

Croxton - Haslingfield Group – Meeting notes

Meeting 1 – Details

Date: 16/01/2025

Time: 18:00

Type of meeting: Virtual (Teams)

Key discussion points and outcomes

- 1 **Introductions, workshop overview, and housekeeping**
 - 1.1 Sarah Jacobs (SJ) welcomed attendees to the meeting, introduced the EWR Co team members and ran through the housekeeping and agenda for the meeting as well as Terms of Reference. She reiterated that the session was being recorded to aid the collection of feedback.
 - 1.2 SJ explained that seven sessions are taking place during the non-statutory consultation with local parish councils to discuss the project and gain feedback.
 - 1.3 Sharon Erzinciloglu (SE) asked why this session was being held so close to the end of the consultation and stated that it would have been more helpful to have this session before the consultation started.
 - 1.4 SJ explained that today's session was the last of the seven sessions which had to be delivered before 24 January and that the dates had to be arranged alongside the consultation events which are also attended by the same staff. SJ apologised that this session fell towards the end of the consultation period but explained that the consultation had been open for a while and hoped that the attendees had been able to visit one of the local in-person events. SE stated that she was only invited to this one session and therefore wanted to know what the other six sessions were.
 - 1.5 SJ replied, clarifying that the sessions have been split up into seven sections; (Bedford, Cambridge, Clapham/East St Neots, Oxford-Bletchley, Harston-Shelford, Fenny Stratford-Kempston, and Croxton-Haslingfield) and that parishes were invited to join the most relevant session. SJ made it clear that all the sessions will be available online shortly.
- 2 **Update on the project**

- 2.1 SJ explained that EWR Co are seeking feedback on the design and options set out within the non-statutory consultation. Due to time constraints, EWR Co are not discussing other route options or any works outside the current scope during this meeting. Feedback will be recorded and will input into the design change process. It was stressed that discussions within the workshop are supplementary to the formal feedback mechanism of the consultation, so attendees were also encouraged to submit feedback via the [formal channels](#) (via [online feedback form](#) or written response).

3 Introduction to the workshops

- 3.1 Rupal Patel (RP) gave an overview of the stage the project is in within the Development Consent Order (DCO) process, detailing past engagement and consultations. RP emphasised that previous route corridor options have become increasingly refined and some preferences for the route have been confirmed. EWR Co are now consulting on the current proposals. There are some options within the proposals, but EWR Co have confirmed preferences within these. RP explained that feedback gained at this consultation from the group, and from wider stakeholders, will be considered as part of the design development process as the designs are further refined. RP outlined that this session is designed to be interactive.
- 3.2 RP gave a summary of the non-statutory consultation so far and noted that the consultation has passed the halfway point and will close on Friday 24 January 2025. Twelve in-person events have already taken place, with over 3,000 attendees. EWR Co have also held two online events with almost 100 attendees and have received over 2,000 responses as of the beginning of January. RP advised that there is a lot of material and information available on the EWR website, including a Virtual Consultation Room. There are three consultation events remaining – the date, time and locations for these were shown on screen.

4 Update on proposals

Design workshops with local authorities

- 4.1 RP explained that EWR Co have held similar workshops with local authority planning and technical officers. In early December, EWR Co met with officers from Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority, and Greater Cambridge Partnership. The feedback from these sessions will be taken into consideration in the development of the design. The key topics raised included the interface of the project with the local highway network, integration

of EWR with the proposed local developments, active travel opportunities with a focus on first mile/last mile, and connectivity between towns around stations.

Non-statutory consultation proposals – Route Section 6

- 4.2 Will Egan (WE) explained that the session was to cover Route Section 6 - Croxton to Toft and part of Route Section 7 - Comberton as far as Haslingfield. WE gave a quick overview.
- 4.3 Peter Deer (PD) asked how Cambourne station will be accessed from the north.
- 4.4 WE confirmed that the first road west of the station would be Brockley Road and St Neots Road, and to the east it would be Knapwell Wood Road. WE also stated that the existing public rights of way (PRoW) would also allow pedestrians to access the station from the north.

Isabel Robinson (IR) questioned what it means when EWR Co say that Cambourne station enables development to the north, and if this is part of the local plan. WE confirmed that a master plan is being developed for the plans north of the station, which is publicly available. PD responded that all the roads are narrow rural roads passing through villages that have few pavements.

