

Fenny Stratford-Kempston Group – Meeting notes

Meeting #1 – Details

Date: 09/01/2025

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 and introduced the EWR Co team members.
 - 1.2 Nick Burton (NB) requested that EWR Co send a diagram that clarifies the job roles of staff present and asked if a representative from Network Rail was in attendance.
 - 1.3 SJ stated that EWR Co could look at providing the job titles job when meeting notes are distributed. SJ confirmed that no Network Rail staff were in attendance, but that EWR Co work closely with Network Rail on this project.
 - 1.4 SJ ran through the meeting agenda, gave an outline of the meeting and how to contribute or ask questions. SJ encouraged attendees to express their thoughts on the proposals.
 - 1.5 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. SJ explained that 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](#) (online [feedback form](#)).
- 2 **Introduction to the workshops**
 - 2.1 Siobhan Adeleke (SA) explained that the project is at non-statutory consultation (NSC) 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.

- 2.2 SA explained that information about the DCO process can be found on the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) [website](#).
- 2.3 SA explained that EWR Co are more than halfway through the consultation and encouraged attendees to go to an event if they have not already. SA showed a table outlining upcoming events prior to the end of the consultation on Friday 24 January 2025 at 11:59pm, with the last event on the Tuesday 21 January 2025.
- 2.4 SA explained that EWR Co are running these workshops as an opportunity for attendees to share their initial thoughts and suggestions about the designs and for EWR Co to answer their questions.
- 2.5 SA explained that meetings are also being held with local authorities. A meeting with Milton Keynes City Council took place on 18 December and a meeting with Central Bedfordshire Council has been scheduled for 22 January.
- 2.6 SA noted that further workshops will take place with all statutory stakeholders throughout 2025.
- 2.7 SJ explained that today's meeting had to be held online due to EWR Co still delivering non-statutory consultation events, but that they would look for future sessions to be in person for the rest of the year. SJ said she will provide more information soon.

3 **Update on Proposals**

Non-statutory consultation (NSC) proposals

- 3.1 Ryan Robertson (RR) provided an update to the route section from Fenny Stratford to Kempston which is called the Marston Vale Line (MVL) and explained the proposals to upgrade stations and train services on the line (two options; Existing Stations Option and Consolidated Stations Option).
- 3.2 RR outlined that the 'Existing Stations Option' would retain the nine stations and the current hourly Bletchley to Bedford stopping service at all stations with two additional services per hour calling at the four stations of Woburn Sands, Ridgmont, Lidlington, and Stewartby. There would also be two core EWR services an hour calling at four of the stations (Woburn Sands, Ridgmont, Lidlington, Stewartby). Under this option, minor upgrades to all existing stations would be carried out for safety purposes. More substantial works would be required at Stewartby station. Platform extensions would be required to accommodate longer EWR trains at Woburn Sands, Ridgmont, Stewartby and Lidlington, whilst some minor platform extensions might also be required at other stations for safety purposes.
- 3.3 RR outlined the 'Consolidated Stations' option, which would consolidate the nine stations to four new, modern, and easier to access stations at Woburn Sands, Ridgmont, Lidlington, and Stewartby, providing upgraded facilities with active

travel hubs and access to buses, taxis, cycle hubs, and ample car parking. This would avoid the need for passengers to park on roads within the villages. RR explained that EWR Co are considering the locations of these stations to better serve the wider community and that there would be three EWR trains servicing these four stations every hour, two running between Oxford and Cambridge, and the third running between Bletchley and Cambridge. The new stations would be more conveniently located to reflect the changes along the Marston Vale Line in recent years, catering to the needs of existing villages and new, growing communities.

