other dwellings also experiencing harmful effects on their living conditions arising from noise (PR 20.80). Vibration is not predicted to result in significant adverse effects on residential occupiers (PR 20.81).

60. The Panel found that the mitigation proposed through the CoCP and LEMPs would provide an appropriate framework for managing construction noise and vibration effects. The Panel noted that the conditions in the planning permission require the approval of phase-specific LEMPs, including a demolition and construction noise and vibration assessment, management and monitoring plan, together with other mitigation measures, secured through planning conditions, will minimise adverse effects on sensitive receptors (PR 20.82). Taking account of that mitigation, the Panel concluded that construction noise carried moderate weight against the Scheme (PR 20.83).

61. In relation to operational effects, the Panel concluded that restrictions on bus movements during night-time periods would be necessary to avoid unacceptable noise effects at sensitive receptors in Cambourne, Cambridge and West Cambridge. The Panel noted that these restrictions would be secured by condition 30, preventing bus use of the busway between 0000 and 0600 and limiting non-electric bus movements during the adjoining hours (PR 20.86–20.87). In relation to Childerley Gate, the Panel concluded that any remaining disturbance should be mitigated through the requirement to evaluate and manage operational noise, including through the requirement to evaluate whether environmental noise barriers are required (PR 20.89). Subject to these measures, the Panel concluded that unacceptable effects on living conditions could be avoided (PR 20.86–20.89). The Panel further concluded that, whilst occupiers of properties near the Scotland Farm Travel Hub may experience some disturbance from bus and vehicle movements, the design, layout and separation distances incorporated into the Scheme would assist in limiting intrusive noise effects, and that operational noise would not exceed existing background levels (PR 20.90–20.91).

62. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that construction activities would result in temporary adverse noise effects for several nearby residents, but that mitigation secured through planning conditions would provide an appropriate mechanism for minimising those effects. The Secretary of State further agrees that appropriate controls on bus operations and other mitigation measures would ensure that unacceptable operational noise effects do not arise and that the living conditions of nearby residents would be adequately protected. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions that this matter carries moderate weight against the Scheme (PR 20.95).

Living Conditions – traffic disturbance

63. The Secretary of State notes that concerns were raised by objectors regarding the effects of construction and operational traffic on nearby residents, businesses and road

users. PX Farms Ltd and PX Land Ltd argued that insufficient mitigation had been proposed to address the effects of additional traffic on neighbouring residential and agricultural occupiers (PR 16.2). Coton Busway Action Group expressed concern that the busway would affect a well-used route to Coton Primary School and could adversely affect pedestrian safety (PR 17.24).

64. Concerns were also raised regarding the effects of the proposed busway and Travel Hub on traffic flows, accessibility and road safety, particularly in Dry Drayton and on Scotland Road, where objectors argued that additional traffic, inadequate traffic calming measures and insufficient assessment of traffic impacts could adversely affect the living conditions of local residents (PR 18.73, 18.82, 18.127, 18.131). Further concerns were raised regarding the effects of the Scheme on local accessibility, construction traffic management and traffic conditions in the vicinity of Coton and the proposed St Neots Road junction (PR 18.27, 18.79, 18.137).

65. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that congestion and increasing travel demand along the A428/A1303 corridor are key drivers for the Scheme and that the Scheme is intended to improve accessibility, relieve congestion and provide a sustainable alternative to private car use (PR 10.4–10.6). The Applicant submits that usage of Public Footpath 55/2 is low and that the proposed at-grade crossing and adoption of guided transport safety regulations would maintain safe access for users (PR 10.130). The Applicant further submits that the Transport Assessment identified no unacceptable effects on local junctions and that the proposed bus stops and Scotland Farm Travel Hub would reduce the likelihood of parking and traffic-related impacts in Coton (PR 10.131).

66. The Panel was satisfied that the safety of road users would be maintained and adverse living conditions as a result of construction traffic would be avoided (PR 20.96). The Panel further concluded that, in relation to operational effects, there is no evidence that this would result in materially harmful effects on nearby residents (PR 20.97).

67. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that appropriate controls would prevent harmful construction traffic effects and that the operational effects of the Order on local traffic conditions and living conditions would not lead to materially harmful effects (PR 20.96–20.97).

Living conditions – operational effects on privacy, outlook, lighting and visual impact

68. The Applicant submits that the visual effects of the Scheme would be acceptable and that its Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment predicts that there would be no significant effects on landscape character after 15 years. (PR 10.112). The Applicant states that only one visual receptor, users of Public Footpath 55/2 between Coton and Madingley Road, would experience a significant visual effect, and that this would be limited to a short section of the route (PR 10.112). The Applicant further submits that visual impacts would be mitigated during construction through the CoCP and LEMP,² and during operation through the design of the busway, landscaping and tree planting. (PR 10.112, 10.162).

69. The Applicant contends that adequate mitigation has been incorporated to address visual effects on nearby residential properties, particularly through landscape planting (PR 10.162). The Applicant therefore submits that permanent visual and landscape effects

² Due to a formatting error in the originally published version of this letter, this wording appeared at the beginning of paragraph 69 rather than at the end of paragraph 68. This has now been corrected.

arising from the operation of the Scheme would be limited and should be afforded limited weight in the planning balance (PR 10.184).

70. The Secretary of State notes that objectors raised concerns regarding the visual effects of the Scheme on residential amenity and outlook. It was argued that the Scheme would introduce a visually intrusive transport corridor into a valued rural landscape, adversely affecting the character of Madingley Hill, the surrounding countryside and the outlook from nearby properties. (PR 14.3). PX Farms Ltd and PX Land Ltd contended that insufficient mitigation had been proposed to reduce visual intrusion on adjoining residential properties (PR 16.2). Concerns were also raised regarding the visual impact of the proposed Bin Brook bridge and embankments (PR 17.38, 18.135). Historic England further expressed concern that fencing, level changes, road infrastructure and the potential loss of trees could adversely affect the setting of the Grade II listed Erskine Building and Clare Hall (PR 18.11–18.12). Other objectors argued that the loss of trees along the route, including those providing visual screening along St Neots Road, would give rise to additional visual harm and reduce the separation between residential properties and surrounding infrastructure (PR 18.129, 18.132).

71. The Panel concluded that the elevated busway, retaining wall and active travel route at Childerley Gate would have an overbearing and intrusive effect on outlook and privacy, resulting in harm to the living conditions of occupiers, particularly at Childerley Lodge. The Panel found that an appropriate range of mitigation would be necessary to address those effects and would need to be carefully designed to avoid exacerbating other impacts (PR 20.98–20.100). The Panel also concluded that occupiers of properties along Herschel Road would experience harmful effects arising from overlooking, visual intrusion and loss of privacy. It found that a suitably designed package of mitigation measures would be required to minimise those effects while avoiding consequential harm arising from the mitigation itself and having regard to the significance of nearby heritage assets (PR 20.101–20.102).

72. In relation to Scotland Road, the Panel concluded that the separation distances between the Scotland Farm Travel Hub and nearby dwellings would avoid harmful effects on residential outlook, although the facility would intervene in the landscape until proposed planting matures. The Panel further concluded that any adverse effects arising from lighting can be reduced to an acceptable level through the lighting assessment and mitigation scheme secured by condition 22 in Annex A (PR 20.103–20.104). The Panel concluded that the effects of the Order on living conditions at Clare Hall and West Cambridge would not be materially harmful and that, elsewhere along the route, separation distances and landscaping mitigation would ensure that living conditions would not be adversely affected (PR 20.105–20.107).

73. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that the Scheme would give rise to harmful effects on the living conditions of some occupiers at Childerley Gate and Herschel Road, particularly in relation to outlook, privacy and visual intrusion. However, she is satisfied that, subject to the implementation of mitigation secured through the Order, including detailed design and landscaping measures, and planning conditions where applicable, those effects can be appropriately mitigated. She therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

Accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders

74. The Secretary of State notes that concerns were raised regarding the accessibility of the Scheme for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Objectors argued that proposed junctions and crossing points could give rise to safety risks for users of public footpaths

and bridleways crossed by the route and contended that insufficient account had been taken of the needs of horse riders (PR 18.133). Objectors also argued that the proposed Scotland Farm Travel Hub would be inaccessible to residents of Dry Drayton and other settlements to the north, owing to the absence of safe walking and cycling links to the facility (PR 18.131). Further concerns were expressed that Rifle Range Road would be unsuitable for the proposed pedestrian and cycle route and that existing cycle provision was already sufficient. (PR 18.133). Martin Grant Homes also argued that the Scheme should make provision for a future North Cambourne Travel Hub to improve active travel connections between existing and proposed communities (PR 18.77).

75. The Secretary of State notes that several parties supported the active travel elements of the Scheme, considering that the proposed route would provide improved opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding between Cambourne, Cambridge and surrounding communities (PR 17.7 and 18.60).

76. The Applicant submitted that improving accessibility is a key objective of the Scheme (PR 10.5). The Applicant stated that the selected replacement open space site was chosen following a site selection process and performs particularly well in accessibility terms, providing convenient access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and improved connections to the surrounding footpath and bridleway network on both sides of the M11 (PR 10.175). The Applicant further submitted that the replacement open space land would provide at least an equal level of accessibility to the existing land, with improved access routes, enhanced natural surveillance and a layout better suited to recreational use (PR 10.176). The Applicant's position is that the Scotland Farm Travel Hub and the active travel route would deliver significant transport benefits by improving opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding and supporting the modal shift objectives of the Scheme, such that they should both be given significant weight in terms of benefits (PR 10.185).

77. The Panel concluded that the active travel route would provide a substantial benefit by creating a largely traffic-free route for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders between Cambourne, Cambridge and surrounding communities (PR 20.108). The Panel found that it would improve accessibility and provide opportunities for integration with public transport services, including at the proposed Scotland Farm Travel Hub (PR 20.108). The Panel further concluded that the route would complement existing and proposed active travel initiatives and that the existence of alternative routes, including the Comberton Greenway, would not diminish its substantial benefits (PR 20.109).

78. The Panel acknowledged that the Scheme would introduce a number of new crossings and junctions and that some users may experience limited inconvenience as a result (PR 20.110). However, the Panel concluded that the proposed at-grade crossing of Public Footpath 55/2 would maintain access to existing destinations and that any delay caused by crossing the busway would be minimal (PR 20.111). In their assessment, the diversion of Bridleway 39/30 would result in only a minor inconvenience and that the proposed signalised crossing would maintain safe access (PR 20.112). The Panel found that access would be maintained along existing public rights of way and bridleways and that there is no substantive evidence that the proposed crossings and junctions would have a materially adverse effect on accessibility, journey times or the overall user experience (PR 20.113).

79. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that the active travel route would provide substantial accessibility benefits for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and would significantly improve connectivity between Cambourne, Cambridge and surrounding communities. The Secretary of State further agrees that access would be maintained along existing public rights of way and bridleways

and that the introduction of new crossings and junctions would result in only limited inconvenience which would not materially affect accessibility, journey times or the overall user experience.

Safety of motorists, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders

80. Concerns were raised regarding the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and other road users. Objectors argued that proposed junctions, crossing points and sections of the busway could create conflicts between buses and users of public footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes, particularly where the route intersects existing paths and local roads (PR 13.14, 17.47, 18.133). Objectors were also concerned that the suitability of the proposed route at Rifle Range Road and Grange Road, is heavily used by pedestrians and cyclists, including school children, and that additional bus movements could adversely affect safety (PR 17.39, 17.44, 18.89, 18.134). Objectors further referred to safety issues associated with existing guided busway infrastructure, the adequacy of provision for horse riders, the effects of the Scheme on wide agricultural and goods vehicles, and the safety of proposed private crossing points (PR 14.6–14.8, 18.133). Concerns were also raised that construction, and operational traffic could adversely affect pedestrian and cycle safety in nearby settlements, including Dry Drayton (PR 18.131).
81. The Applicant's position on these matters includes that proposed crossings would maintain access and be subject to further safety assessment and detailed design, and have been designed to accommodate all users, including those with mobility impairments (PR 10.130, 10.138). The Applicant states that the proposed crossing of FP55/2 would maintain access and that appropriate safety assessments and detailed design would be undertaken to ensure safe operation of the route (PR 10.130). Regarding Rifle Range Road, the Applicant submits that it represents a preferable and safer option than Adams Road for the eastern section of the busway (PR 10.73). and that the proposed crossing points in the Scheme have been designed to comply with disability access standards and that the needs of users with mobility impairments have been taken into account (PR 10.138).
82. The Panel concluded that there is little substantive evidence to suggest that the proposed junctions and crossings would inherently make users more vulnerable to harm than existing features in place. Equally signal junctions and appropriately designed crossings would provide satisfactory protection for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders (PR 20.114).
83. Regarding Rifle Range Road, the Panel found that its use, rather than Adams Road would reduce the potential for conflict with cyclists and pedestrians and would represent the safer option for the eastern section of the route (PR 20.115).
84. The Panel acknowledged that there is an inherent risk of conflict where active travel interfaces with motor vehicles (PR 20.116). The Panel found that the active travel route would provide a safe, segregated environment for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and that measures proposed to prevent unauthorised use of the busway would reduce the risk of conflict between users and vehicles (PR 20.117–20.118).
85. The Panel also concluded that there is no convincing evidence that private crossing points could not be designed to provide safe and practical access for users, including those with mobility impairments, and that the Scheme would not give rise to a breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PR 20.120–20.122).
86. In relation to Grange Road, the Panel concluded that the additional bus services would not in principle introduce an unacceptable safety risk to other road users. Whilst the intensification of the Rifle Range Road junction would require careful consideration through the detailed design process, the Panel concluded that the safety of Grange Road,

Rifle Range Road, the busway and the active travel route can be safeguarded through the approval of detailed junction designs secured by planning conditions (PR 20.123–20.124).

87. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She has no reason to disagree with the Panel's conclusions on this matter and is satisfied that the proposed junctions, crossings and active travel route can be designed and operated safely and that the Scheme would not give rise to unacceptable risks for motorists, pedestrians, cyclists or horse riders.

Effects of congestion, movement, accessibility, parking and convenience on motorists, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders

88. The Applicant submits that the Scheme is required to address existing and forecast congestion arising from planned housing and employment growth and that improving accessibility, relieving congestion and supporting sustainable travel are key objectives of the Order. (PR 10.4–10.6, 10.18). The Applicant further submits that the Transport Assessment identified no unacceptable adverse effects on local junctions and that proposed bus stops, together with the Scotland Farm Travel Hub and Park and Ride facility, would improve accessibility and reduce the risk of parking and congestion impacts in Coton (PR 10.131). The Applicant also contends that the Scheme would provide substantial transport benefits through improved journey time reliability, modal shift and congestion relief (PR 10.185).

