

# Cambourne & surrounding areas Group - Meeting notes

## Meeting #2 - Details

**Date:** Monday 27 June

**Time:** 7.30 PM

**Type of meeting:** Virtual meeting (Zoom)

---

## Documents discussed in this meeting

The following documents were discussed during the meeting and are available on the Group's dedicated Community Hub site - [here](#):

- Action Tracker
- Agenda
- Slides

## Key discussion points and outcomes

### 1. Agenda, housekeeping and meeting notes

- 1.1 Ian Parker (IP) welcomed attendees and thanked them for joining the meeting; he also introduced the EWR Co Team presenting in the meeting. IP also introduced Deanna Gray (DG) as new Interim Engagement Manager. IP outlined the agenda, housekeeping and meeting notes production arrangements.

### 2. Actions from meeting one

- 2.1 2.IP summarised the actions captured from the last meeting, explaining which had been completed and which were still outstanding.
- 2.2 IP advised that for the outstanding action, *'To confirm with the group EWR Co's approach to answering questions posed by Cambridge Approaches'*, EWR's CEO is pleased to hear from all interested parties across the route. He also mentioned that EWR Co is arranging a meeting with Cambridge Approaches (CA) and acknowledged the importance of engagement and of gaining useful feedback.
- 2.3 IP advised that for the outstanding action, *'To follow up with an answer regarding the inclusive design of EWR trains and whether interested groups have been contacted'*, Caroline Eglinton (CE) will cover this in a later agenda item.

2.4 IP noted that the agreed topics for future meetings: meeting 3 – business case; meeting 4 (onwards) – stations (Cambourne Station location). He offered the opportunity to suggest and vote on other topics for future discussion, to which there was no response.

2.5 IP noted that the quarterly model currently being used for LRGs was working well.

### **3. Active Travel / First Mile Last Mile (FMLM)**

3.1 Robbie Gibb (RG) outlined the meaning of Active Travel / FMLM. He explained how EWR Co wants to enable Active Travel / FMLM with health and wellbeing, inclusivity and accessibility at the heart of the solution; how EWR Co wants to promote it and how EWR Co could simplify the whole journey for its customers.

3.2 He further explained how EWR Co plan to work with stakeholders to ensure there were the right opportunities for Active Travel (buses, bicycles, e-scooters etc.) as well as exploring government funding to help deliver the solutions that were best for the customers. Another of EWR Co's goals is to be able to offer an integrated ticketing system that would cover customers' entire public transport journey, creating a seamless door-to-door system. Station upgrades and choice of rolling stock would factor into Active Travel / FMLM and how EWR Co promotes it. The Group confirmed they were happy to see that EWR Co was considering Active Travel / FMLM and prioritising inclusion.

3.3 Attendees recommended providing ample bicycle storage for the average-sized bike, not just for more compact folding bikes, on new trains, to accompany and facilitate the Active Travel model.

3.4 Attendees asked for clarification between 'wayfinding' and 'wayshowing'. RG explained that 'wayshowing' for the EWR project would mean building directional signage into the environment through clear lines of sight or different paving indicating a specific route, for example, as opposed to traditional signage.

3.5 Attendees asked about bike shop/repair facilities, using Cambridge Rail Station as an example. RG explained that a more holistic solution that provides everything needed to encourage Active Travel as a sustainable solution is a desired outcome for the EWR project. IP cited the French Alps cycle paths as an example of holistic solutions, wherein tools are freely available in the public realm for cyclists' use.

3.6 Attendees asked why the local community's health and wellbeing is a relevant topic to EWR Co, due to it being a primary concern of local authorities rather than the rail organisation. RG stated that EWR Co's aim to promote active travel creates opportunities for health and wellbeing and, in turn, could support wider local government initiatives to promote health and wellbeing.

3.7 Attendees also asked how EWR Co was planning to work with and bring together the various different stakeholder groups and interested parties in order to achieve the shared goals and aspirations for Active Travel. RG advised that EWR Co's ambition is to work with stakeholders and partners to provide integrated services to the station and incentives, which would encourage a change of attitude towards the use of private vehicles as a mode of transport.

- 3.8 Attendees asked for parking capacity at Cambourne station. RG stated that EWR Co are not yet at this stage of the development.
- 3.9 Attendees sought clarification on how EWR Co sought to make progress with seamless ticketing for this project, as it has been considered in the rail sector for a considerable time and privatisation has slowed progress in this area. RG explained that less disparate franchises and technical advancements will allow a lot more industry collaboration, not just in the rail industry but more widely across the transport sector, creating new possibilities for seamless ticketing. .
- 3.10 Attendees asked what measures would be put in place to dissuade anti-social parking. RG promoted strong relationships with the community and councils as an effective approach, collaborating on the best way forward. Attendees agreed, suggesting cohesive bus timetabling, as well as adequate support with sensible infrastructure, and affordable station parking balanced with readily available public transport and other sustainable options.
- 3.11 Attendees asked for further clarification on FMLM – what it would look like and examples. RG explained that EWR Co are working with councils on their travel plans and working with bus providers to coordinate public transport links to and from the EWR station.
- 3.12 Attendees asked for assurance of communication with bus groups, namely where the C2C is under consultation. RG assured attendees that EWR Co are in talks with the Cambridge to Cambourne bus groups.