- 3.4 RR explained that EWR Co is continuing to consider the 30 level crossings across the MVL between Fenny Stratford and Kempston ranging from road crossings to footpaths, bridleways and farmland access.
- 3.5 RR explained that EWR Co is considering what crossings could potentially remain open but, where this is not possible, considerations are being made to provide suitable diversions and infrastructure to close the crossing.
- 3.6 RR explained that work is ongoing regarding the passing loops required along the MVL to allow for faster trains to overtake slower trains, including freight. RR mentioned a couple of potential locations in the Ridgmont and Stewartby area for a passing loop, but this is not yet confirmed as it is important to EWR Co that the best service concept is determined first.

Approach to the Environment

- 3.7 Toby Wastling (TW) outlined key environmental considerations and constraints on the MVL including landscape and visual impacts around the new stations; properties being subject to acquisition; wildlife sites; listed buildings and Roman settlements; as well as flood risk along the route.
- 3.8 TW explained that EWR Co remains fully committed to environmental principles outlined in the 2021 non-statutory consultation and that the team has prepared an environmental strategy and an [Environmental Update Report](#) which is available online. He continued to explain that a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) will be shared as part of the statutory consultation and that subsequently a full Environmental Statement will support the submission of the DCO application. TW explained that throughout the process the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will continue to make use of information gathered from surveys and engagement.
- 3.9 NB asked for clarification about a document received from PINS about the scope and depth of the environmental proposals which parish councils were asked to review to determine if EWR Co have adequately scoped.
- 3.10 TW explained that PINS had circulated the Scoping Report. The report is part of the EIA process and will inform the Environmental Statement as to what topics

could potentially experience significant environment effects and are therefore included within the Environment Statement. TW explained that the purpose of the Scoping Report is to set out what needs to be assessed within the Environmental Statement and make it proportionate. For a project of this scale, most topics would be scoped in.

Homes, land and property

- 3.11 RR discussed impacts on homes, land and property. EWR has tried to reduce potential impacts on land and property owners where possible, through use of existing railway land to build and operate the railway, but RR noted that with a project of this size, acquisition and usage of other land along the route (which can include homes, businesses and agricultural land) will be required.
 - 3.12 RR stated that the proposals presented at this non-statutory consultation show the extent of the land that has been identified at this stage as potentially needed for the railway.
 - 3.13 RR stated that the Secretary of State for Transport has safeguarded land within this area, triggering statutory blight provisions, and iterated that property owners not eligible to serve a blight notice may still be able to apply to EWR Co to buy their property under the Need to Sell Property Scheme. He invited anyone who feels they are affected to send their questions to the EWR Co Land and Property Team at land@eastwestrail.co.uk to start discussions.
- 4 **Design feedback session**
- 4.1 RR introduced this section of the meeting and invited feedback on the design such as the options and station connectivity.
 - 4.2 Philip Ball (PB) asked if under the consolidated station model, Bow Brickhill station would be lost, as this would negatively impact traffic, door to door connectivity, access to the factories and offices, and employment opportunities.
 - 4.3 In addition, PB asked if the level crossing and bridge would be lost if Bow Brickhill station were to remain.
 - 4.4 RR confirmed that Bow Brickhill would not be retained under the consolidated stations option but explained that work is being undertaken to look at active travel routes and the connectivity to each station location, and what routes can be provided to make journeys into stations easier. Once the feedback from the consultation has been considered, EWR Co will present further plans on connectivity to the stations and wider areas.
 - 4.5 Hugh Roberts (HR) introduced himself as representing Marston Moreteyne Parish Council, where the options would be to maintain Millbrook station, or close it in favour of the new Lidlington station. HR pointed out that, at present, it is possible

to walk from Marston Moreteyne to Millbrook station, but that it is not safe to walk to the existing station at Lidlington. HR therefore asked if the proposal for the new station at Lidlington will include a new pavement to enable Marston Moreteyne residents to walk there.