89. The Secretary of State notes that CPPF & CPC disputed the need for the Scheme and questioned whether it would deliver the congestion, accessibility and journey time benefits claimed by the Applicant (PR 12.12). Objectors further argued that the proposed termination point at Grange Road would not provide effective access to key destinations, that onward public transport connections were unclear and that Grange Road lacked the capacity to accommodate additional bus movements (PR 17.10, 17.40, 18.89, 18.134). Concerns were also raised regarding construction traffic, the removal of lay-bys on St Neots Road, commuter parking in Coton and the effects of the Scotland Farm Travel Hub on local traffic conditions and accessibility (PR 17.24, 18.73, 18.82, 18.131, 18.132).

90. The Panel concluded that disruption during construction could be appropriately managed through established controls and mitigation measures (PR 20.129). The Panel further concluded that the Scheme would help address existing congestion by enabling buses to avoid congestion, particularly on Madingley Road, and that the proposed signalised crossing at Cambridge Road, Coton, would not materially affect the local road network (PR 20.130–20.131). Whilst recognising that wider congestion issues in Cambridge would remain, the Panel found no convincing evidence that routing services via Grange Road would materially worsen congestion or adversely affect the operation of the local highway network (PR 20.132).

91. In relation to St Neots Road, the Panel concluded that the removal of lay-bys would cause some inconvenience but would not result in material harm to accessibility or parking arrangements, provided suitable access arrangements are secured for affected businesses (PR 20.133–20.137). The Panel also concluded that the Scotland Farm Travel Hub would remain accessible from Dry Drayton and that the absence of additional traffic calming measures or a dedicated active travel route north of the site does not weigh against the Scheme (PR 20.138–20.139). The Panel further concluded that there is no convincing evidence that commuter parking associated with the Scheme would result in unacceptable parking problems in Coton (PR 20.140).

92. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the Scheme would improve accessibility and support congestion relief by providing quicker and more reliable journeys.

She further agrees that the removal of lay-bys on St Neots Road would not result in material harm to accessibility or parking arrangements and that there is no convincing evidence that the Scheme would result in unacceptable parking problems in Coton or elsewhere along the route. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's overall conclusions on this matter.

Effect on the environment – Flood Risk

93. The Applicant states that the Scheme would not give rise to any significant flood risk effects, and any adverse effects would be minimal. It is noted that the Environment Agency initially objected to the Scheme in relation to concerns about modelling and the flood risk but following additional information and a flood risk assessment, this was withdrawn. The Applicant's modelling assessed that the Scheme would result in only very minor increases to flood extents and depths and would not increase flood risk elsewhere, including for residents of the Gough Way estate (PR 10.120–10.121).

94. The Applicant further submits that the Scheme would be safe for its lifetime and that, in light of the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment, the sequential test is not required. Alternatively, the Applicant contends that there is no sequentially preferable route available and that the Scheme would satisfy the requirements of both the sequential and exception tests (PR 10.121–10.123).

95. In relation to the Water Framework Directive, the Applicant's position is that any potential effects can be addressed through the detailed design process and the Flood Risk Activity Permit regime, and that it is both unnecessary for the decision-making process to duplicate controls that would be secured through that separate statutory regime, and that the Secretary of State may lawfully assume that the relevant regulatory system will operate effectively, having regard to case law (PR 10.141).

96. The Secretary of State notes that concerns were raised regarding the adequacy of the flood risk assessment and the potential effects of the Scheme on flood risk both upstream and downstream of Bin Brook. Objectors contended that the proposed Bin Brook bridge and embankments could increase flood risk to nearby properties, including those at Gough Way, Barton Road and St John's College, and argued that alternative on-road routes would avoid the need for development within the floodplain (PR 17.38, 17.43, 18.45, 18.110, 18.128).

97. Objectors further argued that the Applicant's flood modelling was incomplete and failed adequately to assess the effects of the Scheme on third parties. Concerns were raised regarding the robustness of the modelling, its treatment of downstream impacts and whether sufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that the Scheme would not increase flood risk elsewhere (PR 18.103, 18.110, 18.127).

98. Additional concerns were raised that the Scheme could affect existing drainage infrastructure and increase flood risk to nearby properties, particularly in the vicinity of the A428 and St Neots Road (PR 18.27).

99. The Panel acknowledged concerns regarding the potential effects of the Bin Brook bridge and embankments on nearby properties, including those at Gough Way, Barton Road and St John's College. A strip of land is noted to be within flood zone, meaning in accordance with the NPPF, there is a high probability of flood events occurring (PR 20.145). However, the Panel concluded that there is no reasonably available alternative route which would be suitable for the Scheme and found that the sequential test is satisfied (PR 20.145–20.147). The Secretary of State further notes that, as elements of the Scheme constitute essential infrastructure located within Flood Zone 3, the exception test applies (PR 20.148).

100. The Panel concluded that the Scheme would provide wider sustainability benefits which outweigh the identified flood risk and that the proposed flood mitigation measures, including the surface water drainage strategy, would ensure that the Scheme would be safe for its lifetime without materially increasing flood risk elsewhere (PR 20.148-20.150). The Panel therefore concluded that the Scheme would not materially increase flood risk and would accord with the requirements of the NPPF in relation to flood risk (PR 20.151).

101. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that the flood risk modelling underpinning the Flood Risk Assessment is sufficiently robust and that significant weight should be afforded to the Environment Agency's withdrawal of its objection. She further agrees that there is no reasonably available alternative route which would avoid the identified flood risk constraints and that the sequential test is therefore satisfied.

102. The Secretary of State also agrees that the proposed surface water drainage and flood mitigation measures would ensure that the Scheme would be safe for its lifetime and would not materially increase flood risk elsewhere, including for nearby properties. She therefore agrees with the Panel that the Scheme would not materially increase flood risk and accords with national planning policy in relation to flood risk.

The Effect on the environment – Nature Conservation

103. The Secretary of State notes that concerns were raised regarding the effects of the Scheme on designated nature conservation sites, protected species and priority habitats. Natural England highlighted the importance of the landscape surrounding Madingley Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest ("SSSI") and the Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation for barbastelle bats and raised concerns regarding the potential severance of bat populations and the implications for genetic connectivity between colonies. Natural England also identified the need for further survey work and mitigation measures relating to bat foraging habitat, collision risk, lighting and crossing points (PR 18.17, 18.19).

104. Objectors further argued that the Scheme would result in unacceptable harm to Coton Orchard and other valuable habitats. It was argued that the ecological assessment relied on incomplete or outdated information and that the loss and fragmentation of orchard and scrub habitats would adversely affect a range of species, including barbastelle bats, red and amber listed birds, scarce invertebrates and notable flora. Objectors also questioned whether the proposed mitigation measures had been demonstrated to be effective and argued that further ecological assessment and independent review were required (PR 18.92, 18.112).

105. In relation to Madingley Wood SSSI, the Panel concluded that while the operation of the Scheme would disrupt the flight paths of bats it would not affect the woodland interest of the site and would not harm the favourable conservation status of the barbastelle bat in the SAC. Similarly, the proposal would not be materially harmful to the continued presence of barbastelle bats associated with the SSSI (PR 20.159).

106. It is noted that 12 veteran Bramley apple trees at Coton Orchard are covered by a Tree Preservation Order, three of which will be retained with measures secured by condition 13 of the deemed planning permission in Annex A (PR 20.161). The Panel records that three additional veteran trees within Coton Orchard are intended to be translocated but was not confident that this could be undertaken without loss or deterioration of those trees. Paragraph 193(c) of the NPPF (N6 paragraph 2 of the updated NPPF) provides that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including veteran trees, should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional

reasons and a suitable compensation strategy is in place. It is noted that, in the event of loss, the Applicant has prepared a draft compensation package as set out at PR 20.165, but the Panel considered that, because this remained in draft, with further detail of compensation expected, it could not be regarded as a suitable compensation strategy as sought by paragraph 193(c). The Panel considered that in any event harm would have occurred to the veteran trees (PR 20.165). The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel's conclusions at PR 20.327 and is satisfied that the benefits of the Scheme amount to wholly exceptional reasons and that a planning condition (condition 13) will ensure a suitable compensation strategy will be put in place before any works or development is to commence at Coton Orchard, including in relation to veteran trees. For this reason, the Secretary of State takes a different view to that taken by the Panel and is therefore, content that paragraph 193(c) of the NPPF is satisfied.

107. The Panel concludes that the construction of the Scheme through Coton Orchard County Wildlife Site ("CWS") would result in the loss of habitat and a permanent harmful effect on the County Wildlife Site, to which substantial weight should be given (PR 20.160). The Panel further concluded that there is a significant risk of harm to the veteran Bramley apple trees proposed for translocation and gives substantial weight to the potential loss or deterioration of those trees (PR 20.162–20.166).

108. The Panel concluded that, in addition to Coton Orchard CWS, the Scheme would result in habitat loss within parts of three other non-statutory wildlife sites. However, the Panel found that habitat creation, landscaping and compensation measures would reduce those effects, although they would take time to become fully effective. The resulting harm is afforded moderate weight in the planning balance (PR 20.167–20.168).

109. The Panel further concluded that construction of the Scheme would result in temporary disturbance to protected and notable species and has the potential to have an adverse effect. However, appropriate mitigation, licensing and management measures could be secured to avoid or minimise significant effects. The Panel also finds no evidence that the proposed operational mitigation measures would be ineffective and concludes that the operation of the Scheme would not give rise to significant adverse effects on most species (PR 20.169–20.172). The Secretary of State agrees with this conclusion and is satisfied that appropriate measures are secured in the Deemed Planning Permission.

110. The Panel records that there was a dispute about the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain ("BNG") (PR 20.173). The Panel concluded that an uplift in BNG would be delivered by the Scheme, but that the extent of that uplift would need to be reassessed using a revised metric. For that reason, the Panel considered that BNG should attract no more than moderate weight in favour of the Scheme (PR 20.173). Whilst there is no statutory requirement for BNG to be delivered in relation to the deemed planning permission, the Secretary of State notes the Applicant's intention to deliver 10% BNG and that this is secured by condition 17 of the deemed planning permission in Annex A (PR 10.86). For the reasons given by the Panel, she agrees that this attracts moderate weight in favour of granting consent.

111. The Secretary of State also agrees that the loss of habitat due to the construction of the Scheme would result in a permanent harmful effect on Coton Orchard CWS and that substantial weight should be afforded to that harm (PR 20.161). She further agrees that substantial weight should be given to the potential harm to the veteran Bramley apple trees proposed for translocation (PR 20.166).

Habitats Regulations Assessment

112. Under regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2017, as amended by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit)

Regulations 2019 ("the Habitats Regulations"), the Secretary of State as the competent authority is required to consider whether the Scheme (which is a project for the purposes of the Habitats Regulations) would be likely, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, to have a significant effect on a European site.

113. Where likely significant effects cannot be ruled out, the Secretary of State must undertake an appropriate assessment ("AA") under regulation 63(1) of the Habitats Regulations to assess potential adverse effects on site integrity. Such an assessment must be made before any decision is made on undertaking a plan or project on any decision giving consent, permission or other authorisation to that plan or project. In light of any such assessment, the Secretary of State may grant development consent only if it has been ascertained that the plan or project will not, either on its own or in-combination with other plans and projects, adversely affect the integrity of such a site, unless there are no feasible alternatives and imperative reasons of overriding public interest ("IROPI") apply (regulation 64). Where a plan or project is agreed to in accordance with regulation 64, notwithstanding a negative assessment of the implications for a European site, regulation 68 also requires that the appropriate authority must secure that any necessary compensatory measures are taken to ensure the overall coherence of the national site network is protected.

114. The Applicant's HRA conducted a screening assessment to identify European sites potentially affected by the Scheme. This included a zone of 2km surrounding the Scheme which was extended subject to circumstances, such as where bats were identified as a qualifying feature of a Special Area of Conservation ("SAC") within 30km of the Scheme. The Applicant identified the potential for likely significant effects ("LSE") on the following four European sites:

- Eversden and Wimpole SAC;
- Ouse Washes SAC;
- Ouse Washes Ramsar site; and
- Fenland SAC.

115. No evidence was presented during the Inquiry to suggest that effects from the Scheme could occur to any other European sites. The Secretary of State agrees with this assessment.

116. Under the Habitats Regulations, it is necessary to consider the potential for in-combination effects, as well as effects due to the project in isolation. The Applicant's HRA Report considered the potential for in-combination effects with other plans and projects that have the potential for significant effects on the identified European site. The Applicant identified eleven projects which have the potential for in-combination effects.

117. Of the eleven projects identified in the Applicant's HRA, only Bourn Airfield (planning ref: S/3440/18/OL, outline consent granted) was assessed as having the potential for in-combination effects to occur to the Eversden and Wimpole SAC. The Secretary of State agrees with this assessment.

118. As part of the Secretary of State's HRA, an additional potential in-combination project was identified, Land South of St Neots Road (planning ref: 26/01263/OUT. The Secretary of State has reviewed the available information on the Land of St Neots Road project and has determined that an in-combination assessment of this project is not possible at this stage due to the lack of information available. Therefore, such an assessment would be more appropriate carried out by the applicant for the Land of St Neots Road project and no further assessment was undertaken as part of the HRA process.

119. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant concluded that no LSE were anticipated to occur at the following sites as there are no impact pathways identified and this conclusion was not disputed:

- Ouse Wash SAC;
- Ouse Wash Ramsar site; and
- Fenland SAC.

120. The Secretary of State has considered the Applicant's conclusions and the Panel's Report for all European sites, qualifying features and pathways of effect and agrees that there would be no LSE for the Ouse Wash SAC and Ramsar site, and the Fenland SAC. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant identified potential LSE on the Eversden and Wimpole SAC both alone and in-combination with the Bourn Airfield New Village. The Secretary of State agrees with this assessment.

121. The Applicant identified two potential impact pathways where LSE on the one qualifying feature of the Eversden and Wimpole SAC, the Barbastelle Bat (*Barbastella barbastellus*), could not be ruled out. The two impact pathways included: fragmentation impacts to qualifying features during construction and / or operation; and killing and injury of interest features/species during operation. Natural England and the Panel agreed with the potential impact pathways and the potential for LSE on the Eversden and Wimpole SAC. The Secretary of State accepts this view.

122. The Applicant conducted an AA to assess if there is any potential for Adverse Effect of Integrity ("AEol") to the Eversden and Wimpole SAC as a result of the Scheme either alone or in-combination.