- 4.5 WE advised that further work is required to consider the roads and traffic passing through villages. In addition, Ben Nicholass (BN) provided context on access to stations and EWR Co's approach to highways. BN explained that EWR Co have created a series of transport models to better understand the road network, the current issues and pinch points. Forecasting has also been carried out to help understand the impacts the project would have on the road network and how these can be mitigated. BN explained that this information and data has been collected by engaging with the relevant local authorities. BN explained that the models show that, by 2034, the network is going to be busier regardless of whether the project goes ahead, and it is EWR Co's responsibility to implement measures to ensure any impacts caused by the project are mitigated appropriately. This information can be found in the [Transport Update Report](#), which breaks down the network into routes, highlights the impacts, and clearly shows how busy the highway network is now and how this is forecast to change in 2034 and 2049. EWR Co will be responsible for providing interventions to help mitigate the issues introduced by EWR Co.
- 4.6 Sean Houlihane (SH) said there is an enormous amount of information available, and that it is difficult to find the pieces that are relevant.
- 4.7 BN acknowledged that there is a lot of information, but that it is easy to navigate and search the documents by route and this should provide a good overview of the information available. SJ confirmed that the documentation is also available at the events and that the staff can help find the required information. SJ confirmed that these links will be shared after the meeting.

- 4.8 Nicola Pritchard (NP) stated that it is hard to ask for specific information if you do not know it exists and that today was the first time she learnt about traffic modelling. NP said that, early in the process, EWR Co said they would 'solve its traffic problems'. Caldecote is generally a quiet, rural village, but there are concerns that with the new station in Caldecote, people will come through St Neots Road from the east, passing the BP petrol station to get to the station, which is quite a dangerous junction. NP also did not understand how people from the south are going to get to the station. Caldecote residents are worried that people are going to use the village as a rat-run to get to the station.
- 4.9 BN stated that, within the modelling, the local roads do have capacity to hold the traffic, but the current consultation is designed to capture feedback or any alternative diversions that may change this modelling. Although there may be more traffic on the roads, there should not be an increase in delay.
- 4.10 NP said that Caldecote is a rural village, not a road that people should be using for through traffic, and they cannot see how it could take additional traffic, so they will be putting this into their consultation feedback.
- 4.11 Neil Stutchbury (NS) agreed with NP and stated that people coming from the villages south of Cambourne, for example Kingston or Haslingfield, are almost never going to be passing through Bourn or Caldecote to get through to Cambourne, and that these villages are not equipped for a massive increase in traffic. NS asked how many people are expected to use the train daily, how many cars EWR Co are expecting to park at the station, and what directions the traffic will come from. NS noted that Bourn has a very narrow chicane road and a very busy school that is heavily congested, so Bourn would not be able to take additional traffic.
- 4.12 BN stated that the Transport Update Report displays the modelling that has taken place which can be viewed by section. BN explained that 85% capacity is the point at which the efficiency of a road begins to break down, so anything above this highlights an issue. The modelling does not currently suggest that there will be any roads over 85% capacity.
- 4.13 BN explained that there is a station choice model that will predict how many people arrive and depart from a station throughout a day, but that this information is not yet available at non-statutory consultation. BN explained that this is because there is still optionality to be considered along the route but that this information will be available at statutory consultation. BN acknowledged that EWR Co not being able to provide definite figures such as the numbers of cars using the roads creates some concern among communities but confirmed that currently the modelling shows that the local road network will be able to accommodate it.

- 4.14 NS stated that EWR Co need to be aware that concerns and worries are heightened among residents affected by the railway when the information they need cannot be provided.
- 4.15 BN agreed that without the transparency of numbers there is going to be some uncertainty. BN recommended that NS refers to the Transport Update Report, as it gives a good overview of the likely demands and impacts on the highway network and that this will hopefully provide more certainty that the roads will be able to handle the necessary demand. BN acknowledged that the traffic modelling is not perfect, hence why EWR Co are wanting to hear community feedback, information and local knowledge about the roads or sections of the road that EWR Co should consider further.
- 4.16 SJ added that the purpose of this non-statutory consultation is to collect more localised knowledge on these matters and evolve the plans accordingly.
- 4.17 David Revell (DR) stated that transport modelling has been discussed in an operational case, but asked what will happen during construction, and to what degree of detail critical areas have been modelled.
- 4.18 BN stated that the impacts of construction are a key focus for EWR Co. It was explained that EWR Co are considering the peak construction date as 2032 and are working with their construction logistics team to work out construction details and impacts. EWR Co does not currently have this information as there is still optionality along the route to be considered. Roads that are suitable for HGVs have been identified and active travel and public transport routes have been considered. EWR Co will avoid construction traffic going through local villages as much as possible and will aim to minimise the damage to local roads wherever possible. However, if roads were to be damaged by EWR Co, those roads would be returned to the standard condition expected of that road following construction. EWR Co will also be avoiding peak periods. BN confirmed that the project team will discuss potential pinch points and associated mitigation with the local highways authorities. A full suite of maps showing the construction logistics routes will be available at statutory consultation, but feedback is encouraged at this point.
- 4.19 DR raised that Long Road Bridge, although outside of this area, is going to affect many people travelling into Cambridge. Furthermore, DR asked if haul routes are being considered, rather than using existing roads that are unsuitable for HGVs, if the Chapel Hill tunnel has access from either end.
- 4.20 BN confirmed that, where appropriate, haul routes will be used. If roads need to be used, EWR Co will speak to the highways authority to mitigate any impact to these roads. This information will be available at statutory consultation.