- 4.6 HR also asked if more detail will be provided about the parking provision at Lidlington station and what impact EWR will have on the existing bus routes.
- 4.7 RR responded that EWR Co is still looking at what it can provide or what local authorities can provide to improve connectivity in the area between for example the station and Marston Moreteyne, considering provisions made for the Marston Valley development which is located between Marston Moreteyne and Lidlington station.
- 4.8 RR confirmed that discussions with the local authorities and other public transport companies are underway discussing active travel and how to improve public transport in the area. This work, however, is ongoing and EWR Co will provide more detail at the statutory consultation.
- 4.9 NB expressed confusion at EWR Co's two station options (either keeping nine stations or closing nine to build three new ones) as the technical report states that EWR Co may not have the funds available, yet which potentially suggests that one of the options may not be viable. NB was concerned that there are not truly two choices if EWR Co cannot deliver one of them.
- 4.10 RR explained that, at this stage, the proposals for the stations are high level and that part of the work is to seek 3rd party funding opportunities. RR explained that the non-statutory consultation asks for people's views on the two service concepts and that funding is separate from this. The project is at the early design stages, with such details not being confirmed yet.
- 4.11 NB commented that this is not what EWR Co have said and that this detail is not in the handouts, nor the main non-statutory consultation documentation but is deep in the technical documentation [referring to information on [p.121](#), [p.147](#) and [p.148](#)].

Post meeting clarification: Since the launch of the consultation in November, all details on our updated proposals have been freely available on our website with our Consultation Document providing a broad summary of our proposals and our Technical Report providing more detailed information. "While not solely reliant on developer funding, our Technical Report states that final station configurations on the Marston Vale Line are subject to affordability criteria and acknowledges potential consideration of third-party funding opportunities. Sourcing potential additional revenue from third parties is a very common feature during the planning process for large-scale public sector developments and infrastructure projects and will help us to deliver the best

possible outcomes in terms of functionality and accessibility for communities. "Like in other areas of the route, councils along the Marston Vale Line already have plans for additional housing as part of their local plans, which are independent of our proposals. Detailed funding allocations for our proposals will only be finalised once the DCO process is completed and the necessary consents to build the railway are secured. It should be noted that in the Autumn Budget last year the Government committed to funding and delivering the full route of EWR. "We strongly encourage as many people as possible to take part in this consultation process, as public feedback is essential to shaping the final design for the Marston Vale Line and East West Rail."

- 4.12 AP asked via the chat function if the bridge at Bow Brickhill will be built whichever option is chosen.
- 4.13 RR responded that the decision to construct a bridge or keep the level crossing open will be determined by the level of usage and is independent of the decision on station options. EWR Co are now moving into more detailed traffic and transport assessments across the whole route and are considering whether they can keep the crossing open or whether provisions are needed for a bridge.
- 4.14 AP asked via the chat function if further clarification could be given on the Woburn Sands station option and whether there are funding issues for option 2 stating that if the proposed new stations across the MVL (option 2) are not guaranteed to be built then that will influence what people opt for.
- 4.15 RR explained that four stations are proposed along the MVL in the consolidated scenario, and that EWR Co is continuing to develop what these stations will look like and seeking opportunities for where 3rd party funding could be provided for these stations and their facilities.
- 4.16 SJ added that this approach applies to other sections of the route and how other large infrastructure projects are delivered and confirmed that further into the project timeline EWR Co will look at what role external/3rd party funding will play.
- 4.17 NB added that such information should have been made clearer in the consultation document and asked how much 3rd party funding would be needed to complete the stations.
- 4.18 SJ responded to say that, at the moment, EWR Co is just looking at the optionality and that the purpose of the consultation is to listen and consider feedback and people's preferred options. This was confirmed by RR. SJ explained that funding is not known currently, and that there is information available in the technical report for people to read. SJ stated that, if necessary, this can be drawn out of the [technical report](#) and sent out following the call.

