# Appendix 16: Table 12.2 - Engagement since the close of the 2021 consultation – Community event feedback

| Matter raised | EWR Co Response |
|---|---|
| Someone asked the question whether the SEND impact had been considered for disabled people and whether the Equality Impact Assessments had been undertaken.<br><br>Concerns were expressed about the impact the railway will have on disabled people in areas such as Lidlington and London Road level crossing. A query was also received about how current walking routes will be preserved for all accessibility needs and whether disabled ramps will be provided on all crossings.<br><br>Feedback was received that some bridges for non-motorised users may be technically compliant for accessibility but are in fact impossible to use in practice, such as the bridge at Garth Park. | We're committed to delivering a railway that is inclusive, and we believe that stations must be designed to be accessible for a wide range of users. We are carefully considering the needs of different users, including disabled people, people with visible or non-visible health conditions, pushchair users and older people, as we develop our proposals. Our dedicated Head of Inclusion ensures our inclusion strategy, 'East West Rail for All', is followed, and we set up an Accessibility Advisory Panel to find accessible solutions to our services and make inclusive decisions throughout the project.<br><br>Being able to access all areas of the station, as well as getting on and off trains easily, is paramount to all users, so all our new stations will be built to industry standards and guidance, including the Office for Rail Regulations' Accessible travel policy – Guidance for train and station operators (March 2021). Our stations will have step free access, providing ramps where required for access on and off trains, wide gates (where gatelines are installed), trained staff available for assistance and regularly maintained modern lifts. We'll provide more information on station design at the statutory consultation.<br><br>The Office for Rail Regulations' Accessible travel policy – Guidance for train and station operators (March 2021) sets out how rail companies must help older and disabled customers. Currently, customers can pre-book assistance at stations ahead of their rail journey, however assistance can also be provided to people who have not booked in advance.<br><br>We would have trained staff at all stations who can provide booked and unbooked assistance for customers, giving people a choice to pre-book or be spontaneous, ensuring that everyone can turn up and go. Further information about assistance booking app can be found at National Rail Enquiries - Passenger Assistance App.<br><br>**Accessibility of Bridges**<br><br>We understand that safe, accessible alternatives to cross the railway, such as at level crossings, are important for all users. We have taken all consultation feedback into consideration as we have developed the proposals, including the need for an accessible route across the railway. We note respondents' specific |

| | |
|---|---|
| | comments including in relation to Garth Park footbridge. As part of any bridge proposals that are progressed, bridge design, accessibility, safety, visual impact, access for disabled people and road noise will be some of the factors considered during the design process.<br><br>The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors (including 14 environmental impact and opportunities) which are outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report. Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation.<br><br>**Accessibility at London Level Road Crossing**<br>As detailed in the non-statutory consultation documentation, we explored six concepts for the London Road level crossing all of which were to shut the crossing. Since the closure of the non-statutory consultation additional work has been undertaken, including consideration of keeping the crossing open to local traffic. We are still exploring options to identify a suitable location for a road bridge, investigating the potential to maintain the existing crossing for local traffic and investigating ways to maintain accessible connectivity for pedestrians and non-motorised traffic.<br><br>We understand that safe, accessible alternatives to the level crossings are important for all users. We have taken all consultation feedback into consideration as we have developed the proposals, including the need for cycle access across the railway and the potential impacts of a road bridge in this location.<br><br>We are also working with England's Economic Heartland on first and last mile travel, which includes consideration of emerging modes and micro-mobility such as electric scooters. We would also endeavour to provide ongoing access during construction, subject to safety considerations.<br><br>If progressed as an option, bridge design, accessibility and safety will be some of the factors considered during the design process.<br><br>The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors (including 14 environmental impact and opportunities) which are outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report. Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Lidlington Level Crossing**<br><br>We appreciate that level crossings play an important role in local connectivity allowing people to move around their communities, so we recognise local people's concerns about our proposals for upgrades to level crossings along the MVL such as Lidlington Level Crossing. Accessible and safe alternatives to level crossings are important for users so that everyone can make the journeys they require to access local facilities.<br><br>We provided several options for pedestrian connectivity during the consultation and have taken all consultation feedback into consideration as we developed the proposals, including how pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders can make the journeys. We will continue to consider the non-motorised users (NMU) crossing integration as we continue through the option appraisal and selection process into the next level of detail in the design. Since the non-statutory consultation we have carried out further options analysis at Lidlington, including in respect of the potential for the crossing to remain open, as confirmed within the Economic and Technical Report. Before preferred options can be confirmed safety risk assessments and traffic assessments need to be completed. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented for comment at the statutory consultation. Access across the railway and to the station, businesses, and residents in close proximity will be considered during the development of proposed options. These proposals will be informed by ongoing engagement with England's Economic Heartland on first mile last mile connectivity. We would also endeavour to provide ongoing access during construction, subject to safety considerations. |