- 4.21 BN stated that the same applies for Long Road Bridge. BN assured DR that EWR Co are aware and will seek to mitigate the impacts accordingly and communicate measures to the local people.
- 4.22 SJ noted that EWR Co are engaging with stakeholders such as schools, colleges and businesses that are impacted. SJ confirmed that EWR Co are also in discussions with the emergency services (Addenbrookes). SE referred to a comment that BN had previously made, asking what counts as 85% road capacity. SE explained that Great and Little Eversden have no public transport currently, so anybody wanting to access Cambourne station would be driving, passing through Kingston and either Caldecote or Bourn. SE also discussed a natural chicane in the village, around the church, which is a pinch point.

Post meeting clarification:

Following the meeting NE reached out to EWR Co to say they believe the lack of public transport is the case for many, if not all places, and stated that there is no bus access from Comberton to Cambourne.

- 4.23 BN stated that he would come back to SE with more information on the 85% road capacity but explained that all the models are banded by size. EWR Co will provide a fuller answer about the capacity on a B road.

Post meeting clarification:

The capacity at junctions dictate the capacity of the road network in the UK. EWR Co's model calculates Operational Capacity at junctions during the AM, Inter Peak and PM peak travel periods. Capacity at junctions vary by time period and, as such, the capacity of a B road may change over the day depending on the capacity of the junction. However, the working assumption is that for a single carriageway B Road the capacity would be 1,328 Passenger Car Unit (PCUs) an hour for standard width and 1,010 PCUs for narrow widths, but as noted previously this will adjust depending on the demand at the junction feeding the B road.

- 4.24 SE asked if anybody involved in the modelling had driven the roads in a car at peak times to understand the current problems.
- 4.25 BN stated that road traffic counts have been undertaken along the routes so that the team understands the traffic flows on key routes. BN clarified that EWR Co are not going to solve current road operational issues however the team will work in close collaboration with the local authority to potentially find joint solutions where this is feasible.

- 4.26 SE stated that there will be an increase to traffic on the roads, and that many villages have already been working with the highways authorities to implement traffic calming measures due to local traffic issues.
- 4.27 BN confirmed that traffic calming measures address traffic behaviour concerns, not traffic capacity. BN suggested that there is capacity on the roads but understands that there are traffic concerns from a safety perspective.
- 4.28 SE agreed and stated that there is a doctor's surgery in Great & Little Eversden Parish which is accessed by a few surrounding villages, but the car park is not big enough, therefore causing traffic issues and parking on the verges. SE was also concerned they will be cut off from the other villages at the construction phase. There are two routes into Comberton and both will be affected by EWR so they wouldn't want both routes to be closed at the same time. SE said that there is another route into Comberton but that this is quite a long diversion.
- 4.29 BN confirmed that this is important detail that would be captured in the feedback.
- 4.30 NP referred to the earlier discussion about the 85% road capacity topic and asked, if capacity on a village road is say 50%, are EWR Co saying that they would not consider addressing the issue unless the capacity goes over 85%. Also, if traffic went from 50% to 75%, would this flag up as an issue that was caused by EWR?
- 4.31 BN replied that it had not reached that bar and that roads are designed to manage a certain amount of capacity.
- 4.32 NP raised concerns about this as although EWR Co may not consider that the increase in traffic needs mitigation, this increase in traffic would completely change their quiet, rural village including noise pollution and children's safety. NP also added that the villages did not want their speeding issues resolved with having more cars on the road.
- 4.33 BN explained that this was not what he suggested earlier and clarified that the purpose for introducing calming measures is that people were driving too fast on the village roads and this is a safety and not a capacity issue. BN confirmed that roads are designed to carry a certain amount of capacity but that the outputs from traffic and transport assessments also feed into the environmental work. BN noted that the environmental team will be undertaking their own assessments on impacts of traffic such as air quality. So far, EWR Co have not yet established exactly how much traffic will be on the roads, and hopefully EWR Co will be able to share the likely increases in traffic in the future and alleviate some of the concerns shared. NP agreed this would be helpful. BN confirmed this information will be available at the statutory consultation and will provide more visibility and transparency.