#### **4. Accessibility and inclusion**

- 4.1 CE defined EWR Co's vision for accessibility and inclusion, describing the project as an exciting and early opportunity to enable this. She stressed that 'intuitive, safe and simple transport' is a priority for EWR Co, who seek to set the inclusion standards for the rail sector and prioritise customer experience with a coordinated approach to bring the strategy to life.
- 4.2 CE set out EWR Co's goal of setting up an Access Advisory Panel, made up of local people affected by accessibility issues, in order to gain a local point of view that can advise EWR Co's strategy.
- 4.3 CE introduced some of EWR Co's partners in achieving this accessibility and inclusion role. This includes methods of Artificial Intelligence power-based research, helping to gain general points of view and how they can be addressed, as well as carrying out surveys for all means of accessibility for all passengers.
- 4.4 CE stressed the importance of making affordable and sustainable travel in this goal for accessibility to and from stations, tying into RG's FMLM and Active Travel topic.
- 4.5 Attendees asked whether facilities within station would also reflect EWR Co's accessibility goals. CE explained that EWR Co must adhere to rail accessibility standards, which would by default cover station facilities.
- 4.6 Attendees asked for more details on the Access Advisory Panel, and whether EWR Co would welcome councillors encouraging their communities to get involved. CE welcomed attendees' involvement with this.

## 5. DCO Deep dive

### ***DCO timeline and stages***

5.1 Jeremy Damrel (JD) explained the elements of a DCO application and noted that EWR is currently in the pre-application stage which typically lasts between two to four years. JD outlined that, following the pre-application stage, there would be a period of approximately 18 months between the DCO application being submitted and a decision being made on whether to grant consent. There would be a period of six weeks after the decision in which a judicial review might be brought. JD provided further detail on each of the steps following the submission of the application.

### ***DCO Pre-application phase & EWR Pre-application activities***

5.2 JD provided an overview of the activities undertaken during the pre-application phase and how the different workstreams within EWR Co interact with one another to develop a solution which considers all perspectives.

### ***DCO Pre-application process – where we are***

5.3 JD set out where EWR currently sits in the pre-application phase. The second non-statutory consultation was held in 2021 and EWR Co is in the process of analysing feedback before identifying the preferred option.

5.4 Attendees asked Jeremy to explain why the red arrows point in both directions – and whether the things were happening simultaneously, feeding back into each other. JD confirmed that the red arrows indicate that each process feeds into the others, indicating the iterative way in which the design is developed.

### ***Consultation, engagement and comms & Local Authorities' role – working with us and the ExA***

5.5 JD explained the differences between consultation, engagement and communications, and outlined the documents and activities associated with each of these for the DCO application, and then following its submission.

### ***How and when we will engage***

5.6 JD stated that EWR Co aspires to engage in an open, honest and timely manner and outlined how EWR Co aimed to schedule engagement going forward. JD confirmed that the ultimate aim of engagement with key stakeholders was to gain consensus where possible, and to record areas of agreement and disagreement in

a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG). This would go to the Examining Authority, providing them with an understanding of the key issues for the examination.

### ***Development of the SOCC***

- 5.7 JD explained that formal comments would be sought by EWR Co from local authorities on the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) at the appropriate time. In the run-up to this, there would also be an opportunity for informal discussions to ensure the way EWR Co intends to consult is suited to individual authorities' constituents.

### ***Planning Performance Agreements***

- 5.8 JD outlined that Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) set out the way EWR Co will work with local authorities and enable local authorities to provide discretionary input and feedback, which is fundamental into the developing design, noting that the statutory responsibilities of the local authority are not caught within the PPA

### ***EIA and production of the Environmental Statement***

- 5.9 JD outlined the EIA process and how the Environmental Statement (ES) is produced. JD noted that the legal requirement of the ES was to set out the likely significant effects of the project on the environment; positive and negative.

### ***Survey data***

- 5.10 JD outlined the survey data that must be included within the EIA but noted that additional surveys may also be carried out. JD confirmed that survey data would be published and made available to stakeholders as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and ES but noted that there may be some exceptions, for example due to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) or protected species regulations limiting what could be provided.