| A suggestion was made that the cycle route between Addenbrookes and Cambridge Station should be preserved and widened.<br><br>A suggestion was made for London Road Level Crossing to redevelop the small tunnel under the railway between existing A41 and the sewer works as a cycle route to allow direct access between north and south Bicester and link up | We are committed to encouraging active travel and we will focus on integrating this with existing and future regional and local plans and planning strategies. We will seek to deliver a real step-change in the quality of active travel infrastructure throughout the EWR corridor, so that travelling by bike and on foot becomes a realistic and attractive choice for short journeys. This could then serve as a catalyst for greatly improved active travel infrastructure nationwide, bringing associated health and economic benefits to communities.<br><br>Options for active travel could include new and improved walking and cycling routes, to complement new or altered bus services and on-demand services that could provide a door-to-door service between the station and a customer's destination. More information will be shared at the statutory consultation.<br><br>Our stations could serve as community travel hubs, integrating the railway with the wider transport network – including bus, taxis, walking, and cycling and emerging micro-mobility modes such as e-scooters. We will make sure that public transport connectivity and the ability to use new and improved active travel modes over personal vehicles are appropriately considered in the development of our station designs. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Graven Hill to the secondary school and retail area | **Addenbrookes Great Shelford Cycleway**<br>We have considered the potential impacts on public rights of way, including the DNA path between Great Shelford and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and other cycle routes around Cambridge station. Ongoing design development will determine the location of two new tracks and we will present information at the statutory consultation for comment. As part of this design work, we will seek to mitigate any impact on the DNA path. We aim to enhance local connectivity and to encourage the use of active travel modes, including new and improved walking and cycling routes, throughout the EWR corridor. We want bike and foot travel to become a realistic and attractive choice for short journeys.<br><br>**London Road Level Crossing**<br><br>We are working to identify a solution to maintain connectivity across the railway at London Road level crossing (to keep connectivity between the North & South of the railway including Graven Hill, schools and retail areas). The options being considered include an accessible pedestrian overbridge or underpass either at or near the existing London Road level crossing. For vehicles we are working to identify the most suitable location for an alternative road bridge (which includes consideration of Gavray drive) which would then not require a diversion such as onto the A41. Before preferred options can be confirmed, safety, risk and traffic assessments need to be completed. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented at the statutory consultation. |
| Concerns were received about the impact on farmland and wheat production, particularly in south Cambridgeshire and a request was received that this should be reflected in the business case. | We understand the importance of agriculture to the communities the railway will serve (including Cambridgeshire) and we want to find solutions that avoid, reduce or mitigate adverse impacts on land use and agricultural holdings as far as reasonably practicable.<br><br>At each stage of the planning and development process, we will assess the environmental impacts on important areas such as agricultural land (including best and most versatile (BMV) land) and the countryside. As part of this, we'll explore ways to reduce the impact of the railway on agricultural land holdings and soil resources. To better understand how the land is used, we'll continue to work with landowners, occupiers and land managers to gather information that will help inform the design process. Where land needs to be |

| | |
|---|---|
| | acquired, or is proposed to be acquired, the Compensation Code sets out the circumstances in which compensation is payable, a Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation is provided on our website.<br><br>The PEIR will include information regarding baseline soils environment, including presence of BMV land, and existing agricultural and forestry land use and agricultural land holdings. The potential impacts and likely effects on the baseline soils environment arising from disturbance and displacement and mitigation, such as outline plans for soil management during construction, will be presented as part of the PEIR and will be presented at the statutory consultation.<br><br>Potential impacts and likely effects on agricultural and forestry land use and agricultural land holdings arising from land-take, demolitions of key agricultural infrastructure, severance and changes in accessibility will be presented as part of the PEIR and will be presented at the statutory consultation. We will then submit a full environmental statement as part of the DCO application. We will then submit an Environmental Statement as part of the DCO application. |