- 4.34 Norman Evanson (NE) raised a few questions in the Microsoft Teams chat. NE asked firstly for a comment from EWR Co about the requirement for Section 106 payments, particularly as the disruption would be significant during construction and changes would be permanent. SJ noted that there was not anyone on the call to respond to the query about Section 106 payments and that she will take it away, however she did confirm that EWR Co will always put pavements and roads back to the position they were in before.
- 4.35 NE's second question was about the lack of local stations in the Cambridge area. SJ advised that EWR Co cannot build additional stations for several reasons such as increased journey times and costs but did ask NE to add this to their feedback. NE explained that most commuters would be travelling to Cambridge from those areas and would need to drive to Cambourne to be able to use the railway if they do not have access to local stations.
- 4.36 SJ continued to read through the questions posted in the Microsoft Teams chat and acknowledged that most of the questions had already been answered. The types of topics questions included station access from the south, traffic and transport, modelling, Scotland Farm, and door-to-door connectivity. SJ went on to explain that they are speaking to the local authorities around available services and door-to-door connectivity as EWR Co want to facilitate people's journeys to the station and enable them to use EWR.
- 4.37 SJ noted that Simon Moffat (SM) had made some comments about the northern approach. SJ confirmed that the northern approach is no longer an option and that the southern approach is the preferred route.
- 4.38 Des O'Brien (DS) asked if EWR Co's proposals would dovetail with the Greater Cambridge Partnership's plans for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway which includes the provision for a large park and ride site at the Dry Drayton/Hardwick junction on the A428. DS commented that they should complement one another and said that access to Cambourne station via public transport from all local villages is essential. SJ explained that conversations about door-to-door connectivity are ongoing with local authorities.
- 4.39 SE asked if EWR Co would be involved in the provision of public transport operations such as bus services for the southern villages to the station so that not everyone has to drive. SE stated that buses are needed from Cambridge to Camborne.
- 4.40 BN explained that, at each station, EWR Co are establishing the demand for entry and exit to the station. This information will be used to create modal splits, highlighting how people access the station, including by bus, private car or active travel. SE pointed out that there are only buses from Cambridge to Camborne, with none from Camborne to many of the southern villages, although from Comberton a person may be able to get to Camborne. BN explained that EWR Co

would not operate the buses, and that for a bus company to run services, the route must be profitable or subsidised by DfT. BN explained that EWR Co will communicate modal splits on how people access the station to the local authority once demand for buses is established, which will inform discussions about the bus services that are required. BN reminded that, due to economic and housing growth in the area, greater demand is anticipated which will likely also feed into the discussions. BN reiterated how EWR Co can help shape a narrative around the need for a bus service but will not be delivering the bus services themselves. BN further responded to NE's question about Section 106 and explained that the Section 106 does not tend to establish bus services, however they may be used to help fund them in part, although EWR Co would not be involved in this.

- 4.41 SJ noted a question from Laurence Haslop (LH) about drainage along St Neot's Road. WE asked for clarification and whether his question referred to the area being prone to flooding.
- 4.42 LH replied that the ground can get quite low along St Neots Road, and that there have been some issues along the A428 surrounding balancing ponds. LH asked if it is a cutout after Highfields, and if the ground is higher or lower after the cutout, due to concerns about surface water drainage.
- 4.43 BN answered a question from IR about capacity on roads, stating that each road will have its own capacity, rather than a standard capacity across the entire network. These capacities have been coded according to available data that informs the modelling, meaning each road has its own corresponding capacity and a flow speed curve.
- 4.44 WE shared a drawing and LH and WE identified the area of the railway where the road begins to dip near Bourn Airfield and then into Highfields. LH asked if the railway would go down into the fields as he feels this would cause an issue with the surface water and asked what the strategy would be to deal with it. WE clarified that the general design approach would be to intercept the water in the drainage channel and direct it towards a stream or a watercourse. For the water that gets into the cutting the track drainage will collect this excess water into a pond before it is discharged into a watercourse.
- 4.45 LH noted that, as the line goes east, the water courses are located along St Neots Road, where water is currently being picked up, but if there will be a cutting before, water must go somewhere, so LH queried how water could be taken to the waterways across St Neots Road. LH stated that St Neots waterways require maintenance as many of the culverts are full of mud. LH was concerned that the houses along St Neots Road would have the water flow into their back gardens.
- 4.46 WE outlined a couple of approaches, firstly to ensure drainage systems are in place to collect the water and discharge it at an acceptable rate for the local

catchment and, secondly, to understand the baseline flood risk in the area and the impact of the railway. If there is an increase in the risk of flooding due to the new infrastructure, then EWR Co would need to put in place appropriate mitigations. The current design has the drainage system in place, however, the team is working on developing the flood models to understand the baseline and what mitigation may be needed to address any increase in flood risk.

- 4.47 SE asked in the Microsoft Teams chat if EWR Co would ignore feedback which says that the northern approach should be re-considered. SJ responded that EWR Co are aware of the frustration around the route choice. SJ also noted that whilst the preferred route alignment was announced in 2023, and EWR Co is not seeking specific feedback in this regard, consultees are welcome to provide their feedback in relation to any part of the proposals, which includes the approach to Cambridge. All feedback will be taken into account. SJ shared a screenshot of a document given out at the Comberton in-person event which outlines the rationale for the approach taken and stated that she would ensure a copy of this is included with any of the notes that go out to the group after the session.
- 4.48 Going back to the discussion on drainage, SH asked if the analysis of the outflows is going to be limited up to the point the water is discharged into a watercourse, or if it will follow the watercourse up until the point that EWR Co have assessed the flood impact. SH expanded to say that although Dry Drayton is five miles away from the route they may be impacted and end up with a lot more water.
- 4.49 WE confirmed that the modelling and the mitigations need to satisfy the Environment Agency and that the proposals are not making flood risk worse than it currently is, so they should not see more water coming through a watercourse near them because of the project. Fiona Man (FM) confirmed this was correct.
- 4.50 SH asked for further clarification about the collection of water, and WE expanded to say that the purpose of the balancing ponds is to slow the rate of water coming through, so that there is enough storage within those ponds to regulate the flow.
- 4.51 FM acknowledged that she was not a flood modeller but understands that EWR Co would analyse a wider study area and must model the entire catchment area to understand where surface water and groundwater are going, and flood risks, and that this needs to be agreed with the Environment Agency. EWR Co will be producing a flood risk assessment as part of their DCO application which will set out all the details from the outputs, modelling and mitigations.
- 4.52 SH stated his concern that, if the modelling is limited in scope, then the model may seem fine now however future issues may not be intercepted. If flagged up as a risk now, then at least the modelling will take it into account.
- 4.53 WE suggested that this point is taken away and a fuller answer will be provided by the experts. WE confirmed they cannot say much more other than EWR Co

