

Bedford Group – Meeting notes

Meeting #1 – Details

Date: 10/01/2025

Time: 17:00

Type of meeting: Virtual (Teams)

Key discussion points and outcomes

1 Introductions, workshop overview, and housekeeping

- 1.1 Chloe Smith (CS) welcomed attendees to the meeting, introduced the EWR Co team members and ran through the housekeeping and agenda for the meeting.

2 Introduction to the workshops

- 2.1 CS explained that the purpose of the workshops is to talk about the non-statutory consultation and answer any questions the attendees may have. It provides an early opportunity for attendees to give feedback which will be captured and input into the design change process.
- 2.2 The workshops are taking place during the consultation period and therefore it's important that attendees also give formal feedback through the consultation which ends on Friday 24 January 2025. EWR Co are only seeking feedback on the design and optionality set out within the non-statutory consultation, not anything outside of scope or historic engagement.

Engagement with local authorities

- 2.3 EWR Co held similar workshops with local authorities. On Tuesday 3 December 2024, EWR Co met with Bedford Borough Council officers. Some of the key topics raised included environmental impacts, potential rebuilding of road bridges, connectivity at stations, and the Bedford Hospital Car Park.
- 2.4 CS highlighted that Bedford Borough Council are opposed to the proposal to build two additional tracks to the east of the existing railway corridor north of Bedford station and supported the shared use of the existing four-track corridor. The Council also provided beneficial feedback on the viaduct and the A6 carriageway.

3 Update on the project

- 3.1 Rupal Patel (RP) explained that the project is at non-statutory consultation and stressed the importance of engagement with councillors on the design as this feedback will help shape the designs for the next round of consultation, ahead of final Development Consent Order (DCO) application submission.
- 3.2 RP gave a summary of the non-statutory consultation so far and noted that a total of 10 in person events have taken place to date, with approximately 3000 attendees. As of January, EWR Co had received over 2000 responses to the consultation.

4 Update on proposals

Train services

- 4.1 Mohamad Alserdare (MA) gave a short overview of EWR's proposals in the area, starting with the proposed train service pattern. The services that run from Cambridge to Bedford Station no longer turn around at Bedford Station but rather extended to Stewartby. This has resulted in a third platform at Bedford Station no longer being needed.
- 4.2 He also advised that there are two service pattern configuration options along the Marston Vale Line (MVL) in the consultation, however the proposed number of trains offering at Bedford remains the same.

Powering the trains and freight

- 4.3 MA explained the various options for powering trains with Discontinuous Electrification being EWR Co's preferred method of powering the trains.
- 4.4 MA reiterated that EWR is predominantly a passenger service but is looking to maintain current levels of freight near Bedford and Oxford. Consideration will also be given to future freight growth to help support economic growth. These proposals will be available to view at the next consultation.

Route

- 4.5 MA ran through the proposed Bedford route, which would require improvements to the existing railway and stations and building a new section of railway.
- 4.6 The route would be approximately 5.4km in length and extend north from Ampthill Road in Kempston to Clapham Road south-east of Clapham village, next to the River Great Ouse.
- 4.7 MA gave a summary of the works in Bedford including:
- Relocating Bedford St Johns Station to the site of the current Britannia Road car park, to better serve Bedford Hospital

- Building a new multi-storey car park on hospital-owned land, west of the railway
- Building a new two-track railway to the north of Sandhurst Road that would replace the existing single track MVL into Bedford station
- Moving Jowett Sidings to Cauldwell Walk, making space for the railway tracks as they approach Bedford Station
- Building new infrastructure to integrate EWR services at Bedford Station, along with providing other station improvements
- Building a new 1.1km viaduct crossing the Great River Ouse and Paula Radcliffe Way

4.8 Fouzia Atiq (FA) enquired about when and where the new multi-storey car park proposed for Bedford St Johns Station will be. Also, whether EWR Co will work with Bedford Borough Council to increase parking capacity and if alternative parking will be in place before the work begins to prevent displacement to areas where parking is an issue. FA continued stating that they saw the benefit of the station near to the hospital.

4.9 FA raised concerns about the noise impact on Cauldwell Street due to the proposed relocation of the Jowett Stabling sidings to Cauldwell Walk.

4.10 Jon Franklin-Ferrar (JFF) replied, explaining that these questions would be addressed as part of the design feedback session, taking place later in the workshop.