- 4.19 HR asked if travel to Oxford from Lidlington will be as easy as travelling to Cambridge. The consultation materials mainly seem to focus on the prospects available to travel to the East (Cambridge). HR mentioned that easy connectivity to both Cambridge and Oxford would be particularly appealing to teenagers and young professionals in the Marston Moreteyne area.
- 4.20 RR answered that the new station for Lidlington would indeed cater for a footbridge between platforms. The current proposal is to provide a footbridge and lifts for disabled access between the two platforms ensuring easy access for travel to both Cambridge and Oxford.
- 4.21 AP asked via the chat function whether EWR Co could give an idea of the volume of expected passengers for station option 2. RR responded to say that a number cannot be provided yet, as work to finalise expected passenger demand is ongoing but that more detail will be available in the next consultation.
- 4.22 Lloyd Haley (LH) asked about the potential theme park and resort project from Universal Destinations & Experiences in Stewartby and mentioned that Universal is not happy with the proposals so far and has asked for better infrastructure and stations. LH asked whether this is captured in the EWR Co's designs. RR responded that the Universal proposals are not considered in the EWR proposals at this time as Universal's developments are currently an uncommitted project whose impact in the area would greatly skew what EWR Co proposes. However, RR clarified that EWR Co are working and engaging with Universal around their requirements at the site and the potential impact on the wider rail network. Until EWR Co are clear on Universal's needs, the Universal proposals will need to be left out of the consultation
- 4.23 NB asked what effect level crossings will have on road traffic in Woburn Sands?
- 4.24 Ben Nicholass (BN) outlined the method of forecasting EWR Co is using, which is in line with the Department for Transport's (DfT) guidance on Traffic Forecasting. BN confirmed that they have created the analytical tools to appraise impacts on road traffic that align with government guidance, with more detail to come in the next year or more.
- 4.25 Peter Roberts (PR) added that a Risk Assessments (RA) process which follows the All level Crossing Risk Assessment Tool (ALCRM) that must be carried out for all Level Crossings. The risk assessments look at all the analysis usage and; Risk(s) including; Train Per Hour (TPH), Traffic Census, geometry, Railway systems (Including signalling), road curvature, line speeds, barrier downtime, incidents. This then feeds into a scored Risk model, and this would determine if the crossing is safe or unsafe. PR explained that these factors then output actions (Including additional mitigations or closures).
- 4.26 NB queried whether the risk model would be run at the statutory consultation, which would then inform EWR Co that Woburn Sands crossing is unsafe. PR

- clarified that the models are already being run on the level crossings for all scenarios - what is unclear is some of the other idiosyncrasies around other developments and road structures.
- 4.27 NB asked for further clarification as he understands that EWR Co have yet to do the detailed modelling which will then need to be risk assessed and may inform EWR Co of a problem.
 - 4.28 PR explained that RA's are being done as a matter of course by Network Rail and also by EWR Co specifications that feeds into the assessments. EWR Co are currently running several scenarios on them.
 - 4.29 NB asked when EWR Co can share modelling of the level crossings.
 - 4.30 BN confirmed these will be shared at statutory consultation.
 - 4.31 BN clarified that the railway will not be delivered in isolation, it will be developed with the Highways Authority, local authority, network rail and, where appropriate, National Highways. BN reiterated that the purpose of the session is to gain local knowledge about the current highway network, and to hear local concerns, for example concerns about the closure of level crossings. This will help inform detailed design.
 - 4.32 AP asked via the Teams chat if EWR Co have any leverage to ensure good connectivity to the stations so that passenger numbers are met, or whether the responsibility sits entirely with local authorities who currently don't prioritise South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.
 - 4.33 BN outlined the process of forecasting demand, and how people enter and exit a station. He explained that the demand from people accessing the station via bus or active travel marks the starting point of discussions with local authorities and bus companies. EWR Co can of course help inform what the demand is and EWR Co hope to influence, but these are ongoing discussions. More information will likely be available at statutory consultation, especially about active travel and potential bus routes.
 - 4.34 Philip Ball (PB) asked BN if traffic data from 2023 was relied upon and pointed out that for much of 2023 and 2024 level crossings were often closed due to a lack of trains. PB queried whether this would skew the figures.
 - 4.35 BN confirmed that EWR Co is aware that services were not operating in that time period and are therefore revisiting some of the level crossing modelling. BN explained the differences between strategic and local modelling and how the more detailed modelling provides more nuance, and he explained the need to choose a neutral month outside of half term and school holidays to gather data.
 - 4.36 PB asked if all trains will go via Milton Keynes Central, or if people will need to change at Bletchley and how easy this would be.
 - 4.37 RR explained that the proposals do not currently see the Oxford to Cambridge services go to Milton Keynes Central directly and that a change at Bletchley will