Appropriate assessment: alone

123. Regarding the potential for fragmentation impacts to qualifying features during construction and / or operation, the Applicant's HRA Report outlines landscaping proposals to mitigate the LSE and to minimise the disruption of flight paths for bats through the landscape. These proposals include, but are not limited to, the following: the planting of woodland, trees and hedgerows; the specification of larger, more mature standard trees; trees to be planted along the banks of the busway and close to the service road; landscaping proposals to be reviewed by a competent ecologist; landscape mitigation features are proposed at each habitat severance point where bat crossing surveys reached the threshold for mitigation installation; mitigation / buffering for increased levels of lighting; and a landscape strategy implemented and secured through a planning condition. The Applicant's HRA Report concluded that, following the implementation of these mitigation measures, there would be no AEol to the Eversden and Wimpole SAC.

124. Natural England's correspondence from 8 January 2025 raised that there is a known bat maternity roost located in Madingley Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest ("SSSI") and as such Madingley Wood SSSI is classified as functionally linked land to the Eversden and Wimpole SAC bat population. Additionally, Natural England also noted that the Coton Orchard CWS has the potential to provide supporting habitat for barbastelle bats, particularly from the nearby Madingley Wood SSSI.

125. Natural England also raised concerns about barbastelle bats and advised that the Applicant's HRA report was not robust enough to provide sufficient certainty that there would be no AEol to the Eversden and Wimpole SAC. Natural England requested that a bat activity survey for Coton Orchard CWS and adjoining scrub and woodland be undertaken. They also requested that they see and approve detailed lighting plans and strategies for both construction and operation phases, as well as requesting to see the Ecology Site Management Plan, and recommended a strict 'no night working allowed'

commitment. Additionally, they requested more information on how the proposed dark corridors will be maintained and monitored.

126. Following continued engagement between the Applicant and Natural England, Natural England provided a Position Statement in September 2025. This contained a draft of planning conditions agreed with the Applicant which set out a requirement for consultation with Natural England once the final design of the bat mitigation has been produced. Natural England confirmed that they are satisfied that sufficient regard has been given to the identification of foraging areas and the potential for Coton Orchard CWS to be a valuable foraging habitat. Natural England concluded that, provided the necessary mitigation measures are implemented, there would be no AEol on the Eversden and Wimpole SAC as a result of the Scheme. In response to the Secretary of State's consultation on 15 July 2026, Natural England confirmed their position has not changed.

127. The Secretary of State is satisfied that the landscape design and control measures are such that there would be no AEol on the Eversden and Wimpole SAC arising as a result of fragmentation impacts of qualifying features and that these have been secured in the planning conditions attached to the Deemed Planning Permission.

128. Regarding the potential for killing and injury of interest features/species during operation, the Applicant's HRA Report outlines measures to mitigate the risk of bat mortality, these are, but are not limited to, the following: limiting the speed of buses; limiting bus movements during the juvenile bat risk period; embedded landscape mitigation features; extensive replacement woodland; increased embankment height; a dark corridor; planting of new woodland; a sensitive lighting strategy; willow fencing or similar to be used as a temporary mitigation measure; the re-evaluation at the detailed design stage of the requirement of a bund; as a general rule, the gap between canopy heights either side of the new road to be no more than 20m wide; and annual monitoring for 5 years until establishment and then every 3 years thereafter (HRA 4.28 and 4.29). Following the implementation of the mitigation and monitoring measures, the Applicant concluded that there would be no AEol of the SAC as a result of bat mortality (HRA 4.30).

129. In their correspondence of 8 January 2025, Natural England disagreed with the Applicant's conclusion, stating that even a handful of collisions may significantly reduce the population size of a colony. They stated that a 20m gap between canopies puts bat at a greater risk of collision. They advised that the timings of first and last bat pass registrations should be analysed to identify priorities for the highest quality mitigation, and that further investigation into the current road crossing behaviour of bats in the area should be undertaken.

130. Subsequently, the Applicant produced a Technical Note 3: Thermal Imaging Report which provided additional information on how Barbastelle bats interact with the existing road and neighbouring vegetation in the local context.

131. Following this and continued engagement with the Applicant, including the agreement of draft conditions, Natural England's September 2025 Position Statement confirmed that, subject to the agreed upon mitigation being implemented, there would be no AEol of the Eversden and Wimpole SAC. Natural England confirmed in their response to the Secretary of State's consultation on 15 July 2026 that their position has not changed.

132. Based on the information before her, and subject to the mitigation measures which the Secretary of State is satisfied are secured in the planning conditions, the Secretary of State is satisfied that there will be no AEol of the Eversden and Wimpole SAC arising as a result of the killing and injury of interest features/species during operation of the Scheme (HRA 4.39).

Appropriate assessment: in-combination

133. Regarding the potential for the fragmentation impacts of qualifying features during construction and / or operation, Bourn Airfield was the only project identified as having the potential for in-combination effects. The Bourn Airfield HRA Report undertook an AA due to the potential for LSE to the Eversden and Wimpole SAC as a result of a reduction in available foraging for the male barbastelle bats in the Site (construction and operation); and females deterred from visiting the Site (construction and operation). The Bourn Airfield HRA concluded that, subject to artificial lighting mitigation, there would be no AEoI to the Eversden and Wimpole SAC. The Secretary of State is satisfied that there will be no in-combination effect as a result of the Scheme and Bourn Airfield, subject to the mitigation for both projects being implemented.

134. Regarding the potential for the killing and injury of interest features/species during operation, there is no potential in-combination effects with the Bourn Airfield project due to the nature of the project (HRA 4.40).

HRA Conclusion

135. The Secretary of State has undertaken an objective scientific assessment of the implications of the Scheme on the qualifying features of the European site, using the best available scientific knowledge and on a precautionary basis. The assessment has been made in light of the conservation objectives for the European site. Based on the information available to her and subject to the mitigation measures which are secured in the planning conditions (conditions 9, 10, 20 (with the relevant omitted text requiring consultation with Natural England inserted by the Secretary of State), 21 and 22), including those agreed between the Applicant and Natural England, the Secretary of State is satisfied that the Scheme, either alone or in-combination with other committed developments, will not adversely affect the qualifying feature of the Eversden and Wimpole SAC. The full reasoning is set out in the HRA which has been published alongside this decision letter.

The effect on the environment – Character and Appearance of the Area

136. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant's landscape and visual impact assessment predicted that there would be no significant effects on landscape at Year 15 with only users of public rights of way predicted to experience a significant, albeit, local effect. Effects would be mitigated both during construction by way of the CoCP and LEMP and during its operation through the design of the busway and its landscaping. The Applicant stated the technical assessment is robust and correct confirming that the effects of the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity would be acceptable (PR 10.112). The Applicant states for the part of the route of the busway between Hardwick and Cambridge the linear form of the busway would not significantly disrupt the countryside to which it passes and planting, earthworks and other mitigation measures would help to integrate the busway into the surrounding landscape. To the north of the A428 construction of the park and ride facility would encroach onto the settled rural landscape and would be a substantial built feature, although the impact would be lessened by planting within the site. Lighting would be introduced which would indicate the extent of the encroachment during darkness when the busway would be operational but there is already lighting nearby at the junction of Scotland Road with the A428, and traffic on the road and properties in Hardwick would also contribute to light impact (PR 20.175).

137. At Cambourne the busway would for the most part pass through the existing built up area and no adverse effect is expected. Townscape Character Area 2 is of greater sensitivity with the presence of heritage assets but the Panel found that the Scheme would

cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the West Cambridge Conservation Area, which would become moderately more urbanised (PR 20.176).

138. Insofar as the Order lands and the immediate surroundings, there would inevitably be a major change arising from the construction of the busway, its accompanying access and maintenance track, the Park and Ride facility and the new bridges (PR 20.177).

139. The Secretary of State notes that objections were raised regarding the effects of the Scheme on the character and appearance of the countryside, including the introduction of a new transport corridor across rural landscapes. Objectors argued that the busway would represent a discordant feature in the landscape and would adversely affect the character of the area and the visual amenity enjoyed by residents and users of public rights of way. The Panel did not share that view. They considered that the busway would introduce a hard-surfaced roadway to the area but for the most part this would be at or close to ground level. The Panel noted that the proposed planting and earthworks would provide screening which itself would blend into the surroundings (PR 20.179).

140. The Panel concluded that the principal landscape effects of the Scheme would arise within the Lolworth to Longstowe Wooded Claylands landscape character area (PR 20.174–20.175). Whilst the Scotland Farm Travel Hub and associated infrastructure would introduce new built development into the landscape, planting and other mitigation would reduce those effects over time (PR 20.175). The Panel concluded that the Scheme would give rise to a limited adverse effect on the landscape character of that area as a whole (PR 20.175). The Panel further concluded that the effects of the Scheme on other affected landscape and townscape character areas would be negligible or limited in extent (PR 20.176).

141. The Panel found that the busway, access and maintenance track, Travel Hub and associated structures would inevitably alter the immediate surroundings of the Order lands, but concluded that landscaping, earthworks and strengthened field boundaries would lessen those effects. The Panel concluded that the resulting effect on local landscape character would give rise to a moderate level of harm (PR 20.177). The Panel also concluded that construction activities would temporarily detract from landscape character and visual amenity. However, having regard to the temporary nature of those effects, the Panel afforded them limited weight (PR 20.178, 20.180).

142. In relation to visual effects, the Panel concluded that the busway would not appear as a discordant feature in the wider landscape and that, from many viewpoints, it would either not be readily discernible or would not represent a significant component of views. The Panel further concluded that, by year 15 once landscaping has matured, the localised visual harm to amenity would not merit more than limited weight (PR 20.179–20.180).

143. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the Scheme would result in some adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity, particularly within the immediate vicinity of the Order lands. However, she also agrees that those effects would be moderated by planting, earthworks and other mitigation measures and would lessen over time. The Secretary of State further agrees that the effects of the Scheme on the wider landscape would generally be limited and that the residual effects on visual amenity, once mitigation has matured, would be localised and of limited significance. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

The effect on the environment – Carbon Emissions

144. The Applicant submits that supporting the transition to a low-carbon economy is a key objective of the Scheme (PR 10.6). The Applicant contends that the Scheme would result in a net reduction in carbon emissions, based on the latest F-series traffic model and recent data from the May 2025 TAG data book (PR 10.92).

145. The Applicant further submits that its carbon assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Department for Transport's Quantifiable Carbon Guidance and represents the most appropriate methodology for assessing the effects of the Scheme (PR 10.93 and 10.94). The Applicant argues that criticisms of the carbon assessment rely on methodologies that are inconsistent with current guidance (PR 10.95 and 10.96). The Applicant provided information which satisfied the legal requirements of the ES with the methodology in the Quantifiable Carbon Guidance. Even if there were an error in the ES regarding whether the correct data book was used to inform it the conclusions of the assessment would not materially change had the November 2022 TAG data book been used and the same conclusion of a minor beneficial effect would result. The decision whether an assessment should be updated as a result of TAG data book changes is a decision for the promoter based on the principle of proportionality with a scheme specific assessment requirement. The Panel found that the decision not to update the carbon assessment was correct (PR 10.97–10.103).

146. The Applicant also submits that, even if the Scheme were found to result in residual carbon emissions, it is still a strategic fit with relevant local transport policy which is focussed on decarbonisation. Further the National Networks National Policy Statement ("NNNPS") is a material consideration (paragraph 1.9) and the Panel viewed the materiality in this matter particularly apparent because specific provision is made in respect of roads and buses as a form of public transport. The NNNPS provides that the approval of schemes with residual carbon emission is allowable and can be consistent with meeting net zero where emissions would not have a material impact on the Government's ability to meet its statutory carbon budgets. A balanced approach can be taken and the Scheme complies with national and local policies in this respect (PR 10.104–10.105).

147. The Secretary of State notes that CPPF & CPC disputed the Applicant's carbon assessment of the ES in failing to use the correct TAG data book for the composition of the vehicle fleet. They argued that the assessment relied on outdated assumptions regarding future vehicle fleets and electric vehicle uptake and contended that the Scheme would result in significantly higher emissions than those identified by the Applicant. CPPF & CPC further argued that, using alternative assumptions and methodologies, the Scheme could result in net carbon emissions rather than a carbon saving. (PR 12.23–12.28).

148. Objectors also questioned the extent of the carbon benefits attributed to the Scheme, arguing that projected reductions in emissions were highly uncertain and would arise largely from wider trends in vehicle decarbonisation rather than from modal shift generated by the Scheme itself (PR 18.125).

149. Concerns were also raised by objectors regarding the carbon impacts associated with construction of the Scheme. The off-road section of the busway would have a great environmental impact which amongst other impacts would have unacceptably high levels of infrastructure carbon associated with its construction (PR 17.20). It is calculated that the off-road section would take 57 years to break even on carbon in contrast to the alternative in-road scheme proposed by CPPF & CPC (PR 17.21). The Cambridge & Peterborough Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England oppose the busway, which is seen as offering poor value for money, destroying valuable areas of the countryside and creating unnecessary carbon emissions and support CPPF & CPC's alternative bus scheme coupled with measures to reduce traffic in Cambridge (PR 17.33). The Applicant's estimates are that vegetation loss from the construction of the Scheme would result in the release of sequestered carbon stored in vegetation, and even with newly planted trees would lead to a small decrease. The carbon emissions from construction are estimated at 29,130tCO₂e but the saving from a shift to bus use is expected to yield a reduction in emissions of 4,500tCO₂e over 60 years (PR 18.106). The

loss of trees will release large amounts of stored carbon and a kerb guided busway will require a large amount of concrete for construction which would create harmful carbon emissions (PR 18.136).

150. The Panel noted that there is a dispute regarding the carbon effects of the Scheme but concludes that the Applicant's assessment methodology more closely follows current Government guidance (PR 20.181–20.185). The Panel further noted that the Applicant's updated assessment identifies a net reduction in carbon emissions over the assessment period, taking account of operational emissions, changes in vegetation and embedded construction carbon (PR 20.181–20.182).

151. The Panel acknowledged CPPF & CPC's criticism of the Applicant's assumptions regarding future vehicle fleet composition and electric vehicle uptake. However, the Panel concluded that the alternative approach proposed by CPPF & CPC would not be appropriate as it would imply levels of electric vehicle uptake in excess of 100 per cent and would not accord with the relevant Department for Transport guidance (PR 20.183).

152. The Panel further concluded that, whilst future carbon impacts remain subject to uncertainty, particularly in relation to future vehicle fleet composition, the Applicant's approach to assessing carbon emissions more closely follows government guidance (guidance represents the most appropriate assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme) (PR 20.184–20.185).

153. The Panel concluded that the predicted reduction in carbon emissions is relatively small and should therefore be afforded only at most little weight in support of the Scheme. However, the Panel also concluded that, even if the Scheme were a net emitter of carbon, it would remain consistent with the strategic objective of supporting the decarbonisation of local transport by providing a sustainable transport alternative (PR 20.185).

154. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that the Applicant's carbon assessment has been undertaken using the most appropriate methodology and in accordance with relevant Government guidance.