Environmental Impacts

4.11 Leah Bargeta (LB) gave an overview of EWR Co's environmental approach. EWR Co is using a proactive approach to avoid, reduce, or compensate for potential negative environmental impacts. Since 2021 the Government has published a new policy setting out its environmental goals and EWR Co has updated its environmental sustainability strategy to reflect this.

4.12 EWR Co has six environmental sustainability pillars which are central to its approach to the environment. These include Natural Environment, Carbon, Climate Resilience, Historic Environment and Landscape, Circular Economy, and the People and the Community.

4.13 Further consideration of environmental impacts of the proposals and potential mitigation techniques are described in the [Environmental Update Report](#) that is available as part of the consultation and online on EWR Co's [website](#).

4.14 EWR Co will produce a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) for the statutory consultation as well as producing an Environmental Statement (ES) which will be submitted as part of the application for development consent alongside further design development. The Environmental Impact Assessment

(EIA) will be used to inform development of appropriate environmental mitigation measures, and it will also support detailed analysis of biodiversity measures needed to deliver biodiversity net gain.

- 4.15 The Environmental Scoping Report (ESR) sets out the methodology and scope of the EIA which will be used to produce the ES. The ESR does not form part of the statutory consultation as it is being managed by the Planning Inspectorate, who will reach out to all relevant consultees for feedback.

Homes, Land and Property

- 4.16 MA raised that, where possible, EWR Co are looking to reduce their impact on land and property owners as much as possible. MA wanted to bring to attendees' attention the publication of the Safeguarding Direction from the Secretary of State for Transport which means that property owners within the safeguarded area may be able to serve a blight notice.

5 Design Feedback Session One – South Bedford & Bedford St Johns Area

- 5.1 JFF spoke about how EWR Co have developed the design in three key areas. Area 1 is South Bedford & Bedford St Johns, Area 2 is Bedford Station from the crossing of the River Ouse to Bromham Road and Area 3 is North of Bromham Road.
- 5.2 JFF shared a plan and profile drawing of the proposal and explained that all of the materials are available online.
- 5.3 The first 1.3km of the Bedford section through to the start of the MVL curve is unchanged. There is no proposed realignment of the tracks, and all works are inside the existing rail corridor. Any changes will be to rail systems such as changing of signalling equipment.
- 5.4 From the existing Sandhurst Road footbridge into the current station at Bedford St Johns, the track curve radius is tight. As such this will require realigning, and the proposed new station location would have a longer platform capacity. EWR Co are looking to strike a balance between having tight track geometry (a smaller curve radius), which generates noise and vibration, and increases maintenance, and a flatter track geometry (a wider curve radius), which would bring the railway closer to the residential properties and community facilities. Noise mitigation is also being considered.
- 5.5 A multi-storey car park is proposed to the west of the railway, situated on part of the existing surface car park, and has been positioned such to correlate with potential redevelopment of Bedford Hospital.
- 5.6 There are two crossovers planned between Cauldwell Street and the Great River Ouse. Ampthill Road and Cauldwell Street will need to be realigned due to the

inclusion of provision of overhead electrification of the railway. EWR Co are proposing to lower the railway as much as reasonably possible (noting concerns with flooding in the area) while raising the roads as little as possible. JFF then explained the areas that would be impacted due to the raising of Cauldwell Street, including a temporary realignment of the junction at Prebend Street to maintain traffic flow and the demolition of the Crown Care Home. Under the latest proposals, the block of flats opposite the care home would not require acquisition and alternative access for nearby businesses would be provided. There would also be a temporary impact on the car parking spaces of a number of properties that run along the boundary of the railway while a retaining wall is built.

Attendee questions and feedback

- 5.7 Eric Cooper (EC) asked what would happen to the parking for Borough Hall during the construction of the temporary alignment of the junction at Prebend Street and how it is going to be constructed. JFF replied there would be an impact on parking during the construction period, but EWR Co understand that there are some currently underutilised car parks nearby and there will also be opportunities for temporary car parks to be built, the specifics of which are still in development. The conversations EWR Co has had with Bedford Borough Council has indicated there is a clear instruction that only one highway is to be worked on at a time to reduce the impact on traffic which is something we will consider with further planning.
- 5.8 Zara Layne (ZL) asked when the traffic modelling would be available. JFF explained that some traffic and transport modelling has been carried out, however modelling is an ongoing process. MA added that more modelling information will be published as part of the statutory consultation.
- 5.9 ZL asked how the EWR Co's proposal for the multi-storey car park would integrate with Bedford Hospital's Master Plan and how large it would be. JFF replied that Bedford Hospital had aspirations for a multi-storey carpark in the same location as EWR Co, and therefore they will work together to create a proposal that suits both needs. There are several conversations ongoing with Bedford Hospital to make sure that both parties' needs are met and MA reassured ZL that the operation of the hospital will not be compromised by the project.
- 5.10 ZL asked how much of the land inside the red line boundary is and isn't owned by Bedford Hospital as this could impact future development of the hospital. MA replied that EWR Co continues to have conversations with Bedford Hospital. EWR Co is aiming to enable as much of Bedford Hospital's development as possible,

should they want to develop and deconflict EWR Co's proposals with the Bedford Hospital redevelopment aspirations wherever plausible.