- be required to travel to Milton Keynes. Regarding ease of accessing connecting services, RR noted that the new platforms seven and eight at Bletchley Station will have an underpass with lifts, which take the passenger to the other side. From here a bridge will connect passengers to other platforms.
- 4.38 In response to PB's message in the chat, Freddie Luff (FL) shared pages from Section 5 of the consultation document in the Teams chat, which show the train services for the consolidated and existing station concept options.
- 4.39 AP left a message in the chat to say that closing the station at Bow Brickhill is a huge concern without the provision of a bridge at Bow Brickhill. She explained that the only route across is through Woburn Sands. Currently HGVs are using residential streets which have parked cars on both sides and a 90 degree turn on Theydon Avenue.
- 4.40 RR answered that this is why within the proposals EWR Co have been looking at keeping the crossing open or providing a bridge slightly to the east of the level crossing as initial work looking at the crossings has confirmed that there is a lot of traffic there, as it is a link through Caldecott to the A5 on the other side.
- 4.41 NB queried why the view was taken that Woburn Sands station cannot be extended due to acquisition issues as in other parts of the route compulsory acquisition is being proposed.
- 4.42 RR explained that while EWR Co has tried to minimise impacts on local businesses, properties and villages, the current station is constrained on all sides with businesses, homes and green space, with the primary school not far away. RR stated that EWR Co are only looking to buy land as required and cannot comment on other sections of the route as this is not in his remit.
- 4.43 NB raised concerns about the footbridge for the school in Woburn Sands and expressed that, given the amount of work EWR Co are going to do, it would be a pity not to replace it.
- 4.44 RR explained proposals around Woburn Sands, and notes the crossing was previously closed for EWR Co's works, with a diversion to Woburn Sands crossing. EWR Co is looking to continue this system, keeping the diversion. In the new scenario the crossing itself would be very unsafe. RR confirmed that the replacement of the bridge has been considered previously.
- 4.45 NB raised an issue around Ridgmont, regarding the A509 overbridge which crosses what will become the EWR line. NB expressed that in the morning and potentially the evening, this overbridge is congested all the way down to the roundabout and onto the junction to the A421 and M1, with an effect on either of the Ridgmont station options.
- 4.46 BN acknowledged the importance of local knowledge and noted that these effects would be picked up by transport modelling. BN noted that, while the bridge is currently busy, it is likely to be busier in 2034. EWR Co would look to

mitigate against the impacts of EWR where it can and work with local authorities to address existing issues on the local network where practical.