will satisfy the Environment Agency through the DCO process about modelling the catchment area.

- 4.54 SH added that there is limited knowledge of the route along the A603, but suspects there are big issues around flooding here. WE confirmed they understood that this is a concern for many people.
- 4.55 DR asked if the balancing ponds are designed primarily as permanent features or construction features. WE confirmed that they were permanent features but added that flood risks may need to be managed during construction as well.
- 4.56 DR stated that there was belief that EWR Co were not going to maintain the ponds and asked whether this was true and, if not, who would maintain them.
- 4.57 WE confirmed that the expectation for maintaining the balancing ponds for the railway would be the owner of the infrastructure and the highways ones would be maintained by the highways authority.

Non-statutory consultation proposals – Route Section 7

- 4.58 WE gave an overview of Route Section 7 which goes as far as Shelford, but in this session, only the route as far as Haslingfield was being discussed.
- 4.59 SE stated that, in this new plan and because of the new tunnel under Chapel Hill and a cutting in Comberton, residents are faced with a bigger and longer embankment but were not asked their views about this in the consultation, even though it was a change in design. SE stated that they only found out the embankment was higher for longer through personal detailed study of the designs, so residents were not happy about this.
- 4.60 WE stated that, for this area, there was a free-text area to provide feedback more generally as opposed to asking for specific feedback. SE said they were disappointed that this was not a specific question.
- 4.61 DR stated that the feedback from Haslingfield Parish Council in respect of Chapel Hill Tunnel is that the tunnel should be much longer. The western portal is about 200 metres from people's properties, which they consider to be unacceptable. The eastern portal, the option EWR Co have said they prefer, would obliterate a Bronze Age burial mound(s) and desecrate the views of the landscape in the area.
- 4.62 DR stated that Haslingfield Parish Council also supports Harlton, who wanted a low track to the north of Harlton, and for EWR Co to go under the A603, (or the A603 could rise on an embankment over the railway).
- 4.63 WE stated that the length of the tunnel is touched upon in the [technical report](#) and acknowledged that a longer tunnel has benefits, so they welcome this feedback.
- 4.64 WE addressed the other comment about the railway crossing the A603 and said this will be considered. WE explained that there are limitations as to how low the

alignment can go as there are a couple of watercourses and the flight path of the Barbastelle bats. This is why EWR Co are currently considering going over the A603, rather than under it.

- 4.65 IR stated that EWR Co said that putting the railway into a shallow trench would affect the Barbastelle bats but believes that an embankment would possibly have a greater effect on them. WE confirmed that when it is on embankment, the bats would go under the railway where there is a bridge between Bourn Brook and the A603.
- 4.66 IR responded to say that there is no mitigation for the bats between the A603 and Harlton to Haslingfield. WE confirmed that there is Longbrook underbridge where the bats follow the water course but thereafter there is not another mitigation until Chapel Hill.
- 4.67 IR asked if the bat modelling is seen as a perfectly good mitigation in terms of the bats flight path.
- 4.68 FM confirmed it helps to establish current flight paths and roosting spots, so where they are intercepting or severing that, they can provide them with a suitable crossing either under or over the railway alignments whilst providing sufficient clearance underneath structures, providing foraging and commuting habitat such as planting new woodland. FM confirmed that, as well as visual impacts, one of the reasons for the tunnel at Chapel Hill is so EWR Co are not severing the bats' flight path. EWR Co have carried out some bat surveys and have contacted local bat groups to understand where their flight paths are.
- 4.69 IR questioned whether the research completed on the bats was available to view. FM confirmed these bat surveys are ongoing, and EWR Co would provide more information at the statutory consultation.
- 4.70 IR stated that Harlton Parish Council was contacted by EWR Co regarding the completion of bat surveys but, as far as they know, these have not been completed, and they would like to see the results of these.
- 4.71 FM confirmed this is something they would take away and that the surveys are still ongoing. SJ confirmed to get back to IR with more information.
- 4.72 SE suggested that the environmental representatives from EWR Co had stated at an event that they are considering evidence from European studies as to whether the proposed mitigations are appropriate. SE asked what would happen if the proposed mitigations do not work.
- 4.73 FM confirmed that engagement with Natural England is ongoing and that the Barbastelle bats are a qualifying feature of the Eversden and Wimpole Special Area of Conservation, so will put in place a mitigation strategy and gain the relevant licenses. EWR Co also must produce a Habitats Regulations Assessment as part of the DCO application.