| Concerns that the railway will significantly add to the congestion in areas such as Bedford and Bicester and pollution along the route, particularly diesel trains.<br><br>Residents living in the villages in the EWR catchment area will need to drive to their nearest station and concern was raised that this will further increase the pollution. | We take our commitment to delivering sustainable transport seriously. We're developing the project in line with UK Government policy and law, such as the Clean Air Strategy, and will continue to consider impacts on the air quality (including $CO_2$ emissions) throughout the design process. The project team will seek to work with local authorities to understand the current situation in communities and how to consider relevant Air Quality Management Areas as we develop our proposals.<br><br>We will develop a PEIR to describe the likely environmental effects of the proposals and consider means of mitigation. The PEIR will include information regarding the baseline air quality environment and the relevant air quality standards and targets. The likely risks from construction activities and potential impacts from operation, including identification of mitigation and control measures, will also be included and will form elements to be presented at the statutory consultation. We'll then submit an Environmental Statement as part of the DCO application, which will assess potential changes in Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and fine particulates (known as $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10}$) and dust. This assessment will follow best practice and guidance such as that set by the Institute of Air Quality Management and other recognised bodies and include consideration of how railway users travel to and from stations.<br><br>We recognise that journeys to and from stations are important and are considering measures to enable sustainable travel. Station access is a key consideration for us. We will continue working with other organisations, including bus operators, to improve interfaces and interchange with bus services at stations |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and provide onward travel information. We are also committed to delivering a real step-change in the quality of active transport infrastructure throughout the EWR corridor, so that travelling by bike and on foot becomes a realistic and attractive choice for short journeys. Options for active travel being considered include new and improved walking and cycling routes and increased safe cycle storage to promote the use of bikes.<br><br>Our team will look to reduce the impact the new railway may have on air quality as far as is reasonably practicable. We'll consider what vehicles and equipment will be used during the construction and operation of EWR, the routes construction vehicles will take to work sites, and how to manage work sites to avoid and reduce any dust creation.<br><br>In 2021, the Department for Transport's Transport Decarbonisation Plan set out an ambition to remove all diesel-only trains from the rail network by 2040. We are committed to running a sustainable railway in the long term, with reduced emissions, including for carbon, NOx and particulates. Therefore, we are exploring how we could introduce new and emerging technologies in the long-term train fleet. We will share information about this at the statutory consultation.<br><br>We will undertake a Transport Assessment of impact on the strategic and local highway networks, road safety, and local sustainable modes of transport, including public transport. Outcomes of this will initially be reported in the PEIR published at the statutory consultation and then within Environmental Statement submitted alongside the DCO Application. |
| A query was received how EWR will get trains into Cambridge and ensure they're on the right platform for onwards Eastward journeys.<br><br>A preference was expressed for EWR to run parallel to the M11. | The design for the preferred southern approach meets the scope of EWR to provide connectivity between Oxford and Cambridge. EWR trains will not continue eastwards under the current project. It is noted that the southern approach does not preclude the extension of services eastwards in the future.<br><br>A route running parallel to the M11 would also have to cross over the M11. This route would have significant direct and indirect impacts upon the residential housing and road networks on the western side of Cambridge and would make it very difficult for EWR trains to connect to the existing rail network or serve the stations at Cambridge North, Cambridge and Cambridge South. We do not consider crossing the M11 to be a feasible option. |
| More information on the assessment factors of the route options and the weighting for each | Fifteen Assessment Factors are used to evaluate how well options meet our overall objectives. All fifteen factors are taken into account at each stage in design, along with public and stakeholder feedback generated at each stage of consultation, and all other relevant matters. The assessments factors and their usage are outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report. |

| | |
|---|---|
| area under consideration was requested. | |
| Someone commented that Bicester should not be split by the railway and that a solution to this would be an underpass for motors with foot and cycle bridges for pedestrians and cyclists. However, some have commented that the footbridge built as part of the Oxford to Bicester reopening is unpopular and residents do not want another one.<br><br>A suggestion was made for a subway crossing in Bicester as it would be much more manageable for non-motorised users (NMUs).<br><br>Someone pointed out that the new Bicester Road bridge over the present village station has good soundproofing and that the new station can be rebuilt there as well.<br><br>A suggestion was made for the Shell garage in Bicester to be replaced with a nursery, park or cafe. | We understand that level crossings play an important role in local connectivity and allowing people to move around their communities and recognise local people's concerns about the potential closure of London Road level crossing. We also recognise that Concept 1 and Concept 6, which would close the level crossing without a vehicular replacement, raised concerns for many local people.<br><br>We have carefully considered the options at London Road, Bicester, and put forward the options presented at the non-statutory consultation – all of which were to shut the crossing. Since the closure of the non-statutory consultation additional work has been undertaken, including consideration of keeping the crossing open.<br><br>We understand that safe, accessible alternatives to the level crossings are important for all users. We have taken all consultation feedback into consideration as we have developed the proposals, including the need for cycle access across the railway and the potential impacts of a road bridge in this location.<br><br>We are working to identify a solution to maintain connectivity across the railway at London Road level crossing. The options being considered include an accessible pedestrian overbridge or underpass either at or near the existing London Road level crossing. For vehicles we are working to identify the most suitable location for an alternative road bridge. Before preferred options can be confirmed, safety, risk and traffic assessments need to be completed. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented at the statutory consultation.<br><br>We are also working with England's Economic Heartland on first and last mile travel, which includes consideration of emerging modes and micro-mobility such as electric scooters. We will also endeavour to provide ongoing access during construction, subject to safety considerations.<br><br>If progressed as an option, bridge design, accessibility, safety, visual impact and road noise will be some of the factors considered during the design process.<br><br>The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors (including landscape and visual, noise and vibration, accessibility and safety) which are outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report. Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation, which we expect to take place in the first half of 2024. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We note the positive comments regarding the existing bridge at Bicester Village station. A new station is not being proposed at Bicester Village as the existing station is deemed sufficient.<br><br>It is not within EWRs scope to replace the Shell garage. |
| Some people questioned the need for the proposed 4 rail tracks from Shepreth Branch Junction to Cambridge. | Shepreth Branch Junction is currently the meeting point of the twin track Shepreth Branch Royston line, and the twin track West Anglia Main Line, resulting in four tracks becoming two as they approach Cambridge. The existing twin track West Anglia Mainline between Shepreth Junction & Cambridge has insufficient capacity for the new EWR services and therefore this line needs to be four-tracked. We have considered a number of potential track layouts and further information will be provided at the statutory consultation. |
| EWR was challenged that there is no clear business plan to demonstrate the actual demand for the project.<br><br>Several requests were made to see the detail of the business case and there was criticism that the business case rests with the DFT and is not available to the public. A comment was made that EWR should have a totally independent business case.<br><br>A person also queried how the business case will evaluate the environmental impact of EWR.<br><br>A question was asked how EWR fits in with the government's levelling up agenda. | We are developing our business case to underpin decisions about how the railway will be built and delivered. The business case will use a range of evidence to ensure that money is spent in the most effective way and delivering value for money. This is an iterative process and ongoing work is underway to gather more evidence, both qualitative and quantitative in nature. We'll also work with the Department for Transport to assess opportunities to simplify fares and purchase options for consumers.<br><br>EWR is an investment that is complementary to other activity that the Government may undertake to grow areas around the country, enabling growth to the UK economy as a whole.<br><br>While no consensus has formed about long-term rail demand in the UK, we have started testing the possible impact a long-term increase in working from home could have on the route. However, EWR is addressing a fundamental lack of east-west connectivity in the region and the benefits should not be considered based on potential short-term fluctuations in demand. It is a long-term investment that will provide sustainable economic growth, will help to attract investment and will connect communities along the route for decades to come.<br><br>We will continue to monitor these figures and to factor them into our iterative business case process.<br><br>We will follow government guidance, procedure and best practice as we develop our business case. This includes, but is not limited to, the HM Treasury's Green Book and the Department for Transport's Transport Analysis Guidance. Developing the business case for the project is an iterative process and we will make sure that we have a broad range of evidence to give decision makers a good understanding of the costs, benefits |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and strategic merits of the scheme. This includes consideration of social and environmental benefits and impacts. In addition to the benefits and impacts considered through the business case analysis, we will undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment of the project. Outcomes of this will initially be reported in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report published at the statutory consultation and then within Environmental Statement submitted alongside the DCO Application.<br><br>We will learn from other comparable infrastructure projects to inform our approach to delivering the railway. We'll use a range of techniques to estimate costs and monitor and manage risk. This will include risks associated with costs, for example by applying approaches such as reference class forecasting, sensitivity analysis, quantified risk analyses and optimism bias, in building the commercial case. Value engineering and innovative approaches to design, construction, and operation of the railway, will help us to monitor and manage costs to minimise the likelihood of overspend.<br><br>More information on cost estimates will be presented at our statutory consultation.<br><br>EWR could support the national levelling up agenda by providing the right environment for business growth across an area where new business formation, innovation and entrepreneurship is strong. This would help new business growth and survival, but also assist in retaining businesses and investment in the UK, encouraging further investment and scaling up across other parts of the country. Many businesses and industry sectors that EWR would support already have strong links to other parts of the country considered priority areas for levelling up. |