- 5.11 Colleen Atkins (CA) enquired about the land next to Borough Hall, asking whether EWR Co plans to return it to how it was before, should it be raised to provide the temporary route. JFF replied that the aim is indeed to return the land to its original use.
- 5.12 Nicola Gribble (NG) asked how long it would take to complete the full scope of works proposed for Bedford Town Centre. JFF replied that overall construction duration for a road like Cauldwell Street would be approximately 20 months, but this does not necessarily mean that the entire road could be closed for that period. MA added that until further topographical surveys and more design works are carried out to determine the full scope of works, it is not possible to discuss anticipated construction durations. JFF further explained that EWR Co are looking to mitigate the extent of the works as far as reasonably practical to reduce impacts over the construction period.
- 5.13 EC enquired about the traffic modelling in relation to construction and the impact on the road networks during peak times. EC asked whether EWR Co had a town traffic model with junction modelling feeding into it and where EWR Co is in the calibration validation of it. JFF replied that EWR Co have wider and junction models of the town. The design is being tested and fed back on using these models. MA added that the model would be provided by Bedford Borough Council, and that scenario testing is ongoing. EC replied that there are some issues with Bedford Borough Council's model which could cause some issues. EC requested that during future meetings, EWR Co can discuss the Traffic Update Report in more details in relation to flow capacity and breakdown.
- 5.14 Peter Norris (PN) mentioned that the proposal to lower the railway lines south of the Great River Ouse by 1 metre will bring it into contact of the highest recorded floodwater levels of the river. JFF replied that EWR Co are aware of the challenge.
- 5.15 PN also mentioned that he asked previously about the status of the multi-storey car park and who was paying for it. MA replied that EWR Co will be funding the construction of the multi-storey car park.
- 5.16 Michael Headley (MH) stated that they felt the best option with regards to the Ampthill Road bridge would be to do nothing to it. Should discontinuous electrification be used, would EWR Co then look for alternative engineering solutions for the crossovers, such as track geometry, in order to prevent needing to reconstruct the road bridge. They asked if EWR Co would continue to look for alternative engineering options to provide the crossing. JFF confirmed that EWR Co are looking at all opportunities.

6 Design Feedback Session Two – Bedford Station Area

- 6.1 JFF gave an overview of the Bedford Station Area (area 2). The crossing over the Great River Ouse to Bedford Station is a fixed point that will not be moved. The preferred option of relocation of the Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) stabling roads is to the proposed Cauldwell Walk site. This is where offices and other rail associated buildings are also likely to be built. There is no intention of changing anything inside the existing Cauldwell rail depot. There are some existing Network Rail maintenance sidings that will be turned around to face Bedford Station and replaced on a like-for-like basis.
- 6.2 EWR Co has reduced the number of tracks shown in previous designs from three to two. The aim is to put one track through each of two arches under Ford End Road to potentially eliminate the need to partially reconstruct Ford End Road.
- 6.3 The design for Bedford Station features numerous improvements such as new footbridges, new station facilities, private-hire vehicle drop off, bus stops, a reconfigured surface car park, as well as the new multi-storey car park.

Attendee questions and feedback

- 6.4 CA asked for clarification on the decision to not have an Up Fast platform. MA replied that as part of the 2023 Route Update Announcement, EWR Co undertook extensive modelling that showed that the existing railway track was not sufficient to support EWR Co's needs even with the Up Fast platform improvement. Therefore, as the proposals are to segregate EWR operations, the Up Fast Platform is not included within proposals. MA added that EWR Co does understand that an Up Fast platform is a good thing for Bedford Station, and though it is not currently in the proposal, should someone come forward to fund it, conversations could take place to see how it could be delivered.
- 6.5 CA asked about congestion coming into the station and if that had been investigated. Additionally, they raised that the proposed multi-storey car park on Ashburnham Road is not in keeping with the current street scene and asked whether it might be moved somewhere else. MA replied there will be modelling that takes place to assess congestion and the capacity of the junctions so that EWR Co can produce mitigation methods. MA replied that EWR Co are looking at ways to minimise the visual impact of the car park on residents. One option involves reducing the car park's size, but other options and suggestions have also been heard during the consultation and all of them are being considered as the design continues to be refined.
- 6.6 CA asked if rented property businesses displaced by the land for Cauldwell Walk sidings would be supported by EWR Co and given help to relocate. Ian Miles (IM) responded that EWR Co have discussed this with Bedford Borough Council and