- 4.47 SJ invited RR to discuss twin tracking.
- 4.48 RR gave an overview on the need for twin tracking between Bletchley and Caldecotte, mentioning that there was historically twin tracking on that section which has since been removed. RR explained that to provide services between Oxford and Cambridge, another track will be added as these services cannot be provided on a single track. EWR Co is looking to use the same alignment that was there previously on the northern side. This would necessitate further works especially to bridges and the level crossing in that area. EWR Co would have to remove a bridge crossing on Saxon Street and replace it with a twin track bridge. The Fenny Stratford level crossing would require an upgrade with a second track to cover both. The bridge over the canal is wide enough to allow for both tracks, so EWR Co are looking to use that bridge, with inspections planned to determine what improvements would need to be made. Bridges over the River Ouzel and A5 are single-track bridges so EWR Co is looking to add a second bridge next to the existing one to accommodate the additional track. Towards Bow Brickhill the line returns to twin tracking.
- 4.49 AP asked if both options will still be open after this informal consultation as, given the lack of modelling information on traffic and the impact on both options, it is hard for people to make an informed choice now. AP continued to say that the parish receives many questions on the impact of traffic on Woburn Sands but acknowledges that this is also linked to the SEMK plans.
- 4.50 SJ explained that EWR Co will review feedback from this consultation to help inform a decision. EWR Co has not yet made a decision regarding the sharing of further information between now and the statutory consultation, but work is continuing to determine how to reach a final decision at statutory consultation. If there is a need for EWR Co to provide more information, then EWR Co would consider doing so.
- 4.51 SJ added that it may be worth for AP to include in her consultation feedback that people will find it difficult to make a choice given the lack of traffic modelling information.
- 4.52 To progress the meeting SJ asked if there were any further questions on public rights of way (PRoW) or any other topic they would like to cover. BN added that they could also give an overview on PRoW and active travel.
- 4.53 BN explained that if a PRoW needs closing during construction, it will be replaced, or an alternative will be put in place. BN continued to explain that EWR Co is undertaking surveys to ascertain how busy PRoWs are to help inform design decisions.

- 4.54 BN shared that there is an entire workstream with EWR Co that is in discussion with local authorities about potential active travel solutions that could be put in place at the station but that first the level of demand at the station needs to be understood. BN assured the attendees that there is much focus on connectivity and creating safe and sustainable corridors to allow people to connect to stations, new housing developments or employment sites on travel routes.
- 4.55 BN encouraged questions about preferences for active travel routes/ interventions and PRoWs. BN gave an example and said that he was aware of a running group in Bedford that may see 250 people running down a PRoW at specific times. This is the kind of local information the team requires to ensure the designs have the least impact as possible on such groups.
- 4.56 NB requested more information about the patterns of construction, the impact on PRoWs, and information about the construction phase disruption. NB believed that at some stage, the station would need to be closed to put the electrification in – which BN confirmed was true.
- 4.57 BN highlighted that EWR Co has undertaken traffic and transport modelling that specifically looks at construction logistics, incorporating information around speed limits, weight restrictions etc. The team will be using this to ensure they avoid peak periods. BN explained that in relation to the actual railway, the plans are always evolving and therefore effects and timelines of construction will be understood in more detail in the next (statutory) consultation. PR added that the team are looking at different scenarios. For instance, if you build a new station, you normally build them offline and then connect them. EWR Co needs to upgrade elements to make it more operational, functional and resilient. Once they know which scenario is being used e.g. which station it will be stopping at, the signalling system, the track and so forth will follow.
- 4.58 NB asked if the customer experience during construction is expected to be different to what customers experienced during construction of Connection Stage 1 (CS1), which is the section of the railway delivering services from Oxford to Bletchley/Milton Keynes. PR explained that some areas of CS1 were a brand-new build, whereas this area is an upgrade of the existing railway. PR continued to explain that EWR Co wants to keep disruption at an absolute minimum, therefore it will aim to complete works on weekends, nights and bank holidays where possible.
- 4.59 NB explained that his main concern was surrounding the impact of construction on consumers and that CS1 caused a lot of misery because consumers didn't understand what the full impact would be. PR confirmed that this is important and that there will be extensive dialogue with the various stakeholders including landowners along the route to ensure that everyone is aligned. SJ added that NB raised a good point, and that EWR Co has learned many lessons and deliberately