- 4.74 SE asked whether the team is working with the engineers so the design can be altered if proposed mitigations are not suitable. FM confirmed that they work very closely with the engineers and technical partners, and they often have integrated design meetings.
- 4.75 NP asked for clarification on what the bat mitigation is in Caldecote and whether the proposal is for a green bridge. NP also questioned whether this was permanent or temporary for the construction phase.
- 4.76 FM confirmed that where there is a proposal for a bat crossing, there would generally be woodland/hedgerow planting which will help connect those foraging and commuting habitats for bats to guide them from one side of the railway to another. The woodland planting also acts as a screening function too, and FM confirmed that this is permanent woodland planting and is based on current knowledge.
- 4.77 Once the location on the map was identified, NP asked if the proposed bat crossing is just the woodland or if it is a structure and was concerned that bats will abandon the area due to years of construction. FM stated that the mitigation consists of a cut and cover to maintain the bat flight path.
- 4.78 NP wanted to know what this would look like once the roads have been reconnected and the tunnel has been covered and what this mitigation is and will look like. FM confirmed that she will double check and provide further information.
- 4.79 IR asked about the age of the trees that would be planted in the woodland section and stated that someone from the environmental team at the consultation event thought that most areas where tree symbols are displayed on the drawings will be saplings. IR was unsure if this was good enough mitigation to encourage bats. FM confirmed EWR Co would get back to IR on this and that the age of the trees will be confirmed.
- 4.80 NP asked how long the diversion to the A428 would be operational for, and whether it would be for the duration of the project. WE confirmed that the diversion would only be needed for the time required to construct the segment of the cut and cover tunnel under the footprint of the existing A428. NP asked how long that timeframe is envisaged to be, and WE confirmed that there is no estimated timeframe yet.
- 4.81 BN added that, for temporary road closures and diversions, all diversion routes and their duration will be reported in the transport assessment. A draft Transport Assessment will be published as part of statutory consultation (The full Transport Assessment will be submitted with the DCO Application) and will include details on the provision of traffic management. It will also include details on the diversions for all types of road users, as well as information on how much traffic will be diverted.

- 4.82 BN added that bus routes are an important mode of transport in the area and clarified that there will be more detail in the transport assessment. The assessment will also include details on how bus routes will potentially be affected and how bus stops may potentially be re-purposed. On PRoW, BN confirmed that surveys are being undertaken at the moment which will allow EWR Co to report accurate numbers on affected people. BN added that there is an appreciation that some users of PRoW have limited mobility and, as a result, it will be important to demonstrate how any changes may result in a change to topography, as well as any additional hindrances or obstacles as part of a temporary closure.
- 4.83 BN added that engagement with the highways authority will also be important, as the works will go on for longer than six weeks. BN said that any works taking less than six weeks would be treated on a case-by-case basis.
- 4.84 NP asked what feedback is being requested at the moment and asked when the EWR Co team are likely to have answers to her questions. BN responded that because the EWR Co team are still learning about the intricacies of the local road network, it is better to be realistic around timeframes. BN added that the EWR Co team is effectively reaching out for stakeholders' local knowledge about their road networks and where things tend to go wrong.
- 4.85 NP asked for an explanation of how the diversion on Highfields Road is going to work and said that she has received conflicting answers at drop-in events – with some people saying there will be a diversion, and others saying the contrary. NP also enquired about a blue line on one of the maps, and whether it had been added into plans more recently. BN responded by saying that EWR Co are still developing our traffic assessments which are ongoing and more will be shared at the statutory consultation.

Post meeting clarification:

NP has sent the map to SJ and this matter is being dealt with by email. The cyan lines would be proposed utilities diversions and the red telecoms box represents a GSM-R telecommunication mast, as described in section 14.7.3 of the [technical report](#).

- 4.86 NP asked about the blue line which says diversion on the EWR site. Neither NP nor SJ could locate the map in question and agreed to take the matter offline.
- 4.87 IR asked what age of tree would be planted in the woodland section (related to the bats). FM confirmed EWR Co would get back to IR on this.
- 4.88 SM asked what measures EWR Co will put in place to mitigate the noise and disruption to Comberton Village College, the largest secondary school in the county, particularly during exam time, as the rail line and construction runs alongside the school.