155. The Secretary of State further agrees that the Scheme is likely to result in a net reduction in carbon emissions, although the extent of that benefit is subject to uncertainty and should be afforded only limited weight. The Secretary of State also agrees that, even if the Scheme were ultimately found to result in residual carbon emissions, it would remain consistent with the broader objective of facilitating modal shift and supporting the decarbonisation of local transport. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

The effect of the Scheme on the Green Belt

156. The Applicant contended the Scheme would be a local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location but there would be some harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The Scheme would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt (PR 10.115 and 20.186-20.188). However, the Applicant stated that the resulting harm to the Green Belt openness and purposes would be at worst, moderate in extent and that very special circumstances exist because the identified Green Belt harm arising from the busway would be clearly outweighed by its benefits consequently complying with national and local Green Belt policy (PR 10.115).

157. The Applicant further submits that the Scheme would assist in protecting the Green Belt by supporting the adopted and emerging local plan strategies which allocate land for development largely beyond the Green Belt. For this strategy to succeed people must be able to travel between homes beyond the Green Belt to places of work in the City of

Cambridge, something the Scheme would facilitate in a sustainable way. The Applicant contends that, by supporting development outside the Green Belt, the Scheme is likely to make it easier for the local planning authorities to resist development within the Green Belt (PR 10.116–10.117).

158. The Applicant also submits that any transport scheme connecting Cambourne and Cambridge would need to traverse the Green Belt at some point and that there is no realistic alternative which would avoid Green Belt land entirely. Overall the benefits of the Scheme clearly outweigh the harm. The Applicant therefore contends that the very special circumstances balance weighs clearly in favour of the Scheme (PR 10.118, 10.192).

159. The Secretary of State notes that objectors raised concern about the impact of the Scheme on Green Belt, that very special circumstances had not been demonstrated. They further submitted that less harmful alternatives were available which would avoid or reduce impacts on the Green Belt including the alternative promoted by CPPF and CPC (PR 12.3, 12.34-36, 14.3, 17.11, 17.20, 18.88, 18.94, 18.100, 18.104–18.105, 18.135, 18.137).

160. Objectors further argued that the Scheme would harm valued areas of countryside, including Coton Orchard, Madingley Hill and surrounding agricultural land, and would result in the loss of important Green Belt land and associated environmental assets. Concerns were also raised regarding the effects of the Scheme on the openness of the Green Belt, the character of the rural landscape and important views in and around Cambridge (PR 14.3, 17.11, 17.20, 18.88, 18.94, 18.104–18.105, 18.135).

161. Objectors contended that the Green Belt harm arising from the Scheme was unnecessary because viable alternatives existed, including the alternative route promoted by CPPF & CPC. It was also argued that the Scheme could encourage further development within the countryside and Green Belt, thereby increasing pressure on the landscape and undermining Green Belt purposes (PR 18.94, 18.100, 18.137).

162. The Panel concludes that the Scheme demonstrates a requirement for a Green Belt location, noting that any public transport scheme connecting Cambourne and Cambridge along the A428/A1303 corridor would need to pass through the Green Belt. The Panel further notes that both the Scheme and the CPPF & CPC alternative would need to cross the Green Belt (PR 20.186–20.187).

163. The Panel found that elements of the Scheme, including the Scotland Farm Travel Hub, sections of the busway, bridges, embankments, construction compounds and associated infrastructure, would result in harm to Green Belt openness and encroachment into the countryside. The Panel also concluded that parts of the Scheme would detract, to a limited extent, from the role of the Green Belt in preserving the setting and special character of Cambridge (PR 20.188–20.190).

164. The Panel therefore concluded that the Scheme would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt and that certain elements would conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Consequently, the Panel took the same position as the Applicant that although the Scheme involves the provision of local transport infrastructure it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt (PR 20.191).

165. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the Scheme demonstrates a need for a Green Belt location and that there is no realistic alternative public transport scheme which would avoid the Green Belt entirely. The Secretary of State further agrees that the Scheme would result in harm to Green Belt openness and would conflict with certain purposes of including land within the Green Belt. She therefore agrees that the Scheme constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

166. The Secretary of State considers the implications of this Green Belt harm, together with other harms and benefits arising from the Scheme, in the overall planning balance and in assessing whether very special circumstances exist. She therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

The effect of the Scheme on heritage assets

Adequacy of methodology and assessment

167. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that the ES, Heritage Statement and supporting evidence provide a comprehensive assessment of the effects of the Scheme on heritage assets. The Applicant states that the assessment identifies all relevant heritage impacts and concludes that any harm would be at the lower end of the spectrum of less than substantial harm and that many designated heritage assets, including Conduit Head Conservation Area, the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden, the associated listed Memorial and the Grade II listed Madingley Mill, would not be harmed by the Scheme. The Applicant further submits that the Scheme would not result in harm to the Conduit Head Conservation Area (PR 10.106-10.107).

168. The Secretary of State notes that objectors raised concerns regarding the adequacy of the assessment of heritage impacts. Objectors argued that the Heritage Statement focused principally on individual heritage assets and failed adequately to address wider strategic heritage considerations, including the historic setting of Cambridge and the relationship between the western edge of the City and its surrounding landscape (PR 18.127). Historic England stated concerns regarding the adequacy of the information provided to assess the effects of the Scheme on the significance of the Erskine Building at Clare Hall. They contended that further detailed design information was required in order properly to understand the potential effects of fencing, level changes, structures and other associated works on the setting of the listed building (PR 18.12–18.13).

169. The Panel concluded that the Applicant's heritage assessment is comprehensive and that there is no evidence that any heritage assets, material to the consideration of the Application have been omitted. The Panel noted that Historic England agreed with the scope and methodology of the assessment (PR 20.193).

170. The Panel acknowledged concerns regarding the level of design detail available in relation to the Erskine Building and the assessment of the wider historic setting of Cambridge. However, the Panel concluded that sufficient information is available to assess the likely heritage effects of the Scheme and that the Environmental Statement and supporting assessments adequately consider both individual heritage assets and the wider historic setting of Cambridge particularly with regard to its western edge (PR 20.194–20.196).

171. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that the heritage assessment submitted in support of the Scheme is comprehensive and that sufficient information has been provided to enable the effects of the Scheme on heritage assets to be properly assessed (PR 20.193–20.194). The Secretary of State further agrees that the Environmental Statement and supporting assessments adequately consider both individual heritage assets and the wider historic landscape setting of Cambridge (PR 20.195–20.196). The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel that the methodology and assessment undertaken by the Applicant are adequate for the purposes of determining the Scheme (PR 20.193–20.196).

Designated Heritage Assets

172. The Applicant further submits that the Scheme would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of a limited number of designated heritage assets, namely Clare Hall (Erskine Building), Elmside, 48 Grange Road, the Schlumberger Gould Research Centre, the West Cambridge Conservation Area and the Coton Conservation Area. Other designated heritage assets would not be harmed. The Applicant also identifies minor effects on the settings of certain non-designated heritage assets, including the former lodges to Childerley Hall and Leslie Barnet House (PR 10.108–10.109).

173. In relation to the seven groups of archaeological assets identified in the ES, the Applicant submits that, the Scheme has the potential for major adverse and therefore significant effects. However, with the proposed investigation and recording, it is considered in the ES that there would be a negligible residual effect (PR 10.110). The Applicant contends that this less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets would be outweighed by the benefits of the Scheme (PR 10.111).

174. The Secretary of State notes that objectors raised concerns regarding the effects of the Scheme on designated heritage assets and their settings. The Coton Busway Action Group (“CBAG”) fully support the initiative to provide better transport links. However, along with other organisations and individuals, CBAG strongly advocate the adoption of an alternative scheme that includes an on-road section from Madingley Mulch to the M11. CBAG consider the Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire County Council have failed to appreciate proposals for alternative routes and failed to acknowledge, among other matters, the setting for the American Cemetery and the introduction of a busway across the south side of Madingley Hill would be a significant disruption to the setting of the American Military Cemetery (PR 17.14 – 17.15 and 17.26). Cambridge Connect and other objectors similarly contended that the Scheme would harm the heritage landscapes associated with the American Cemetery, Coton and Coton Orchard and would adversely affect a number of designated heritage assets, including the Coton Conservation Area, the West Cambridge Conservation Area, the Erskine Building at Clare Hall and the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden (PR 18.94, 18.130).

175. Historic England raised concerns regarding the potential effects of the Scheme on the Grade II listed Erskine Building at Clare Hall. It was argued that the information submitted did not provide sufficient detail to fully assess the effects of the proposed works and that alterations to Rifle Range Road, including possible changes to drainage features, level changes, fencing, surfacing materials, road furniture and the loss of trees, could harm the significance of the listed building through both direct impacts and changes to its setting. Historic England therefore sought further design information to enable a full assessment of those effects and to identify opportunities for mitigation (PR 18.8–18.13).

176. The Panel concluded that the Scheme would not harm the significance of the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden, the associated Grade II listed Memorial, or the Grade II listed Madingley Mill. The Panel found that the separation distance, topography and intervening vegetation would ensure that the busway would not materially affect their settings, significance or appreciation (PR 20.240, 20.197–20.201).

177. In relation to the Grade II listed Erskine Building at Clare Hall, the Panel concluded that the busway would result in harmful changes to its setting arising from the increased urbanisation of Rifle Range Road, alterations to the character of the surrounding landscape and the likely loss of lime trees. The Panel concluded that these effects would result in moderate harm to the significance of the listed building, although the extent of harm could be reduced through careful detailed design and mitigation secured by planning conditions and given the high level of significance of the asset, it would be necessary for Historic England to have the opportunity for input before any details were approved (PR 20.202–20.210).

178. The Panel further concluded that the Scheme would result in limited harm to the significance of Elmside and very limited harm to the significance of 48 Grange Road through changes to their settings. The Panel also concluded that the Scheme would cause very limited harm to the significance of the Grade II listed Schlumberger Gould Research Centre (PR 20.211–20.217).

179. In relation to heritage assets within Coton, the Panel concluded that the Scheme would not harm the significance of any listed buildings in the village. However, the Panel found that the busway would result in limited harm to the significance of the Coton Conservation Area through its effects on the Area's rural setting (PR 20.218–20.224). The Panel concluded that the Scheme would also harm the character and appearance and hence significance of the West Cambridge Conservation Area as a whole. This would be limited in extent considered in the context of the whole area but with the potential for harm to be greater depending on the detailed design and configuration of the Scheme. The proposed bridge over the Bin Brook and the embankments on either side would be a prominent feature in the flat topography of the open areas and would interrupt some of the views from within the Conservation Area. The introduction of the busway infrastructure and the Bin Brook bridge and embankments with its overall height and mass of the structure along with the vehicle movements occurring at an elevated height being perceptible from within and outside of the Conservation Area would have a moderately harmful effect on the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole which is derived from its setting (PR 20.225–20.228). The Panel further concluded that the Scheme would not harm the significance of the Conduit Head Conservation Area (PR 20.229).

180. The Secretary of State has considered the Panel's conclusions, the Applicant's submissions and the objections received on this matter. She agrees with the Panel that the Scheme would not harm the significance of the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden, the associated listed Memorial, Madingley Mill, listed buildings in Coton or the Conduit Head Conservation Area.

181. The Secretary of State further agrees that the Scheme would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II listed Erskine Building, Elmside, 48 Grange Road, the Grade II listed Schlumberger Gould Research Centre, the Coton Conservation Area and the West Cambridge Conservation Area.

182. The Secretary of State considers that the harm to the significance of these heritage assets should be afforded considerable importance and weight. However, for the reasons set out in the planning balance below, she concludes that the public benefits of the Scheme outweigh the less than substantial harm identified to the heritage assets. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter (PR 20.235).

Non-designated heritage assets

183. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that the effects of the Scheme would result in only minor harm on the settings of non-designated heritage assets known as the former lodges to Childerley Hall, (Gate House and Chapelgate), and on Leslie Barnet House, a Building of Local Interest (PR 10.109).

184. The Panel concluded that Gate House and Chapelgate derive significance from their historic associations, architectural interest and relationship with the former Childerley Hall estate. The Panel finds that the elevated busway and vehicle movements would erode elements of their setting and result in very limited harm to their significance (PR 20.230–20.231).

185. The Panel further concluded that Leslie Barnet House, property within Clare Hall, derives significance principally from its architectural and historic interest. It also derives

some significance from its situation on Herschel Road where it both contributes to, and benefits from, the street scene and also from the relatively spacious grounds of the house and its neighbours to the rear giving a partly secluded and quiet setting. The Panel finds that increased activity associated with the Scheme, together with some limited visual intrusion and noise effects, would result in a minor diminution of its significance. However, its set-back position relative to the proposed busway would mean that effects on its significance by way of changes in its setting would be very limited, as would the extent of any harm (PR 20.232).

186. The Panel noted that, whilst the Applicant characterised these effects as less than substantial harm, the terminology of the NPPF relating to less than substantial harm applies only to designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, the Panel concluded that the extent of harm identified for the affected non-designated heritage assets would be very limited (PR 20.233).

187. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the Scheme would give rise to only very limited harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage assets at Gate House, Chapelgate and Leslie Barnet House through effects on their settings. The Secretary of State further agrees that the identified effects would be minor in extent and would not undermine the overall significance of those assets. She therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

Heritage effects of CPPF & CPC alternative Scheme

188. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that the CPPF & CPC alternative has not been developed in sufficient detail to enable a reliable assessment of its effects (PR 10.58, 10.66). The Applicant further submits that the alternative could give rise to harm to the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden, the associated listed Memorial and other heritage assets in the vicinity of Madingley Road (PR 10.61–10.62, 10.66).

189. The Secretary of State notes that CPPF & CPC contend that their alternative would avoid harm to the Coton Conservation Area and the associated listed Memorial at the American Military Cemetery on Madingley Road. They further submit that any effects on the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden would amount to less than substantial harm and would be outweighed by the public benefits of the alternative scheme (PR 12.38).

190. The Panel concluded that the section of Madingley Road adjacent to the American Military Cemetery is a particularly sensitive location in terms of designated heritage assets and that any encroachment into the Registered Park and Garden would be harmful (PR 20.235–20.236). The Panel further concluded that it is very unlikely that the CPPF & CPC alternative could be delivered without some degree of impact on the Registered Park and Garden or the setting of the associated listed Memorial (PR 20.237).

191. The Panel acknowledges that the full effects of the alternative cannot be conclusively assessed because of uncertainty regarding its detailed design. Nevertheless, the Panel concludes that the alternative would result in less than substantial harm to the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden and less than substantial harm to the associated listed Memorial (PR 20.238 - 20.239).

192. The Panel further concluded that the alternative would be unlikely to cause material harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed Madingley Mill but noted that potential treaty implications associated with land connected to the American Military Cemetery introduce additional complexity and potential delay to an alternative scheme in this location (PR 20.240–20.241).

193. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the available information does not demonstrate that the CPPF & CPC alternative would avoid harm to designated heritage assets. She further agrees that the alternative could itself result in less than substantial harm to the American Military Cemetery Registered Park and Garden and the associated listed Memorial. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel's conclusions on this matter.

Buried heritage assets

194. The Secretary of State notes that the Applicant submits that, the Scheme has the potential to result in major adverse, and therefore significant effects on a number of archaeological assets. However, with the proposed mitigation of investigation and recording there would be a negligible residual effect (PR 10.110).

195. The Panel concluded that the effects of the Scheme on buried archaeological assets and the proposed mitigation measures are not disputed. The Panel found that, with the proposed mitigation in the form of investigation and recording, there is no reason to conclude that the effects would be unacceptable (PR 20.242).

196. The Panel further concludes that a planning condition would be necessary to secure the implementation of an appropriate programme of archaeological investigation and recording (PR 20.242).

197. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that, subject to the implementation of appropriate mitigation, the effects of the Scheme on archaeological remains would not be unacceptable. She further agrees that condition 8 in Annex A should be imposed to secure a programme of archaeological investigation and recording.

Other Matters

Loss of best and most versatile ("BMV") agricultural land

198. The construction of the busway would result in the permanent loss of approximately 39ha of the BMV agricultural land. The Panel concluded that since the ES indicates that this higher quality land extends beyond the route of the busway and the Scheme has been designed with crossing points and access arrangements to facilitate continued agricultural use of land affected by the proposal, although the loss of BMV land would be an adverse effect of the Scheme, it is one which only carries limited weight (PR 20.308).

199. The Secretary of State acknowledges that loss of this land would be an adverse effect but notes that the proposals will comply with Policy NH/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 since sustainability considerations and the need for the development (to support growth and the Development Plan spatial strategy) would outweigh the irreversible loss of BMV agricultural land (PR 20.331). The Secretary of State, therefore, agrees with the Panel that the loss of BMV land should only carry limited weight and is content that the need for the Scheme outweighs the adverse effect of the loss.

Mineral Safeguarding Areas ("MSAs")

200. The Secretary of State notes that parts of the route lie within MSAs and that in accordance with Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2036 ("MWLP"), unless development falls within certain specified categories (which this Scheme does not), it should only be permitted where there is an overriding need for the development (PR 7.8 and PR 20.309).

201. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel's conclusions at PR 20.331 that there is an overriding need for the development which is important to the continued growth of

the Greater Cambridge economy and is content that it would, therefore, comply with Policy 5 of the MWLP concerning MSAs.

The Sadler Family

202. The Secretary of State notes the Inquiry heard that the ashes of deceased members of the Sadler family are buried in one of the fields through which the route of the busway would pass. She notes that the Applicant is aware of the sensitivity of the matter, that the location of the ashes has been established and that whilst within the Order limits the carriageway would not appear to directly interfere with the site. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that careful consideration of the design and appropriate mitigation will be required if the ashes are to remain in their burial place but is content that there is no reason why this could not be achieved in preparing the detailed design (PR 20.310).

Project Governance

203. The Secretary of State notes that concerns were raised about the governance of the project and that submissions to the Inquiry were extremely critical of the way in which the project has been promoted by Cambridgeshire County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership and of the involvement of the University of Cambridge. This is, however, not a matter for the Secretary of State in her consideration of the application and, as stated by the Panel, should be pursued separately (PR 20.311).

The Secretary of State's overall conclusions on the Planning Balance

204. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Panel's weightings (PR 20.328) and that the matters weighing substantially against the Scheme are the impacts on Green Belt which as set out above amounts to inappropriate development on the Green Belt, permanent harm to Cotton Orchard CWS (PR 20.160) and the potential for harm to the veteran trees proposed for translocation (PR 20.166).

205. Matters that moderately weight against the Scheme are noise during construction (PR 20.95), harm to other wildlife sites and habitats (PR20.168 and 20.171), impact on aspects of the character and appearance of the area (PR 20.328) and harm to designated heritage assets (PR 20.325).

206. Matters that have limited weight against granting consent are; flood risk (PR 20.326 and PR 20.328), harms to some non-designated heritage assets (PR 20.325), localised harms to visual amenity, the adverse effect on the living conditions of residents of Childerley Gate and Herschel Road, which with mitigation merits limited weight (PR 20.328) and loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (PR 20.328).

207. Matters weighting substantially in favour of granting consent are the public transport benefits which are fundamental to implementation of the spatial strategy for Greater Cambridge (PR 20.322 and PR 20.328), unlocking delivery of other schemes in the area (PR 20.322) and the improvements in active travel (PR 20.323). Economic benefits resulting from the Scheme also weigh moderately in favour of granting consent. Other matters that have limited weight in favour of granting consent are the air quality impacts, the delivery of BNG and the carbon impacts. Overall the Secretary of State is content that the factors weighting against the Scheme are outweighed by the benefits. Consequently, she also agrees with the Panel that very special circumstances exist to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt in line with paragraph 153 of the NPPF (now paragraph 2 of GB6 of the Updated NPPF) and that the public benefits of the Scheme outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets in line with paragraph 215 of the NPPF (and section HE7 of the Updated NPPF).

Effects on statutory undertakers, statutory utilities and other utility providers

208. The Secretary of State notes that by the close of the Inquiry the only outstanding objection from any statutory undertaker, statutory utility or other utility provider was that from Anglian Water Services Ltd and Cambridge Water (“AW&CW”) (OBJ-271) (PR 18.23-18.25). The Panel notes that all other affected undertakers and utilities, including National Highways and Cadent Gas Ltd, resolved issues with the Applicant, including through protective provisions being amended in the draft Order and subsequently withdrawing their objections (PR 20.248).

209. The objection submitted by AW&CW was referred to as a holding objection to allow for more detailed discussions facilitating the successful delivery of both the water and busway schemes (PR 8.6) and the Panel reports that an update was provided by AW&CW at the Inquiry indicating that they were confident that agreement would be achieved soon after the close of the Inquiry at which point the objection could be withdrawn. It was anticipated that no amendments would be required to the draft Order directly (PR 8.7). The Secretary of State notes that in Post Inquiry Correspondence dated 16 February 2026, AW&CW advised that negotiations with the Applicant to resolve the matters raised in the objection had remained ongoing since the close of the Inquiry and they remained confident that the parties would be able to reach agreement but wished to confirm that their objection remained in place for now. The objection has not since been withdrawn and, therefore, remains outstanding.

210. The Panel states that whilst some parties raised concerns about the potential for conflict between the various proposed infrastructure, these generalised concerns appear unfounded given that both AW&CW and the Applicant have indicated that they are confident that agreement would be reached on outstanding matters and that amendments to the draft Order were not anticipated to be necessary (PR 20.249).

211. Whilst the Secretary of State acknowledges that the holding objection remains outstanding, she notes that AW&CW do not object in principle to the Scheme (PR 18.23) and both parties are confident of reaching agreement. She agrees with the Panel that the protective provisions in Parts 5 and 6 of Schedule 12 of the draft Order would, in any case, ensure that the Scheme would not adversely impact on AW&CW’s ability to carry out their undertakings (PR 20.249). In agreement with the Panel’s conclusions at PR 20.250, she is, therefore, content that, with the protective provisions in Schedules 11 and 12 of the Order, the making of the Order would not have any unacceptable effects on any statutory undertakers, statutory utilities or other utility providers or their ability to carry out their undertakings effectively, safely and in compliance with any statutory or contractual obligations.

Compulsory Purchase

212. As the Order would authorise the compulsory acquisition of land and rights over land and provide powers to use land temporarily for construction compounds and access to enable construction to take place (PR 20.264), the Secretary of State must be content that the relevant tests for justifying compulsory purchase powers as set out in paragraphs 12 to 15 of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government’s *‘Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process’* are satisfied:

- whether there is a compelling case in the public interest to justify conferring on the Applicant powers to compulsorily acquire and use land for the purposes of the Scheme, including whether reasonable efforts have been made by the Acquiring Authority to negotiate the purchase of land by agreement;
- 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);

- whether there are likely to be any impediments to the Applicant implementing the Scheme, including the availability of funding; and
- whether all the land and rights over land which the Applicant has applied for are necessary to implement the Scheme.

Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest and whether reasonable efforts have been made to negotiate the purchase by agreement

213. The Secretary of State has considered whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition powers sought, having regard to the ‘*Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process*’, the need for the Scheme, the absence of any practical alternatives to the proposals and the effects on those with an interest in the land. She notes that the Scheme is important for the future economic and social wellbeing and success of Greater Cambridge (PR 20.290) and agrees with the Panel at PR 20.252 that the benefits that the Scheme would deliver are in the public interest. Given the established need for the Scheme, the Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Panel at PR 20.290 that there is a compelling case in the public interest to acquire and use land for the purposes of the Scheme.

214. The Secretary of State notes the Panel’s comments with regard to the remaining objections from Ms Gazeley, Coton Orchard Ltd and Houston Crest Properties Ltd who contend that, as the guidance mode has not been finalised, there is insufficient detail and certainty that the acquisition of land would be necessary and proportionate to the public benefit identified (PR 20.253). As detailed at paragraph 13 above, the application has been considered on the basis of a road-based sensor guidance system where evidence has been sufficient to evaluate the effects of the Scheme and the Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the evidence has also been adequate to enable a clear understanding of how the land would be used (PR 20.253).

215. Furthermore, the Secretary of State also agrees with the Panel’s comments at PR 20.254 and 20.255 and, having considered the Mayor’s position on future bus services, she is content that there is nothing to suggest that bus routes and services would be limited such that the public benefits which support the compelling case to acquire the land would not be delivered. Given there is no satisfactory alternative to the Scheme deliverable in a timely manner, there is no alternative to the acquisition and uses of land necessary to deliver the Scheme. She also notes that, whilst maintaining their objection, AW&CW have not indicated any outstanding objection to the acquisition or use of land or rights that they own or occupy (PR 20.257).

216. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the Scheme is important for the delivery of future economic and social wellbeing and success of Greater Cambridge. She considers these to be substantial public benefits that support the compelling case to acquire and use land for the purposes of the Scheme (PR 20.290). She agrees that the need case for acquisition is not diluted by the remaining objections (PR 20.258 and PR 20.290).

217. The Panel reports that the Applicant has provided details of the progress of negotiations with affected landowners and others with an interest in the land. Agreement has been reached with a number of parties with land interests and by the close of the Inquiry six statutory objections had been withdrawn, with another indicating that they had no outstanding objections (PR 20.259). The Secretary of State notes, however, that some parties were particularly critical of the way in which negotiations were carried out and that the Applicant accepted that there were shortcomings in the accuracy of records detailing engagement with the Sadlers. The Panel states that even allowing for these shortcomings, the Applicant’s records do, however, show that there have been some attempts to

negotiate with the Sadlers, PX Farms Ltd and PX Land Ltd and the Spearing family and the Applicant has confirmed that an invitation to negotiate with owners remains open (PR 20.261).

218. In agreement with the Panel at PR 20.260 and 20.263, the Secretary of State is satisfied that reasonable efforts have been made to negotiate purchase by agreement and that even if some negotiations may not have been conducted in a manner to be expected by parties, she is content that the evidence indicates that the Applicant has complied with the *'Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process'*.

Human Rights considerations

219. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the potential impact of the proposed compulsory acquisition powers on those whose land and property interests would be affected. Having regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, the Secretary of State is in agreement with the Panel that the purposes for which the land and rights would be acquired and the benefits of the Scheme could only be achieved if the land required for the Scheme and its construction were available and there is thus justification for interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. She agrees that the interference with the rights of those persons whose property would be acquired is necessary and proportionate and that the purposes for which compulsory acquisition powers are sought would justify that interference. The Secretary of State agrees with the Panel that the Scheme would contribute to a significant improvement in connectivity in the region and an associated uplift in economic and social conditions, that there are no practical alternatives to the proposals and that the benefits could only be achieved if the land required for the development and its construction were available (PR 20.266 and PR 20.334).

220. The Secretary of State notes that the acquisition of land at the Sadlers' farm would include a route regularly used by family members of different generations but that a means of access would be maintained by way of a crossing over the busway. Through conditions requiring approval of details, adequate measures would ensure that all crossings would be accessible for those with a disability, impairment and of different ages (PR 20.267). This is reflected in condition 21 of the conditions proposed to be attached to the deemed planning permission at Annex A of this letter. The Secretary of State notes the Panel's comments at PR 20.268 in relation to due regard to the public sector equality duty and is content that equality impacts have been properly taken into account and that the arrangements that would be in place if deemed planning permission is granted would ensure that equality and good relationships between those who share protected characteristics and who do not would be maintained and discrimination avoided (PR 20.268).

Whether there are likely to be any impediments to implementing the Scheme including the availability of funding

221. The Secretary of State has considered whether there are likely to be any impediments to implementation of the Scheme and, in particular, whether sufficient funding is available to deliver the proposals. She notes the Panel's comments at PR 20.269 to PR 20.273 regarding the funding for the Scheme and is content that sufficient funding is available from the City Deal funds which has been confirmed by government and other monies to meet the cost of the Scheme. She has also had regard to the Funding Statement noting that measures are in place to keep Scheme costs and budgets under review with a commitment to allocate further funds as necessary (PR 20.272). The Secretary of State is, therefore, satisfied that funding is in place and, in agreement with

the Panel's conclusions at PR 20.273, is content that funding would not be an impediment to the Scheme going ahead.

222. The Secretary of State has had regard to the Panel's comments at PR 20.274 to PR 20.277 concerning other potential impediments. In relation to the acquisition and replacement of two plots of open space land, the inclusion of these areas of open space in the Book of Reference would not be an impediment to the powers which would be contained in the Order (PR 20.274). The implementation of East West Rail, which would pass under the busway in a mined tunnel where the two schemes would cross, means that it would be unlikely that a physical, timing or phasing impediment to the implementation of the Scheme would occur. The Scheme also overlaps with the planned routes of water supply improvement infrastructure in the vicinity of Madingley Service Reservoir in which AW&CW have confirmed that their proposals would not delay or impede the Scheme. There is reference to restrictive covenants on land formerly owned by the National Trust but the Trust has confirmed that they have agreed to disapply these, so this would not be an impediment to the Scheme (PR 20.275).

223. The Secretary of State has also taken account of the concerns of objectors regarding the prospect of increased powers and functions for combined authorities, the anticipated lifetime of the Greater Cambridge Partnership and future local government reorganisation which may replace Cambridgeshire County Council but the Panel observed that no inherent barriers to delivery by a successor organisation had been identified and in any event article 48 of the Order allows for the transfer of interests with the Secretary of State's consent (PR 20.276). The Secretary of State acknowledges these concerns but agrees with the Panel that these are unlikely to be impediments to the implementation of the Scheme and observes that there is no indication that the requirement to obtain any other consents or licences would lead to any legal impediments to implementation (PR 20.278). She further notes that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government has decided to grant the Open Space Certificate and that the matter of Crown Land has now been resolved as shown in paragraph 228 below. The Secretary of State is therefore satisfied that there are no likely impediments to exercising the powers in the Order and implementing the Scheme.