although there will be no help to relocate for business owners, if the tenants have compensable interest, then EWR Co will pay compensation in accordance with the compensation code. EWR Co would like to meet freeholders and leaseholders in Cauldwell Walk as soon as possible to obtain a clearer understanding of the area.

- 6.7 ZL asked how the construction of Ashburnham Road car park will take into account the existing architecture of the area. Additionally, they asked how EWR Co will manage public safety and security around the multi-storey car park. MA responded that he was not yet able to say what level of commitment EWR Co would have to making the car park aesthetically pleasing at this stage and this will be discussed during the detailed design stage. MA agreed to investigate the level of influence local councillors would be able to have on the design in this topic. Anthony O'Dea (AO) added that, as the car park is a railway car park, it will be compliant with National Technical Specification Notices, which includes provision for persons of reduced mobility such as wider stairwells and lifts. AO added that security would be governed by rail standards.
- 6.8 MH mentioned that, given the recent fire at Luton Airport, EWR Co should make sure the new car parks are fully equipped with fire prevention equipment. AO responded that this will be determined by safety standards although currently only underground car parks are required to have fire suppressants and sprinklers. MH responded that they would like EWR Co to go beyond just the standards. AO Reiterated that EWR Co has still not specified such details of the design but welcomed the feedback from MH and agreed that it would be considered going forward.
- 6.9 CS added that EWR Co are keen to hear any feedback about Bedford Station specifically.
- 6.10 JFF asked attendees whether they had other options or suggestions for the placement of the Ashburnham Road car park or if they had another solution for car parking. CA asked whether the car park could be pushed further north toward Bromham Road overbridge as opposed to having it directly adjacent to Ashburnham Road. JFF responded that there is some opportunity to do so, though the area of land that EWR Co has near Bromham Road overbridge is not ideal for an entire multi-storey car park due to its small size and shape. However, if the car park were split into two multi-storey car parks between the land near Bromham Road overbridge and Ashburnham Road it might be more feasible. CA responded they liked the idea of two car parks. JFF asked whether it would be better if the proposed surface level car park to the west of the line was made multi-storey instead. CA responded that they would like more information before providing feedback.
- 6.11 EC commented that when EWR Co design Bedford Station, could they make it "iconic" and something that adds to the visual appeal of the area in an exciting

way. MA replied that if it lies within cost parameters, EWR Co would be open to exploring more aspirational design options. EC asked if EWR Co could expand the design to build additional offices to fund more extravagant designs. MA replied that the DCO limits EWR Co from building anything more than the railway itself, such as office spaces, even if those things might make the design more interesting. EC suggested that EWR Co could partner with Bedford Borough Council or another developer to deliver something like this. MA reassured EC that EWR Co are exploring opportunities with other partners with regards to potential third party funding.

- 6.12 CA followed on by saying that in the past there were plans for a whole station complex. MA replied that EWR Co were aware of master planning work, and that such aspiration by other parties had influenced the proposals in the area.
- 6.13 PN asked if the new station developments would be funded by EWR Co or if EWR Co are seeking financial assistance from elsewhere. MA replied that the development is self-contained and EWR Co will deliver the proposed works within its own budget which will entirely enable the designs shown in the meeting. JFF went on to reply to the earlier question from FA about noise levels at the Cauldwell Sidings. JFF reminded attendees that Cauldwell Sidings is designed as stabling and would be less noisy than other parts of the rail infrastructure. LB added that noise is considered as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which will establish likely noise impacts and identify if any mitigation would be required.

Post meeting clarification: a train station stabling is the process of parking trains in a designated area when they are not in use. Stabling facilities are also known as carriage sidings, stabling yards, or coach yards.