- 4.89 SJ confirmed that EWR Co are speaking to the school about noise impacts, especially around important times in the term, and these conversations will continue during construction.
- 4.90 SM expressed that the school is particularly concerned about ensuring there is sufficient fencing to stop children from getting on to the railway line. SM was concerned about both construction and when the line is operational.
- 4.91 SJ stated this was definitely going to be taken into consideration and that there were huge safety concerns to be addressed at all stages of the process. Currently EWR Co do not know what this will look like.
- 4.92 Mary-Ann Claridge (MC) pointed out that a bridlepath is missing from the map. This bridlepath is not yet on the ground but was a planning condition for the development of the housing estate. MC noted a bridlepath should be connected to footpath nine.
- 4.93 WE confirmed that EWR Co are aware of this, and it has been raised with the team to be included in their considerations.
- 4.94 MC asked what condition these footpaths and bridlepaths are going to be left in after construction.
- 4.95 BN confirmed that bridlepaths will be returned to the state they are currently in. It is important for EWR Co to establish intended purposes of these paths and return them to that same state. There are lots of conversations being had with the correct organisations to retain and maintain paths.
- 4.96 MC stated that there is an access point shown to the left of the saplings through the housing estate. MC has had discussions at the drop-in consultation event that this was intended to be emergency access to the tunnels, and that this road is completely inappropriate for this use. Another route will need to be considered.
- 4.97 WE confirmed that this will be noted, and that he was involved in this discussion at the event.
- 4.98 DR stated that there is a point near Haslingfield which appears to be a construction compound for utilities or telecoms. DR asked if this was temporary and what it may look like. DR also said that, although there is an understanding that the details of the programme cannot be given at this stage because they have not been worked out yet, an estimated duration of overall construction and what EWR Co would consider to be the main impacts would be especially useful. SJ confirmed they would take this feedback away.
- 4.99 WE confirmed the area that DR was referring to and mentioned that he does not believe there is a proposed telecoms site there. As far as WE was aware, that would be space needed to set up a compound for the diversion work but could not confirm details.

- 4.100 NS stated that he applauds the active travel work that EWR Co are supporting. NS said that it would be beneficial to enable people to bike or walk to the station as much as possible. NS asked if the train will have increased capacity for storing bicycles.
- 4.101 BN stated that, in terms of rolling stock requirements, work is continuing in terms of active travel to determine how many people will arrive at the stations and via what mode. For example, EWR Co will need to validate the number of people leaving their bikes at the station to ensure there is the required storage available. Further assumptions will be made about origins and destinations of journeys and how many will use their bikes. Various assumptions will help inform the rolling stock requirements and how that will play out in terms of capacity on trains, however the rolling stock requirements have not yet been calculated. BN also stated that EWR Co understood that they need to provide options to allow people to get to the station via active transport.
- 4.102 NS noted that EWR Co should expect that their rolling stock would need to have more capacity for bicycles than traditional trains have today, as Cambridge is unique in that respect with a large amount of cycling. BN agreed with this point.

5 Closing remarks, AOB

- 5.1 SE asked when feedback will be shared with them from this meeting. SJ confirmed that there will be a draft summary note and a list of feedback topics that have been covered, as well as the questions that will be taken away. These will be issued out with a copy of the recording. EWR Co welcomes feedback and it will then be published.
- 5.2 SJ suggested that the attendees used the contact email address to ask any further questions they have, and these will be answered in due course. SJ also confirmed that there are upcoming events the attendees can attend.

Post-meeting feedback

Post meeting clarification:

NE submitted additional information post meeting – captured below.

“In the morning and evenings there are a lot of school buses that take the children to Comberton Village College. It’s fairly chaotic, especially with pedestrians and cyclists also rushing to school. Having a station within 3 mins walk of the village college, which is where it would likely be, and having stations in what are many of the college’s feeder villages would be an obvious benefit on travel to school for the kids, take the pressure off the roads during that key time of day for traffic in general and enhance the safety of the walk to school for the children who live in Comberton itself.”

Feedback Log:

Issue	Description
1.	Concern raised about how Cambourne station would be accessed from the north.
2.	Concern for the condition of the local rural roads due to increased traffic or construction and about EWR Co’s approach to maintaining these roads.
3.	Concern raised that Caldecote and Bourn are going to be used as a rat-runs unless further stations are built on the line.
4.	Point raised that there is a dangerous junction in Caldecote, from St Neots Road in the east, just passing the BP petrol station.
5.	Point raised that EWR Co need to be aware that concerns and worries are heightened among residents affected by the railway, when all the information they need cannot be provided.
6.	Query regarding the impact of construction due to the project and to what degree of detail critical areas have been modelled.