### ***Attendee questions***

- 5.11 Attendees asked for clarification on the planning process and whether it differs from that of local authorities (planning applications under the Town and Country Planning Act). JD and IP both confirmed that it is different, and that the application is made to the Secretary of State (through the Planning Inspectorate), rather than to the local authority.
- 5.12 Attendees asked how EWR Co would manage competing interests between different authorities. JD focused on the importance of 1- 2 - 1 relationships with individual

authorities in addition to group meetings, gaining greater insight and detail that can inform the project.

- 5.13 Attendees further asked who would be the most powerful in a point of contention. JD responded that the Secretary of State (SoS) is the decision maker, who receives the recommendation of the panel (Examining Authority), which in turn is based on the examination of the submitted DCO application. IP stressed the importance of finding common ground between parties and encouraging/demonstrating participation and resolution wherever possible.
- 5.14 Attendees asked where EWR Co currently is in the application process. JD confirmed that EWR is in the first phase (pre-application), and that there is more engagement, as well as a statutory consultation, to be held with stakeholders and their feedback gained before the DCO application submission.
- 5.15 Attendees asked when the consultation feedback report from the 2021 consultation is expected to be completed. JD explained that EWR Co are still processing feedback from the 2021 non-statutory consultation, as there are many stakeholders' views still to be reviewed.
- 5.16 Attendees asked for further clarification on whether the route alignment will be determined before submission. JD explained that the DCO application requires a final route to be determined, although there is some optionality afforded during the preparation time.
- 5.17 Attendees asked for further insight into how the SoS makes his decision, namely with consideration given to cost benefit analysis. IP clarified that a business case is prepared in parallel to the DCO application. The SoS will determine whether the project remains a good investment prior to the submission of the application.
- 5.18 Attendees questioned whether changing rail user patterns could affect the long-term viability of the scheme. IP explained it is still too early to determine the post-Covid effects on the rail sector, with some areas returning to normal. IP further clarified that EWR's goal was to satisfy local communities between Oxford and Cambridge, lending to a different model than that used for other inter-city railway schemes such as between Birmingham/Manchester and London.
- 5.19 Attendees asked about environmental effects of the scheme, in particular what fuel EWR would use. IP explained that EWR Co are currently in discussions with the Department for Transport (DfT) to determine the traction solution, and that there are options being considered.
- 5.20 Attendees were interested in how the new line would be utilised by freight trains. IP explained that this also in discussion with the DfT, with freight not being ruled out but stressed that this route is first and foremost a passenger railway that prioritises the local communities it serves.

## 6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 IP noted that there will be a drop-in meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> July for the community, with a special request to councillors to assist in attendance and support. Attendees

asked for details of materials at the drop in event, Alexandra Grassam (AG) confirmed that there will be exhibition boards and accompanying materials to better display EWR's proposals for the community's perusal.

## **7. Closing Remarks**

7.1 IP thanked the Group for attending and attendees thanked EWR Co for the comprehensive presentation and information provided.

## **Summary of actions**

ACTION 1: EWR Co – Contacting councillors when recruitment for the Access Advisory Panel goes live.

The actions and their outcomes or expected completion timescales are captured in the Group's actions tracker.

## Attendees:

### EW R Co attendees

- Ian Parker, EWR Co lead
- Jeremy Damrel, DCO Subject Matter Expert
- Robbie Gibb, Active Travel / FMLM Subject Matter Expert
- Caroline Eglinton, Accessibility and Inclusion
- EWR Co production and support team

### Local authority councillors

- Cllr Peter Balicki, Hilton Parish Council
- Cllr Shrobona Bhattacharya, Cambourne
- Cllr Stephen Drew, Cambourne Ward
- Cllr Helene Leeming, Cambourne
- Cllr Peter Sandford, Caxton and Papworth
- Cllr Neil Stutchbury, Bourn CP

### Apologies:

- Fenstanton CP
- Conington CP
- Hilton Clerk, Hilton CP
- Papworth St. Agnes Clerk, Papworth St. Agnes CP
- Boxworth CP
- Mike Barnard, Boxworth CP
- Elsworth CP
- Peter Deer (Chairman), Elsworth CP
- Papworth Everard CP
- Knapwell CP
- Geoff Clark (Chair), Knapwell CP
- Cambourne CP
- Joseph O'Dwyer, Cambourne CP
- Caxton CP
- Bourn CP
- Tumi Hawkins, Caldecote in South Cambridgeshire
- Helene Elizabeth Leeming, Cambourne in South Cambridgeshire
- Mark Howell, Caxton and Papworth in South Cambridgeshire
- Clare Hannah Tevlin, Fenstanton in Huntingdonshire
- Cath Gleadow, St Ives South in Huntingdonshire
- Nic Wells, St Ives South in Huntingdonshire
- Mark Howell, Cambourne in Cambridgeshire County
- Mandy Smith, Papworth & Swavesey in Cambridgeshire County
- Douglas Dew, The Hemingfords & Fenstanton in Cambridgeshire County