7 Design Feedback Session Three – North of Bedford Area

- 7.1 JFF went on to describe the final area, which includes the construction of two new tracks running in parallel to the east of the Midland Main Line (MML) for approximately 900m. This will require a third span on the eastern side of Bromham Road to accommodate the two additional tracks. The intention is to have the highway remain the same level; therefore the tracks would be slightly lower than the MML to maintain clearance.
- 7.2 These two additional tracks would travel through the Poets area where EWR Co is very aware of the impact on properties in the area. Once the tracks pass the UK Power Networks substation, they diverge from the MML, begin to climb and cross the Great Ouse Way. This requires the A6 to be realigned to pass over the railway

before dropping down to a roundabout. This realignment will be done offline to minimise the impact on the existing highway during construction. Within this area, environmental mitigation is key, with other elements of necessary infrastructure required, for example drainage ponds, access roads, and a utility diversion.

- 7.3 North of the A6, the route crosses the Great River Ouse via a viaduct, then the A6 Paula Radcliffe Way, crossing the Great River Ouse once more before crossing Clapham Road.

Attendee questions and feedback

- 7.4 CA mentioned that they, and ZL, opposed the demolition of any homes in the Poets area and expressed agreement for Bedford Borough Council's support for a four-track option. They requested a map be made available where the houses that are affected by the two additional new railway tracks can be clearly seen and not obstructed.
- 7.5 CA also wanted to know whether EWR Co was making provisions to protect the mature trees near Bromham Road overbridge.
- 7.6 CA also requested that the proposed curve at Milton Road and Sydney Road be revisited and reconsidered to see if it is possible to prevent garden take from a property on Milton Road and whether the line can stop further up the road. Also, with regards to houses on Chesterton Mews and Milne Row, these are connected to one another and as such they would like to understand whether demolition of some will affect the others. CA also sought information regarding blight compensation and the Need to Sell Scheme for both the houses within the red line boundary and just outside.
- 7.7 MA responded by explaining that the points raised by CA are areas that EWR Co are considering as part of the ongoing design development for the statutory consultation. MA clarified that CA was referring to the reduction in terms of land take at the property mentioned on Milton Road to allow for that highway and thanked them for their input. Ian Miles (IM) added that EWR Co will be complying with the compensation code and is continuing with ongoing discussions with residents. CA stated that they feel this should be changed.
- 7.8 ZL raised concerns regarding the environmental and socioeconomic impacts on the Alexander Sports Centre and that there are large amounts of dissatisfaction about the design in the Poets area and they would like EWR Co to go beyond the standard. MA responded that although some land would be required permanently for the railway, the majority of the sports centre land would only be required temporarily. EWR Co is having conversations with the University of Bedfordshire on how they can mitigate impacts, including whether they wish to redesign their playing fields after EWR Co have used them.

- 7.9 ZL said that a commitment from EWR Co to engage with the wider community on potential mitigations would be appreciated and that it would be good to know at what point those discussions would be realistic.
- 7.10 CA asked if there had been a conversation with residents about mitigation of noise from compounds that back onto Beverley Crescent. MA responded that he was not aware, but he would need to check EWR Co's records to be certain. As part of the non-statutory consultation residents are able to give their feedback on these compounds, but EWR Co is also willing to go out and seek feedback from specific areas at the end of the consultation since CA was keen for this to happen.
- 7.11 EC raised that there are funding opportunities as part of the homeowner's payment scheme for properties up to 300m from the line that are currently being used by HS2 that could also be investigated by EWR Co to be included in this project.
- 7.12 EC asked if EWR Co are going to do a 1 in 100 gradient for freight rather than a 1 in 80 gradient as this would make a difference to the height of the viaduct. JFF replied that gradients are being considered across the route and that a 1 in 80 degree gradient would be the absolute limit depending on constraints, but ideally they would use a 1 in 120 degree or 1 in 100 degree gradient if the flatter gradient is not achievable. JFF continued, saying all gradients across the route will be investigated holistically to ensure EWR Co strike the correct balance. EC asked if EWR Co had investigated the different impacts of the different gradients on the local environment such as the viaduct due to different amounts of land take needed for each gradient. JFF responded that this is being investigated ahead of statutory consultation. EC responded that it should be looked at before that, and if changes were made between now and then EWR Co should share those as soon as possible so that councillors have an opportunity to comment on them, thus reducing the number of objections EWR Co might receive when they submit the DCO application. MA responded that EWR Co would share designs as soon as possible.
- 7.13 EC asked if EWR Co's plans for the realignment of the A6 prevented the A6 from being dualled in future. JFF responded this was raised in the 3 December 2024 workshop with Bedford Borough Council. The A6 was designed to be dualled but due to finances it was only made as a single carriageway. JFF did not know the answer, but he said he would ask the EWR Co highways team about the potential to make it a dual carriageway in the future alongside EWR's design.