Whether all the land and rights over land are necessary to implement the Scheme

224. The Secretary of State has considered whether all of the land and rights included in the Order are necessary to implement the Scheme. She notes that, amongst other provisions, article 23 of the Order provides for rights to be acquired by agreement on plots which are not to be compulsorily acquired between Stirling Way and Broadway at Cambourne and between the M11 and Ada Lovelace Road in Cambridge. This approach means that in those circumstances land would not be acquired unnecessarily, illustrating that a proportionate approach has been adopted in identifying the extent and duration of acquisition and use of land or rights (PR 20.279).

225. The Secretary of State is in agreement with the Panel that the inclusion of the access and maintenance track (and therefore the land required for its provision) would be necessary and form an integral part of the Scheme. While not the principal part of the infrastructure on which the guided transport system run, it can reasonably be considered as ancillary to it and the evidence does not point to it falling outside the scope of a TWA Order (PR 20.281 to PR 20.284). She also agrees with the Panel that the extent of land included for provision of the Park and Ride facility at Scotland Farm, along with access, landscaping and drainage works would be necessary to implement the Scheme and that there is no evidence to suggest that the inclusion of a revenue generating element for charging vehicles would be outside the scope or aims of the Scheme (PR 20.285 to PR 20.286).

226. The Secretary of State is, therefore, satisfied that the Applicant has a clear requirement and justification for use of all land included in the Order and that all of the land and rights over land applied for are necessary for the implementation of the Scheme.

Crown Land

227. At the close of the Inquiry representations from the Department for Transport: Group Property Team remained outstanding in relation to registered and unregistered interests included in the Crown Land schedule in which the Department for Transport have an interest. Discussions with the Applicant were ongoing with no formal decision having been taken as to whether consent may be given to include the interests in the Order (PR 18.2).

228. In Post Inquiry Correspondence consisting of an e-mail of 1 April 2026 and attached letter dated 27 March 2026, formal confirmation of consent, as required by section 25(1) of the Act and subject to article 60 of the Order as drafted, was given to the compulsory acquisition of the non-Crown interests in the Crown land. Agreement to the drafting of articles 60 and 36 of the draft Order was also provided. Agreement to the drafting of article 36 was subject to any future agreement that may be made between the Applicant and the Secretary of State for Transport in respect of plot 14-154 where discussions were ongoing regarding the future ownership of the plot.

229. The Secretary of State notes that the correspondence is subject to any future agreement concerning plot 14-154. She is, however, satisfied that the necessary consent is given for the compulsory acquisition of non-Crown interests in the identified Crown land and is, therefore, content that the relevant statutory test is met.

Conditions proposed to be attached to the Deemed Planning Permission

230. The Secretary of State notes and agrees with the Panel's consideration of the proposed conditions to be attached to the deemed planning permission at PR 20.312 to PR 20.319. She agrees with the Panel's proposed conditions as set out at Annex 1 to the Panel's Report subject to the correction of some minor typographical errors which have been addressed in the conditions as shown at Annex A to this letter. The Secretary of State has also inserted wording relating to the agreed condition requiring consultation with Natural England into condition 20 where this had been omitted. She is satisfied that the proposed conditions meet the tests set out in paragraphs 57 of the NPPF (now reflected at DM6 paragraph 1 of the updated NPPF) and would be necessary, relevant to planning and the development to be permitted, precise, enforceable and reasonable in all other respects (PR 20.312).

231. The Secretary of State notes that, exceptionally, in light of potential effects on protected species and a Special Area of Conservation, flooding and a grade II* listed building, it is necessary that Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency are consulted on details submitted to discharge conditions dealing with mitigation of effects on those species, the asset and on ground water (PR 20.317).

232. As detailed at paragraphs 54-57 above the Secretary of State is satisfied that the Panel's recommended wording for condition 30 regarding the restriction of bus movements is appropriate and reflects sufficiently the wording on which Clare Hall withdrew their objection.

Proposed Modifications to the Order

233. The Panel recommended that the Order be made in the form shown in Core Document 1-02h subject to:

- the replacement of the definition of guided busway in article 2(1) with:

- “guided busway” means a way provided for the use of vehicles which are constructed or adapted to carry more than 8 passengers for hire or reward and use the mode prescribed in article 2(g) of the Transport and Works (Guided Transport Modes) Order 1992(b);
- and the insertion of *guided* before *busway* in line 1 of the text relating to Work No 1 in Schedule 1 (PR 21.1(i)).

234. The Secretary of State has adopted the recommendations immediately above. In addition, she has also made the following substantive changes to note to the Order:

- Articles 7, 8, 12, 18 and 19 have all been amended to reflect that where applications for the applicable consent are made, the undertaker is required to notify the relevant body of the effect of the provisions which enable deemed consent to be granted in certain circumstances.
- Article 20(2) and (3) (planning permission and supplementary powers) have been removed, on the basis that the relevant instruments to which those paragraphs are directed have been revoked, rendering them unnecessary.
- Article 36 (open space and exchange land) has been amended to remove references to land being offered for vesting, the Secretary of State considers that this is both consistent with the effect of section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, and the wording applied in the explanatory memorandum for the Order, which expressly contemplates that land has been or will be vested within the meaning of that provision.
- Article 48(6) (powers of disposal, agreements for operation, etc.) has been inserted to facilitate the imposition of conditions were reasonable by the Secretary of State in relation to matters under paragraph (1) and (2) of that provision.

235. In addition to the above, she has also made a number of other minor textual amendments to the Order in the interests of clarity, consistency and precision.

Secretary of State’s overall Conclusion and Decision

236. The Secretary of State has had regard to all matters set out above and, for the reasons given, has determined in accordance with section 13(1) of the Act to make the Order under sections 1 and 5 of the Act, subject to the modifications detailed under ‘Proposed Modifications to the Order’ above and a number of further minor drafting amendments which do not make any substantial change in the proposal such as would require notification to the affected persons under section 13(4) of the Act.

237. For similar reasons, the Secretary of State has also decided that the deemed planning permission should be granted for the development that would be authorised by the Order, subject to the conditions set out in Annex A to this decision letter (PR 21.1(iii)).

238. In line with the recommendations of the Panel at PR 21.1(ii), the Secretary of State also requests that the Applicant provide an amended Book of Reference for the Order, in the form shown in Core Document 1-13.03, and reflecting any change in the interests in land at Bourn Airfield of Anthony Simon Taylor, Leonard Dovell Taylor and Thomas William Taylor, and of Juniper Propco (Bourn) Ltd.

Notice of Determination

239. This letter constitutes the Secretary of State’s notice of her determination to make the Order, with modifications, for the purposes of section 14(1)(a) and (2) of the Act. Your client is required to publish a notice of the Secretary of State’s determination in accordance with section 14(4) of the Act.

Challenges to the Decision

240. The circumstances in which the Secretary of State's decision may be challenged are set out in the note at Annex C to this letter.

Distribution

241. Copies of this letter are being sent to those who appeared at the Inquiry and to all statutory objectors whose objections were referred to the Inquiry under section 11(3) of the Act, but who did not appear.

Yours sincerely,

Natasha Kopala

Annex A

Planning Conditions

INTERPRETATION

In the following conditions:

The development: means the works specified in paragraph 3 of The Cambourne to Cambridge Order - Request for Deemed Planning Permission, November 2024 (CD1-14.01).

The environmental statement: means the environmental statement comprising the Environmental Statement, Appendices and Technical Reports and their Appendices and Reports and Environmental Statement (Addendum) (June 2025), Environmental Statement (Addendum 2 and Clarifications) (July 2025) and Environmental Statement (Addendum 3 and Clarifications) (November 2025).

The Order: means The Cambourne to Cambridge Order 2026.

The Order Limits: means the limits of deviation and the limits of land to be acquired or used and shown on the Works and Land Plans.

The approved planning direction drawings: means the drawings, plans and details referred to in condition No 2 and set out in Annex B of this letter.

CONDITIONS

Commencement of development

1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced not later than 3 years from the date on which the Order comes into force.

Reason: To ensure that the works are commenced within a reasonable period of time.

Approved plans

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved planning direction drawings.

Reason: To provide certainty.

Development Phasing Plan

3) No development shall commence (including any intrusive site investigations and demolition) until a Development Phasing Plan setting out the sequence of delivery of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Development Phasing Plan shall include a proposed sequence for providing detailed design of the following elements and areas including, where appropriate, the securing of any necessary consents, licences or permissions:

- i) areas marked on the approved planning direction drawings "Area of Design to be Executed by Developer";
- ii) enabling works including tree and hedge protection, haul roads, site compounds and accesses, archaeology and site investigations;
- iii) proposed site compounds;
- iv) landscaping; and

v) any other building or structure, or alteration to an existing building or structure, for which details of scale and external appearance were not provided as part of the request for the planning direction.

The Development Phasing Plan shall identify:

- a) each phase of development, including its geographic location;
- b) the indicative duration of works for each site compound, construction access and haul road. This should include where and when areas of existing or replacement open space land are proposed to be used temporarily for construction works and for other associated purposes for the delivery of the development, will be closed to and unavailable for public use and subsequently re opened;
- c) a construction programme providing the sequence and timing of the proposed development; and
- d) for those areas marked on the approved planning direction drawings "Area of Design to be Executed by Developer", where appropriate, the date and planning reference number of the detailed planning permission.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Development Phasing Plan.

Reason: to ensure that the impacts of the proposed works are mitigated in a timely manner, to provide a clear framework for the determination of discharge and monitoring of conditions, to ensure co-ordination with those elements of the development to be delivered by parties other than the Applicant, and to identify when access to existing or replacement public open space land will be interrupted.

Contamination: risk assessment

4) No development shall commence until a Contamination Risk Assessment, including intrusive site investigation, of the risks posed by any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site, and including gases and water quality, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Contamination Risk Assessment shall:

- i) be based on information identified in the Desk Top Study undertaken to support Technical Report 11 Soil, Geology and Land Contamination (Document ref: CtoC-11-TR11-00) of the Environmental Statement and the Mott MacDonald Geotechnical and Geo environmental Preliminary Risk Assessment, May 2020 appended to it; and
- ii) be undertaken by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner, in accordance with British Standard BS 10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice and the Environment Agency - Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) (or equivalent British Standard and Model Procedures if replaced).
and include:
 - iii) an Intrusive Site Investigation Report providing a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination; and
 - iv) an assessment of the potential risks to: human health; property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes; adjoining land; ground waters and surface waters; ecological systems; and archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

Reason: To ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to human health, property, adjoining land, ground and surface waters, ecological systems, and archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

Contamination: remediation scheme

5) No phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall take place where land affected by contamination is found in land to be developed in that phase, as identified in the Contamination Risk Assessment required by condition No 4 which poses risks identified as unacceptable, until a detailed Remediation Scheme for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Remediation Scheme shall:

- i) include an appraisal of remediation options, identification of the preferred option(s), the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, and a description and programme of the works to be undertaken including a verification plan setting out the timescales for the submission of Verification Reports; and
- ii) be sufficiently detailed and thorough to ensure that upon completion the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to its intended use.

The approved Remediation Scheme for each phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approved programme of works within it. Upon completion of the approved programme of works a Verification Report by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant phase of development is first brought into use.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out safely and is safe to use without unacceptable risks to human health, property, adjoining land, ground and surface waters, ecological systems, and archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

Reporting unexpected contamination

6) Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the development hereby permitted that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the relevant local planning authority. Development on the part of the site or phase of development affected shall be suspended until a Supplementary Contamination Risk Assessment has been carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are identified or found, development on that part of the site or phase of development shall not resume until a Supplementary Remediation and Verification Scheme or Schemes have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out safely and is safe to use without unacceptable risks to human health, property, adjoining land, ground and surface waters, ecological systems, and archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

Post remediation long term monitoring and maintenance

7) No phase of development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) where contamination has been identified and remediated shall take place until a Monitoring

and Maintenance Scheme (the Scheme) to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed remediation for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Scheme shall include timescales for the reports and any necessary Remediation Protocols to be completed and submitted. The Scheme shall make provisions to include results of any analysis of samples undertaken as part of the Materials Management Plan required by clause xii) of condition No 10.

The approved Scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales set out in the approved Scheme.

The reports produced must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with the timescales set out in the approved Scheme.

If any of these reports identifies any discrepancy with the Verification Report then a Remediation Protocol for the necessary remediation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with the timescales set out in the approved Scheme.

Thereafter, any necessary remediation and verification shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Remediation Protocol before the relevant phase of development is first brought into use.

Reason: To ensure that the development has been carried out safely and is safe to use without unacceptable risks to human health, property, adjoining land, ground and surface waters, ecological systems, and archaeological sites and ancient monuments and remains so.

Archaeology

8) With the exception of the site investigation works approved under condition No 4, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until a programme of archaeological mitigation work has been carried out in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for that phase, which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The WSI shall include:

- i) details of proposed mitigation works including those identified as being required in relation to areas of archaeological significance by the preceding archaeological evaluation works undertaken and completed in line with the 'Written Scheme of Investigation for an archaeological trial trench evaluation' – WSP (Sept 2022) and set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Report 7 Heritage Impact Assessment (Document ref: CtoC-11-TR07-00) and its relevant supporting appendices (TR7.2 and TR7.3); and
- ii) a programme for assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination, and deposition of resulting material at the Cambridgeshire Archive facility, or another appropriate store approved by the relevant local planning authority, including timescales for any publication, dissemination and deposition and the notification thereof to the relevant local planning authority.

The mitigation works for each phase, and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination, and deposition of resulting material, are to be carried out in accordance with the specifications and timescales in the approved WSI.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of any archaeology and buried heritage assets is investigated, evaluated, recorded, protected and/or preserved as appropriate.

Code of Construction Practice

9) No development shall commence until a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The CoCP must accord substantially with the draft Code of Construction Practice (Document ref: CtoC-26-00). Amongst other provisions, the CoCP must include measures for temporary hedges, screens or other features to ensure that bat flightlines are maintained during construction, that the performance and effectiveness of the measures are monitored, and that there are mechanisms to alter or amend the measures if the monitoring identifies that this is necessary.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve the CoCP until it has:

- i) sought the views of Natural England on all aspects of the CoCP which relate to the provision of the bat flightline maintenance measures; and
- ii) taken any views and recommendations made by Natural England in this respect into account.

The development and construction works are to be carried out in accordance with the approved CoCP.