Issue	Description
7.	Concern over the impact of EWR Co on Long Road Bridge, going into Cambridge.
8.	Query as to what 85% capacity on the roads referred to.
9.	Point raised that Bourn has a very narrow chicane in the road and would struggle with additional traffic.
10.	Concern raised that Great and Little Eversden currently have no public transport that they could use to get to get to stations and that there is no bus service from Comberton to Cambourne
11.	Point raised that there is a doctor's surgery in Great and Little Eversden that causes traffic and parking issues and concern EWR Co may impact this further.
12.	Point raised that there are two routes into Comberton and both will be affected by EWR so both routes should not be closed at the same time.
13.	Concerns that although EWR Co may not consider that the increase in traffic needs to be mitigated, an increase in traffic would completely change Caldecote, which is a quiet rural village, including noise pollution and safety to children.
14.	Query about whether EWR Co are required to make Section 106 payments or other payments to impacted villages particularly as the disruption would be significant during the build and changes would be permanent.
15.	Point raised that it would be beneficial to have more local stations in the Cambridge area.
16.	Point raised that a bus route is required from Cambridge to Cambourne.
17.	Concern raised that excess drainage water would flow into the back gardens of the houses along St Neots Road.
18.	Concern regarding the drainage around the A428 balancing ponds.

Issue	Description
19.	Concern raised about how Dry Drayton may be affected by water/ flood impact.
20.	Concern raised over the fact the tunnel at Chapel Hill requires a bigger and longer embankment, and disappointment among residents that there was not a specific question box in the proposals regarding this.
21.	Point raised that the Chapel Hill Tunnel should be much longer.
22.	Concern raised over the Barbastelle bats in the local area and the impact EWR Co is going to have on the bats and their flight paths.
23.	Point raised that a shallow trench may affect Barbastelle bats less than an embankment.
24.	Concerns over whether design changes will be made if the Barbastelle bats cannot be mitigated.
25.	Concern regarding the age of woodland implemented for the Barbastelle bats – particularly that saplings may not be sufficient
26.	Query about what mitigations are needed for noise and disruption to Comberton Village College during construction and operation. Concern raised around site safety and interventions such as adequate fencing to prevent children entering the railway line.
27.	Suggestion for an alternative access route to be considered instead of the route to the left of the saplings through the housing estate due to feedback that it is inappropriate for use and was intended to be emergency access.
28.	Feedback that there is a point near Haslingfield which is a construction compound for utilities/telecom which should be considered for access.

Issue	Description
29.	Point raised that an estimated duration of overall construction and what EWR Co would consider to be the main impacts would be useful.
30.	Questions about whether the train will have increased capacity for bike storage. Feedback noted EWR Co should expect their rolling stock would need to have more capacity for bicycles than traditional trains have today, as Cambridge has many cyclists.
31.	Positive feedback on the active travel work EWR Co are supporting. A suggestion for the provision of a bike lane next to the railway line
32.	<p>Suggestion for four stations, each serving two villages: Highfields Caldecote / Hardwick; Toft / Comberton; Haslingfield / Harlton; and Harston / Newton.</p> <p>Suggestion for each station to have foot path and bike access from each village via the shortest route. This may require a new footpath from Hardwick to station.</p> <p>Advantages are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stations would increase the usage of the railway. • The Comberton/Toft station would be a few minutes' walk from Comberton Village College leading to reduced traffic and improved pedestrian/cyclist safety in Comberton. • Rat runs through villages are mitigated by placing more stations along the route.

Summary of actions

- **ACTION 1:** EWR Co to share links to various documents after the meeting.
 - [Transport Update Report](#)
 - [East West Rail's southern approach factsheet](#)
- **ACTION 2:** EWR Co to respond to the comment on the Section 106 payments that should be made to the community given the disruption during construction and the permanent changes afterwards.

- **ACTION 3:** EWR Co to confirm the age of trees to be planted in the woodland section.
- **ACTION 4:** EWR Co to provide more information about what the bat mitigations and green tunnel would look like once it has been covered and reconnected to the roads.
- **ACTION 5:** EWR Co to provide an indication about the duration of the construction next to Comberton Village College (+ 500m to the N and S).
- **Action 5:** EWR Co to look into environmental survey timelines.

Attendees:

EWR Co attendees

- **Sarah Jacobs** – Senior Engagement Manager
- **Rupal Patel** – DCO & Engagement Manager
- **Will Egan** – Design Lead
- **Fiona Man** – Senior Environmental Advisor
- **Ben Nicholass** – Traffic, Transport Planning and Modelling Senior Manager

Parish Council representatives

- **Cllr Neil Stutchbury** – Bourn CP
- **Cllr Des O'Brien** – Bourn CP
- **Cllr Nicola Pritchard** – Caldecote CP
- **Cllr Sean Houlihane** – Dry Drayton CP
- **Cllr Peter Deer** – Elsworth CP
- **Cllr Sharon Erzincioğlu** – Great & Little Eversden CP
- **Cllr Isabel Robinson** – Harlton CP
- **Cllr David Revell** – Haslington CP
- **Cllr Martin Yeadon** – Toft CP
- **Cllr Simon Moffat** – Comberton CP
- **Cllr Jessica Marshall** – Comberton CP
- **Cllr Laurence Haslop** – Comberton CP
- **Cllr Norman Evanson** – Comberton CP

Apologies

- Boxworth CP
- Cambourne CP
- Childerley CP
- Eltisley CP
- Hardwick CP

- Knapwell CP
- Papworth Everard CP
- Toseland CP
- Yelling CP