8 Closing remarks, AOB

- 8.1 CS ended the meeting and MA added that if anyone wanted to ask questions, they should feel free to ask the team via email.

Issues Log:

Issue	Description
1.	Concern raised about the impact construction will have on parking, with a particular reference to the Borough Hall area.
2.	Query about how much of the land inside the red line boundary is owned by Bedford Hospital as this could impact future development of the hospital.
3.	Request for the land at Borough Hall to be returned to its original use and state once construction is complete.
4.	Support for nothing to be done Ampthill Road and Cauldwell Street bridges and for EWR Co to look for alternative engineering solutions for the crossovers, such as track geometry, in order to prevent needing to reconstruct the road bridges.
5.	Concern raised about congestion coming into Bedford Station and a request for further modelling.
6.	The design of Ashburnham Road car park should consider the existing architecture of the area.
7.	The importance of EWR Co managing public safety and security around multi-storey car parks was emphasised.
8.	Request for the Bedford Station car park to be pushed further back toward Bromham Road overbridge as opposed to having it directly adjacent to the road.
9.	Request for the design of Bedford Station to be “iconic”, something that adds to the visual appeal of the area in an exciting way.
10.	Request for EWR Co to make provisions to protect the mature trees near Bromham Road overbridge.
11.	Request for the proposed curve at Milton Road and Sydney Road to be revisited and reconsidered to see if it is possible to prevent garden take on Milton Road and whether the line can stop further up the road.
12.	Concerns regarding the environmental and socioeconomic impacts on the Alexander Sports Centre.
13.	Concern expressed regarding the impact of noise from an EWR construction compound on residents of Beverley Crescent.
14.	Request for EWR Co to investigate the different impacts of the various gradients on the local environment such as the viaduct due to different amounts of land take needed for each gradient.

Summary of actions

- **ACTION 1:** EWR Co to investigate and understand the level of influence Bedford Borough Ward Councillors will have on the design of Ashburnham Road car park from an aesthetic perspective.
- **ACTION 2:** EWR Co to send attendees the link to the map of [the Bedford Station area](#) which show the houses that are to be affected by the two new railway tracks.

- **ACTION 3:** EWR Co to check whether conversations have been had with residents about noise mitigation in relation to compounds that back onto Beverley Crescent.
- **ACTION 4:** EWR Co to discuss the Traffic Update Report in more detail in relation to flow capacity and breakdown at the next meeting.
- **ACTION 5:** EWR Co to look into providing further information on the possibility of the proposed surface level car park to the west of the line in the Bedford Area to be made multi-storey to replace the proposed new multi-storey carpark on Ashburnham Road.
- **ACTION 6:** EWR Co to look into whether the proposed realignment prevents the A6 from being dualled in future.
- **ACTION 7:** EWR Co to consider engaging with the wider community and carry out meaningful conversations on how EWR Co may give back to the community that is uniquely affected.
- **ACTION 8:** EWR Co to provide further information on whether demolition of some houses on Chesterton Mews and Milne Row will affect others as they are connected to one another.

Attendees:

EWR Co attendees

- Chloe Smith – Technical Partner Engagement Team
- Rupal Patel – DCO and Engagement Manager
- Jon Franklin-Ferrar – Technical Partner Engineering Manager
- Mo Alserdare – Area Manager for the Bedford Area
- Leah Bargota – Environment Manager
- Anthony O'Dea – Engineering Manager
- Ian Miles – Land and Property

Local authority councillors

- Cllr Fouzia Atiq – Cauldwell Ward in Bedford Borough
- Cllr Abu Sultan – Cauldwell Ward in Bedford Borough
- Cllr Henry Vann – De Parys Ward in Bedford Borough
- Cllr Christine McHugh – Goldington Ward in Bedford Borough
- Cllr Colleen Atkins – Harpur Ward in Bedford Borough
- Cllr Zara Layne – Harpur Ward in Bedford Borough
- Cllr Nicky Gribble – Renhold and Ravensden Ward in Bedford Borough
- Cllr Michael Headley – Putnoe Ward in Bedford Borough

Parish Councils

- Cllr Eric Cooper – Clapham Parish Council

Other representatives

- Peter Norris - Technical Advisor on behalf of Bedford Borough

Apologies

- Castle & Newnham Ward in Bedford Borough
- Kingsbrook Ward in Bedford Borough
- Queen's Park Ward in Bedford Borough