Reason: To ensure that the avoidance, minimisation and mitigation measures upon which the development relies to make it acceptable during the construction phase are appropriately designed, implemented and monitored in order to avoid unacceptable effects on the health and living conditions of human receptors, habitats, species and ecological systems, ground and surface waters, heritage assets, and travel and transport.

Local Environmental Management Plan(s)

10) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until a Local Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) in relation to that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority.

A LEMP shall include all the measures necessary for effectively managing the environmental effects of construction for each phase. A LEMP shall accord with the Code of Construction Practice approved under condition No 9. Unless confirmed in writing beforehand by the relevant local planning authority that elements set out in the following clauses for a particular phase are not necessary, a LEMP shall include:

- i) a Construction Traffic Management Plan, which shall include:
 - a. details of the permitted access routes and accesses for construction traffic;
 - b. details of the access and egress points for worksites and compounds.
 - c. temporary and permanent closures and diversions of highways and other public rights of way;
 - d. a list of roads which may be used by construction traffic in the vicinity of the site, including any restrictions to construction traffic on these routes, measures for the avoidance of large goods vehicles operating adjacent to schools during drop-off and pick-up periods,

and the management and signage necessary to implement, monitor and enforce any restrictions;

- e. the proposed traffic management strategy;
 - f. other measures which will affect the highway, including lorry holding areas;
 - g. measures for the establishment and operation of traffic liaison groups with key stakeholders to ensure programmes of works are shared and understood, including appropriate arrangements for engagement with local communities directly affected by site specific traffic management plans and the frequency of such arrangements; and
 - h. a register of applications for consents associated with temporary traffic management measures;
- ii) construction workforce travel plans setting out proposals for site access for all workers and site staff, including a demonstration of how public transport routes and facilities for cycling and walking according to anticipated demands have been taken into account;
 - iii) a Construction Dust and Air Quality Assessment, Management and Monitoring Plan, which shall:
 - a. be carried out in accordance with the appropriate Institute of Air Quality Management guidance;
 - b. provide an assessment of dust and air quality impacts associated with the construction process, including where these may have more pronounced effects on vulnerable individuals;
 - c. specify the measures to be put in place to avoid, minimise or mitigate potential harm to human health and residents' living conditions;
 - d. specify the dust and air quality inspection and monitoring procedures to assess the effectiveness of measures to prevent dust and pollutant emissions during construction; and,
 - e. specify the measures and procedures required to be implemented should inspection and monitoring indicate that measures are not effective or performing as intended;
 - iv) details for implementation of appropriate handling, treatment and disposal procedures during construction for the control of invasive and non-native species and any other species listed in Schedule 9, Part I or Part II of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, or the Weeds Act 1959;
 - v) surface water and groundwater control measures to include a description of the measures to be used to protect surface water and groundwater from pollution. The measures shall demonstrate how they follow the environmental good practice guidance set out within:
 - a. The latest Groundwater Protection Guides and Pollution Prevention for Businesses guidance from the Environment Agency and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs,
 - b. The Guidance for Pollution Prevention series of documents, including:
 - i. GPP1: A General Guide to Preventing Pollution, and
 - ii. GPP5: Works and maintenance in or near water.
 - c. Relevant CIRIA guidance, including:
 - i. C532: Control of water pollution from construction sites;
 - ii. C648: Control of water pollution from linear construction projects: technical guidance; and
 - iii. C649: Control of water pollution from linear construction projects: site guide, (or any equivalent guidance if replaced) and explain any circumstances where it is not reasonably practicable to do so;
 - vi) details of the construction compounds, access and temporary haul roads;
 - vii) measures to avoid the pollution of surface and groundwater, and remediate any contamination that may occur;
 - viii) details of temporary fencing and means of enclosure associated with the construction phase;

- ix) a Construction Lighting Management Plan, including where applicable, construction lighting shall comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance notes for the reduction of obtrusive light – GN01 (2011) and the provisions of BS EN 12464-2:2014 (Outdoor Workplaces) (or any equivalent guidance and British Standard if replaced);
- x) a Demolition and Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment, Management and Monitoring Plan - in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 +A1:2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration on construction and open sites (part 1- noise & 2-vibration) (or any equivalent guidance and British Standard if replaced) which includes details of any piling and mitigation/monitoring measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise or vibration;
- xi) a Site Waste Management Plan demonstrating how waste arising from the development is to be minimised and that which is produced is to be handled in such a way that maximises opportunities for re-use or recycling;
- xii) a Materials Management Plan covering materials brought onto, used in and removed from the development which shall include:
 - a. details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site;
 - b. details of the proposed sources of the imported or reused material;
 - c. details of the chemical testing for all material to be undertaken before placement onto the site;
 - d. results of the chemical testing which shall show the material is suitable for use on the development; and
 - e. confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development;
- xiii) details of non-road mobile machinery confirming that they meet a requirement to operate to the highest relevant Euro non-road emissions standards at the time of use;
- xiv) an Ecology Site Management Plan, including provisions for protected species;
- xv) details of any embankments and planted hedges to be created to encourage elevated bat crossing of the busway and any other bat mitigation measures;
- xvi) details of a construction phase complaints procedure and protocol for members of the public and businesses which includes provisions for making the procedure and protocol widely available to the public and for the display and publication of contact details of named individuals from contractors empowered to constructively respond to, manage and resolve complaints and details of proactive community liaison and engagement to be undertaken before, during and after construction works; and
- xvii) for the relevant LEMP(s) relating to works on and in the vicinity of Rifle Range and Grange Roads, a groundworks and construction methodology, including details of the physical and management measures to ensure the preservation and protection of Clare Hall grade II* listed building and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, in particular, but not limited to, rainwater goods and the drainage canal, and those features of the adjoining Brian Pippard Building which contribute to the significance Clare Hall grade II* listed building derives from its setting, through all phases of the development. The methodology shall include details of the durations protection features should remain and by which stage they must be removed.

Any LEMP produced shall be made available in forms suitable for inspection by members of the public, including electronic methods.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve any LEMP that incorporates measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate construction effects on bats, including the CoCP's requirement for bat flightline maintenance measures to be implemented, until it has:

- a) sought the views of Natural England on all aspects of the LEMP which relate to the provision of measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate construction effects on bats; and,
- b) taken any views and recommendations made by Natural England in this respect into account.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve any LEMP that includes methodology and details of measures to ensure the preservation and protection of Clare Hall grade II* listed building, until it has:

- c) sought the views of Historic England on all details submitted to discharge this condition which relate to the grade II* listed Clare Hall and its setting; and,
- d) taken any views and recommendations made by Historic England in this respect into account.

The development and construction works are to be carried out in accordance with the approved LEMP and the requirements of its component plans, methodologies, measures, details, surveys and procedures, including the retention of protection features for the durations specified.

Reason: To ensure that the avoidance, minimisation and mitigation measures upon which the development relies to make it acceptable during the construction phase are appropriately designed, implemented and monitored in order to avoid unacceptable effects on the health and living conditions of human receptors, habitats, species and ecological systems, ground and surface waters, heritage assets, and travel and transport.

Piling and boreholes

11) No investigation boreholes, or structures or buildings requiring the use of penetrative methods for investigation or foundations shall commence until the details of the methodology for investigation or the design details of the foundations as appropriate, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The methodology shall be prepared having regard to the relevant Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements. The methodology shall include a demonstration that the work will not lead to any unacceptable risk to groundwater and include details of any mitigation that is necessary.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve any such details, until it has:

- i) sought the views of the Environment Agency on all details submitted to discharge this condition; and,
- ii) taken any views and recommendations made by the Environment Agency in this respect into account.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved methodology including any necessary mitigation.

Reason: To prevent the pollution of controlled waters in order to avoid any unacceptable effects on human health, river systems and the natural environment.

Tree and hedge protection

12) With the exception of the site investigation and mitigation works approved under conditions Nos 4 and 8, no phase of site clearance, enabling or preparatory work, development or any work to trees or hedges, (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall take place on that phase until a scheme for the protection of retained trees and hedges (the Tree and Hedge Protection Plan) and as appropriate an Arboricultural Method Statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction -

Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) or a Hedgerow Method Statement, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Arboricultural and Hedgerow Method Statements shall:

- i) consider all construction and associated activities in a logical sequence in relation to the potential impact on trees and hedges and provide details of proposed tree and hedge works, the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees and hedges from damage during the course of any activity related to the development; and
- ii) be informed by an assessment of the detailed design of the development on existing trees within Coton Orchard, retained veteran trees within Coton Orchard and existing trees within the West Cambridge Conservation Area, which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority beforehand.

The necessary measures identified must be implemented in accordance with the approved Tree and Hedge Protection Plan, Arboricultural Method Statement and Hedgerow Method Statement before any site clearance, enabling or preparatory work, development or any work to trees or hedges take place, and the approved measures shall be retained and maintained until construction work is complete and all construction machinery, equipment and materials have been removed from that phase or part of the site.

Reason: to ensure that trees and hedges are protected during the construction phase to preserve the character and appearance of the area, including the significance of the West Cambridge Conservation Area, and to preserve habitats to maintain biodiversity.

Veteran trees at Coton Orchard

13) No site clearance, enabling or preparatory work or development shall commence and no veteran tree shall be cut down, uprooted, destroyed, pruned, cut or damaged in any manner until a revised Veteran Tree Mitigation Strategy, a detailed Veteran Tree Translocation Method Statement and a revised Veteran Tree Compensation Strategy have been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Veteran Tree Mitigation Strategy shall identify locations to translocate the three veteran trees that would be relocated, in as close a proximity to the current locations as would be reasonably feasible having regard to providing the most appropriate conditions to best ensure their survival.

The work shall be carried out in accordance with the revised Veteran Tree Mitigation Strategy and the Veteran Tree Translocation Method Statement. Should any of the translocated trees be removed, uprooted, destroyed or die within ten years from the date of the last veteran tree to be translocated, or any of the three retained veteran trees closest to the busway be removed, uprooted, destroyed or die within five years of the date of the completion of the busway, the measures in the revised Veteran Tree Compensation Strategy shall be implemented within the timescales it sets out.

Reason: to avoid the loss or deterioration of veteran trees, or if loss or deterioration occurs, to ensure that a suitable compensation strategy exists.

Removal of Trees or Hedgerows

14) No trees, hedges or any part of a hedge shall be removed at any time between 1 March and 31 August of any one year unless a competent ecologist has:

- i) first undertaken a detailed survey of the trees or hedges for active birds' nests immediately before those trees, hedges or parts of hedges are due to be removed; and
- ii) provided written confirmation to the relevant local planning authority prior to the removal of the surveyed trees, hedges or parts of hedges that no birds will be harmed and, where necessary, that appropriate measures have been put in place prior to any tree or hedge removal to protect nesting birds.

Reason: To protect nesting birds and maintain biodiversity.

Soil handling

15) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until a Soil Handling Management Plan (the Plan) for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Plan shall:

- i) be based on available Agricultural Land Classification data and supplemented, as necessary, with the findings of a detailed soil resource and agricultural land classification survey to be undertaken in relation to any agricultural soils that would be disturbed by the development, including volumes of available soil resources; and
- ii) include proposed mitigation measures to manage soils from within the Order Limits from agricultural land in a sustainable way during construction, including measures for stripping, storing and re-use of topsoil where appropriate and protection of soils from contamination.

Site preparation, enabling, construction and development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan and the measures it contains shall be completed prior to that phase of the development first being brought into use.

Reason: To ensure the sustainable use of soils, agricultural land and the safeguarding of natural resources.

Surface Water Drainage

16) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until a Surface Water Drainage Scheme (the Scheme) for that phase, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, on the principles within the Surface Water Drainage Strategy (Annex TR13.1.4 of the Appendix TR13.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Document ref: CtoC TR13 00) and the Water Framework Directive Screening and Scoping Assessment (Technical Report 13, Appendix TR13.2, Document ref: CtoC 11-TR13-00), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Scheme shall:

- i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- ii) include a timetable for its implementation;
- iii) provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime;

- iv) demonstrate that it has been prepared in coordination with the design of hard and soft landscaping required under condition No 19;
- v) demonstrate that it has taken account of the views, comments and recommendations of the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority and, in respect of interfaces with the Strategic Road Network National Highways, sought in connection with the Scheme; and
- vi) demonstrate that the detailed design provides compliance with the provisions of the Water Framework Directive.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Scheme and all measures in an operational condition prior that phase of the development is first brought into use. The sustainable drainage system shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the management and maintenance plan approved as part of the Scheme.

Reason: To ensure that there is no increased risk of flooding within or beyond the Order Limits as a result of the Scheme.

Biodiversity Net Gain

17) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no development shall commence until a Site Wide Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Site Wide BNG Plan shall:

- i) demonstrate that no less than 10% BNG will be achieved;
- ii) be developed in line with a biodiversity net gain assessment, based on the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (February 2024), and demonstrating a minimum positive biodiversity net gain unit score in line with the net gain target of 10% above the pre-development baseline and how this will be achieved through a combination of on-site and/or off-site works.
- iii) where appropriate, provide measures required in accordance with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs guidance on Irreplaceable Habitats, February 2024, except as provided for under the requirements of condition 13: and
- iv) include details of the management and monitoring of BNG, including reporting intervals and the mechanism for any necessary remedial work where the monitoring concludes that the target 10% BNG is not being achieved.

With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until an updated Phase Specific BNG Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The updated Phase Specific BNG Plan shall demonstrate compliance with the Site Wide BNG Plan.

The BNG measures shall be implemented and monitored in accordance with the approved Site Wide and relevant Phase Specific BNG Plans. A monitoring report shall be submitted to the local planning authority in accordance with the approved Site Wide BNG Plan.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements that the development relies on to be acceptable in planning terms.

Sustainability and Carbon Management

18) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until a Sustainability and Carbon Management Plan (the Plan) for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Plan shall include:

- i) details of how the detailed design will incorporate measures for climate change adaptation including aspects described in Table TR3-4 1 - Potential impacts and embedded mitigation of the ES Technical Report 3: Climate Resilience (Document ref: CtoC-11-TR03-00);
- ii) measures for energy and carbon reduction, including equipment and lighting energy efficiency;
- iii) measures for water efficiency and recycling throughout the development's lifecycle; and
- iv) details of materials specification and sourcing, including considerations of embodied carbon and emissions, carbon performance, longevity and measures for prioritising locally sourced materials and local waste management facilities.

All site clearance, enabling or preparatory work, construction and the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Plan.

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, encourages the re-use of existing resources and takes account of, and is resilient to, the effects of climate change.