- started early engagement with communities based on previous concerns with how Buckinghamshire residents and stakeholders suffered with construction.
- 4.60 PR stated that they welcome feedback on this and emphasised that they will work with stakeholders moving forward.
 - 4.61 NB highlighted that the most urgent thing is to sort out what is being done, by whom and what feedback mechanisms will be in place.
 - 4.62 SJ confirmed that as soon as they have more information on that, they will share it, but this is not something that is being looked at right now. PR confirmed that there will be more information on the construction phase in the future.
 - 4.63 RR confirmed that the main issues raised are the key items they see along the MVL - in particular, station level crossings and active travel. EWR Co is trying to maximise positives whilst minimising negatives. RR again encouraged that all feedback is submitted to the non-statutory consultation, so it can be considered as the design develops.
 - 4.64 SJ stated that there are still non-statutory consultation events taking place and proceeded to highlight these to the attendees, encouraging their attendance. The various ways to get into contact with SJ and EWR Co were highlighted, and it was stated that EWR Co would continue to reach out to the attendees to gain more feedback and crucial local knowledge as the designs of the project evolve.
 - 4.65 SJ thanked the attendees and concluded the meeting.

Feedback Log:

Issue	Description
1	Concern raised about the impact on local residents if Bow Brickhill station were to be closed, in particular regarding door-to-door connectivity, traffic and employment opportunities.
2	Concern raised that currently you cannot safely walk to the existing station at Lidlington. The question was asked if provision would be made for a new pavement to access the potential new station at Lidlington so residents from Marston Moreteyne can safely walk to the station.
3	Question as to whether the bridge at Bow Brickhill will be built whichever station option is chosen.
4	Question about the ease of connectivity to both Oxford and Cambridge from Lidlington Station.

Issue	Description
5	Question as to whether the plans for a new theme park (Universal), potentially in the Stewartby area, have been factored into the EWR proposals.
6	Question about the impact of the closure of the level crossing on road traffic in Woburn.
7	Concern raised that the level crossings were not operating for much of 2023 and 2024, and that this data would skew the modelling findings.
8	Concern raised that shutting the station at Bow Brickhill without the provision of a bridge will cause a huge problem as the only route across is through Woburn Sands. Currently HGVs are using residential streets which is challenging given the parked cars and a 90 degree turn on Theydon Avenue.
9	Question about the constraints to extend the car park at the current Woburn Sands station.
10	Concern raised that the footbridge for the school at the Woburn Sands crossing will not be reinstated.
11	Concern raised about the congestion on the A509 overbridge crossing the proposed EWR train track in the mornings and evenings.
12	Concern raised that given the current lack of modelling information and the impact on traffic for each station option, people may have potentially chosen an alternative option if more information had been available to them.
13	Request that, to ensure good communication, engagement and feedback mechanisms are maintained with stakeholders leading up to and during the construction stages so that people are aware of the impacts.

Summary of actions

- **ACTION 1:** EWR Co to provide job titles when sending out the notes of the meeting to attendees.
- **ACTION 2:** EWR Co to circulate information about funding for information which is contained in the Technical Report of the non-statutory consultation documents.

Attendees:

EWR Co attendees

- Sarah Jacobs – Senior Engagement Manager
- Siobhan Adeleke – Development Consent Order Statutory Stakeholder Engagement Manager
- Ryan Robertson – Development Programme Manager
- Toby Wastling – Marston Vale Line Area Environment Manager
- Ben Nicholass – Traffic, Transport Planning and modelling
- Freddie Luff – Engineering Manager
- Peter Roberts – Engineering Manager
- Jonathan Wallace – Marston Vale Line Area Design Manager

Parish council representatives

- Nick Burton – representing Husborne Crawley CP
- Cllr Hugh Roberts – Marston Moreteyney CP
- Cllr David Hopkins – Wavendon CP
- Delia Shephard, Clerk – Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council
- Cllr Lloyd Haley – Stewartby CP
- Cllr Philip Ball – Bow Brickhill CP
- Cllr Alex Poppleton – Woburn Sands CP
- Cllr Brent Fielder – Wilden CP

Apologies

- Aspley Guise Parish Council
- Brogborough Parish Council
- Lidlington Parish Council
- Millbrook Parish Council
- Walton Parish Council