Landscaping

19) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until a detailed soft and hard Landscaping Scheme (the Scheme) for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Scheme shall:

- i) demonstrate how it accords with the landscape mitigation as shown on the Planning Direction Drawings listed in Annex B;
- ii) include a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for all landscape areas;
- iii) include as part of the Scheme a demonstration that no barriers, fences, enclosures or similar features are to be permanently erected anywhere within the Order Limits between a position level with the west elevation of the Brian Pippard Building at Clare Hall in the University of Cambridge and a position level with the east elevation of Elmside at Clare Hall in the University of Cambridge; and
- iv) demonstrate that it has been prepared in coordination with the design and preparation of:
 - a. the Veteran Tree Mitigation Strategy, Veteran Tree Translocation Method Statement and Veteran Tree Compensation Strategy required by condition No 13;
 - b. sustainable water drainage measures required by condition No 16; and,
 - c. the Site Wide BNG Plan required by condition No 17.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved Scheme shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the first use of that phase of the development or the completion of that phase of the development, whichever is the sooner;

and any trees or plants which within a period of 10 years from the completion of the phase of development in which they are planted die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. All landscaping shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved Scheme. No barriers, fences, enclosures or similar features are to be permanently erected in the area set out in clause iii) above.

Reason: To assist in the assimilation of the development into its natural and built surroundings and to provide the mitigation the development relies on to avoid, minimise and mitigate adverse effects on landscape character, biodiversity, the living conditions of residents and the grade II* listed Clare Hall.

Bat Monitoring

20) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until a detailed Bat Monitoring Strategy (the Strategy) according with Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2025) UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats - version 1.2, Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Strategy shall identify:

- i) who is responsible for monitoring;
- ii) how it will be funded;
- iii) how the monitoring will be carried out including details of methods, equipment, survey effort and licensing;
- iv) how access for monitoring will be ensured, including in the event of assets having changed hands;
- v) how, when and to whom the results are to be reported;
- vi) the party or parties responsible for implementing any remedial measures that are required;
- vii) how and by whom any remedial measures are to be approved and reviewed.

The Strategy shall:

- viii) define the elements that are to be monitored, when and how often;
- ix) have clearly defined and measurable objectives;
- x) include a clear definition of success for each mitigation and compensation feature;
- xi) include proportionate and appropriate methods for data collection and analysis;
- xii) stipulate the triggers or thresholds for remedial action, and identify what the remedial action and measures should be; and
- xiii) provide a framework to enable a contribution to a wider understanding of the measures applied and their success.

The monitoring, reporting, dissemination and, as necessary, the implementation of remedial measures, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Strategy.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve a detailed Bat Monitoring Strategy until it has:

- a) sought the views of Natural England; and
- b) taken any views and recommendations made by Natural England into account.

Reason: To ensure that the effectiveness of mitigation upon which the development relies to make it acceptable is appropriately monitored, and that the results of the monitoring can be acted upon, in order to protect bats and their supporting ecological systems from any harmful effects of the development.

Detailed design

21) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no phase of the development (as identified in the approved Development Phasing Plan) shall commence until details of the design, scale, layout and external appearance of the development in that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. As necessary for each phase, these details shall include those for:

- i) any building, including utility enclosures and substations;
- ii) any busway stop, including any shelters, platforms and access;
- iii) the M11 overbridge, Bin Brook crossing or any other bridge and their associated structures including embankments, abutments and parapets;
- iv) environmental noise barriers (whether comprised of earth mounds, landscaping or physical acoustic fence / barriers structures or a combination thereof if required);
- v) retaining structures;
- vi) the formation, laying out or alteration of any means of access to any highway used by the busway or vehicular traffic;
- vii) the formation, laying out or alteration of any pedestrian, cycle or equestrian route;
- viii) the internal roads, footpath and cycle ways, and busway crossings;
- ix) any gates, fences, barriers and means of enclosure, having regard to the provisions of clause iii) of condition 19;
- x) a Busway Traffic Signage and Road Marking Scheme;
- xi) vehicle parking arrangements at Scotland Farm Travel Hub, including the number of spaces;
- xii) cycle parking facilities at Scotland Farm Travel Hub, including the number of spaces;
- xiii) all structures including bus stops and shelters at Scotland Farm Travel Hub;
- xiv) street furniture including bins and benches at Scotland Farm Travel Hub;
- xv) a scheme for any CCTV at the Scotland Farm Travel Hub, including details of the appearance of the height, type, and position of CCTV and supporting apparatus within the Travel Hub site;
- xvi) a Travel Hub Traffic Signage and Internal Wayfinding Scheme; and,
- xvii) those works between Grange Road and the westernmost extent of the proposed location Basin 07 as shown on the approved planning direction drawings, the detailed design of all aspects of the works including the engineering details of the busway and maintenance and access track, any retaining structures, changes in level, replacement footpath links to Clare Hall, any enclosures, signage structures and other street furniture.

These details shall include:

- xviii) clear benchmarks for design quality along the route;
- xix) section details of the busway proposed on Rifle Range Road;
- xx) a 3D model render of a bus stop illustrating that there is coordination with the details of materials in the soft and hard Landscaping Scheme required by condition No 19; and
- xxi) sample panels of finishes and materials in situ concrete finishes; and weathering steel samples.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve any details submitted to discharge this condition relating to clauses iii) and iv) above, until it has:

- a) sought the views of Natural England on those details and,
- b) taken any views and recommendations made by Natural England in this respect into account.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve any details submitted to discharge this condition relating to clause xvii) above, until it has:

- c) sought the views of Historic England on all those details; and,
- d) taken any views and recommendations made by Historic England in this respect into account.

The development of each phase must be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The CCTV scheme required by clause xv) must maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To provide the mitigation the development relies on to avoid, minimise and mitigate adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area, the significance of heritage assets, protected species, the living conditions of residents and to ensure that the scheme is designed to provide accessibility for those with a disability, impairment and of different ages.

Lighting

22) No external lighting shall be provided or installed until an Artificial Lighting Impact Assessment and Mitigation Scheme (the Scheme) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Scheme shall include:

- i) details of the method of lighting and predicted effects of lighting, including luminaire type and profiles, mounting location and height, aiming angles and orientation, angle of glare, operational controls, horizontal and vertical isolux contour light levels and calculated glare levels to receptors;
- ii) the extent and levels of illumination over the Order Limits and on adjacent land, and predicted lighting levels at the nearest light sensitive receptors;
- iii) specifications that all artificial lighting will meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Note for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01/20 (or equivalent guidance if it is replaced).
- iv) confirmation that, where necessary, lighting and mitigation is designed to accord with the Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Note 08/18 (or equivalent guidance if replaced) and that it explicitly addresses sensitive areas for barbastelle bats likely to be affected by the development.

The relevant local planning authority shall not approve any details submitted to discharge this condition, until it has:

- a) sought the views of Natural England on those details and,
- b) taken any views and recommendations made by Natural England in this respect into account.

The lighting and mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Scheme, retained as such and no external lighting shall subsequently be installed, altered, repositioned or replaced anywhere within the Order Limits unless it accords with the Scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the mitigation upon which the development relies to make it acceptable is implemented in order to avoid unacceptable effects on the health and living conditions of human receptors, and on habitats, species and ecological systems.

St Neots Road, Hardwick

23) With the exception of the site investigation, mitigation and tree protection works approved under conditions Nos 4, 8 and 12, no development shall commence on that part of St Neots Road situated between the junction of St Neots Road and Cambridge Road to the east, and No 325 (Old) St Neots Road to the west, until a Layby, On street Parking and Waiting Scheme (the Scheme) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The Scheme shall include details of the layout of the proposed footway and cycleway, landscaping, any laybys to be retained, reconfigured or re-provided, details of any parking and waiting restrictions proposed and details of in and off carriageway bus stops. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Scheme.

Reason: In the interest of the safety of all users of the highway and to ensure that suitable provision is retained for businesses or other properties that can demonstrate a genuine reliance on laybys or other parking and waiting arrangements.

Electric vehicle charging

24) The Scotland Farm Travel Hub shall not be first brought into public use until a scheme providing for electric vehicle charge points (the Scheme) detailing the number and specification of charge points and the management and maintenance arrangements to ensure they remain in good condition, available and modified or replaced as necessary, has been implemented and made available for use, having first been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority. The electric vehicle charge points shall be implemented in accordance with the Scheme and thereafter remain available for use, and managed and maintained in accordance with the approved Scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the facility is designed to enable charging of plug-in vehicles in a safe, accessible and convenient location, to assist in supporting more sustainable means of travel and contribute to the improvement of air quality for all receptors.

Replacement Open Space

25) Prior to any part of the busway first being brought into public use for buses or active travel the replacement open space shall be provided, landscaped in accordance with details approved under condition No 19 and made available for use by the public as public open space in the location shown on the Special Category Land Plans (CtoC-12-D03). The open space shall remain available to the public as public open space thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that there is no net loss in public open space and that the space remains appropriate and available for public use.

Monitoring cycle parking provision within the Scotland Farm Travel Hub

26) Prior to the Scotland Farm Travel Hub first being brought into public use, a scheme for the monitoring of cycle parking provision within the Travel Hub (the Monitoring Scheme) including the specifications for Cycle Parking Occupancy Surveys and the timeframes

within which they must be carried out in a survey year, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the relevant local planning authority. Thereafter, the Monitoring Scheme shall be implemented as approved.

The Cycle Parking Occupancy Survey required by the approved Monitoring Scheme shall be carried out within the timeframe specified within the approved Monitoring Scheme within one year of the date of the Scotland Farm Travel Hub first being brought into public use, and thereafter within 5, 10 and 15 years of the date of the Scotland Farm Travel Hub first being brought into public use.

If at any time, the cycle parking occupancy survey reports that cycle parking occupancy levels within the Travel Hub are above 90% of the total number of existing cycle parking spaces for a defined period set out in the approved Monitoring Scheme, a programme for implementation of additional cycle parking provision at the Travel Hub (the Implementation Programme) shall be submitted to the relevant local planning authority within three months of the date of the completion of the relevant Cycle Parking Occupancy Survey. The additional cycle parking spaces shall be implemented in accordance with the Implementation Programme within three months of the date the Implementation Programme has been approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority, or within nine months of the date of the completion of the relevant Cycle Parking Occupancy Survey, whichever is the sooner.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate cycling infrastructure is provided and that it responds to the any demand for increased provision to assist facilitating active travel and mode shift to sustainable transport modes.

27) Within 14 days of the Scotland Farm Travel Hub first being brought into use the developer must confirm in writing to the relevant local planning authority the date on which the travel hub was first opened for public use.

Reason: In order to be able to establish the timescales by which compliance with condition No 26 requiring the Cycle Parking and Monitoring Scheme can be monitored and enforced.

Bus emission standards

28) No bus shall use any part of the off-road busway unless the bus is compliant with the Euro VI emission standard as a minimum.

Reason: To limit carbon and other emissions to provide the mitigation upon which the development relies to be acceptable and to avoid harmful effects on human health, residents' living conditions and quality of life, habitats and species arising from poor air quality.

Permitted Construction Hours

29) With the exception of specified works relating to construction of the M11 overbridge which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority prior to any such specified works taking place, all investigation, clearance, preparation, enabling, demolition and construction works shall take place only between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To provide the mitigation upon which the development relies to be acceptable and to avoid harmful effects on human health and residents' living conditions.

Restriction on bus movements

- 30) i) No buses of any means of propulsion shall operate on the off-road busway between 0000 hours and 0600 hours on any day.
- ii) No more than 9 bus movements in total shall occur between 0600 hours and 0700 hours on any day, and no more than 9 bus movements in total shall occur between 2300 hours and 2359 hours on any day on that part of the busway running between the south of Charles Babbage Road and Grange Road unless the operating buses are propelled solely by electric motors.
- iii) No more than 6 bus movements shall occur between 0600 hours and 0700 hours on any day, and no more than 6 bus movements shall occur between 2300 hours and 2359 hours on any day on that part of the busway to the west of Broadway unless the operating buses are propelled solely by electric motors.

Reason: To provide the mitigation upon which the development relies to be acceptable, and to avoid harmful effects on human health and living conditions of occupiers of residential properties and Clare Hall.

ANNEX B – SCHEDULE OF PLANS

PLANNING DIRECTION DRAWINGS

Location Plan

Drawing No: 70086660-WSP-GEN-XX-DR-HW-000001 Rev P06

Proposed Site Plans

Drawing Nos: 70086660-WSP-HGN-XX-DR-HW-002000 Rev P10; 002001 Rev P10; 002002 Rev P10; 002003 Rev P10; 002004 Rev P10; 002005 Rev P10; 002006 Rev P10; 002007 Rev P10; 002008 Rev P10; 002009 Rev P10; 002010 Rev P10; 002011 Rev P10; 002012 Rev P10; 002013 Rev P10; 002014 Rev P10; 002015 Rev P10; 002016 Rev P10; and 002017 Rev P10

Proposed Site Sections

Drawing Nos: 70086660-WSP-HGN-XX-DR-HW-002018 Rev P06; 002019 Rev P06; 002020 Rev P06; 002021 Rev P06; 002022 Rev P06; and 002023 Rev P06

M11 Overbridge General Arrangement

Drawing No: 70086660-WSP-SBR-XX-DR-BR-0003 Rev P04

Bin Brook Bridge General Arrangement

Drawing No: 70086660-WSP-SBR-XX-DR-BR-0004 Rev P04

Construction Compounds

Drawing Nos: 70086660-WSP-TTM-XX-DR-CP-009000 Rev P07; 009001 Rev P07; 009002 Rev P07; 009003 Rev P07; 009004 Rev P07; 009005 Rev P07; 009006 Rev P07; 009007 Rev P07; 009008 Rev P07; 009009 Rev P07; 009010 Rev P07; 009011 Rev P07; 009012 Rev P07; 009013 Rev P07; 009014 Rev P07; 009015 Rev P07; 009016 Rev P07; and 009017 Rev P07

OTHER DRAWINGS

Special Category Land Plan

Drawing No: 70086660-OD03-00 Rev P03

Longitudinal Sections

Drawing Nos: 70086660-OD03-0018 Rev P03; 0019 Rev P03; 0020 Rev P03; 0021 Rev P03; 0022 Rev P03; 0026 Rev P03; 0027 Rev P03; 0028 Rev P03; 0029 Rev P03; 0030 Rev P03; 0031 Rev P03; 0032 Rev P03; 0033 Rev P03; and 0034 Rev P03

ANNEX C

RIGHT TO CHALLENGE ORDERS MADE UNDER THE TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992 (“the Act”)

Any person who is aggrieved by the making of the Order may challenge its validity, or the validity of any provision in it, because—

- it is not within the powers of the Act; or
- any requirement imposed by or under the Act has not been complied with.

Any such challenge may be made, by application to the High Court, within the period of 6 weeks beginning with the day after the day on which notice of this determination is published online as required by section 14(1)(b) of the Act.

A person who thinks they may have grounds for challenging the decision to make the Order is advised to seek legal advice before taking action.