| Some people told us that they don't feel listened to as they complete surveys without receiving feedback and EWR do not have answers to their questions. | We take the views of local people, communities, and their representatives seriously and we will keep listening to feedback so that we can build a railway that meets the needs of the communities we serve and for the UK as a whole. All feedback received from the non-statutory consultation has been considered and used to inform the development of the railway design.<br><br>So far, we've held two phases of non-statutory public consultation – one in 2019 and a second in 2021. A Public Feedback Report was published in March 2020 that gave a summary of the 2019 consultation responses and how that feedback had been considered. A similar approach has been taken with this document for the 2021 consultation, and we expect this approach will also be taken for any future rounds of consultation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | In 2021, we ran an extensive programme of advertising and communications activities to publicise the consultation. This included posting consultation information directly to 270,000 households across the whole Oxford to Cambridge route, placing adverts in locations along the route, on local radio, on social media and in local print media. We also sent press releases to local media and conducted interviews with a range of media outlets which generated further coverage for the consultation. Local representatives were briefed in advance of the launch of the consultation.<br><br>We're committed to making sure that communities have the information they need to help make informed decisions about our proposals, with a level of detail appropriate to each stage of the project's development. We have continued to listen to all project stakeholders, including community groups, since the end of the last public consultation in June 2021.<br><br>We communicate with communities and individuals in a number of ways, including a regular email newsletter, public information events, the project website and via local media. We are also engaging directly with individual property owners/occupiers of land that may be directly affected by our proposals. We'll keep communications channels under review to make sure that it's easy for people to receive updates on our work as the project progresses.<br><br>Alongside this ongoing engagement there will be more opportunities for communities and other stakeholders to comment on the proposals during the statutory consultation, which will be undertaken before the submission of the DCO application. The Planning Inspectorate will then also carry out a public examination of the application, giving further opportunity for comment. |
| Some queried what compensation the residents will receive if the project does not go ahead and criticised the lack of clarity on compensation for those impacted.<br><br>There was concern that properties in Roxton that are blighted by the railway will not receive any compensation. | For the owners of properties which will need to be acquired in part or wholly to construct the railway, full unaffected market value compensation will be provided in accordance with the Compensation Code as explained in the Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation.<br><br>Where no land is taken (whether this be at Roxton or elsewhere along the route), under Part I of the Land Compensation Act 1973 compensation may be claimed for reduction in the value of the property due to physical factors caused by the use of a new or altered railway, which is explained further in the guide on our website: Guide to Part 1 Claims, including an explanation of what constitutes a qualifying interest. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | When we submit our application for the Development Consent Order this will show the details of the land required. Landowners and leaseholders may then be able to require us to purchase the land identified. This is explained further in the guide on our website: Guide to Statutory Blight Notices.<br><br>Occupiers who receive a formal notice to end their tenancies would be entitled to receive compensation, in accordance with the Compensation Code, subject to them having a qualifying interest; This is explained further in the guide on the website; Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation, for which the link is as above.<br><br>We will look at ways to reduce the impact of the construction and operation of the railway as part of the design development process. Once a detailed design has been created, we'll discuss the potential impacts with the owners of land and property likely to be required for the scheme and seek to mitigate these.<br><br>Where part of a property is required by the project and acquired by compulsory purchase, the landowner may require EWR Co to acquire the whole plot if the rest is deemed incapable of reasonable beneficial use. The landowner will be able to engage a surveyor to advise the owner of their options and to act on their behalf in relation to the compensation claim. The surveyor's reasonable costs will be reimbursed as explained in the Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation for which the link is as above.<br><br>If the Project does not proceed then no compensation would be payable, however, we consulted on a proposed Need to Sell scheme at the same time as the main Non-Statutory Consultation and introduced the Need to Sell Property Scheme which aims to assist eligible property owners who have a compelling need to sell while the EWR Project is in development and delivery, but who have been unable to do so other than at a substantially reduced value because of the EWR Project. The Need to Sell Property Scheme is separate to the statutory blight notice process and (as the trigger for statutory blight is the submission of a DCO application) it provides early support for eligible property owners who can satisfy the criteria of the Need to Sell Property Scheme. The details for the Guide to the Need to Sell scheme are available here: The Guide to the Proposed Need to Sell Scheme.<br><br>We have launched the Need to Sell (NTS) property scheme – to support property owners who have a compelling reason to sell their property but are not able to do so, other than at a substantially reduced value, because of EWR. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Applicants will need to meet five criteria, which includes providing evidence that they currently have a compelling need to sell. The NTS scheme reflects non-statutory consultation feedback and NTS consultation feedback, both received in 2021. More information can be found in the NTS Property Scheme Guidance and Application Form [Link to be added].<br><br>Our preferred route Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant) would eliminate the encirclement of Roxton and mitigate the impact on the setting of heritage assets that would have been caused by Alignment 9. Alongside this, it would provide a new station at Tempsford. |
| Concerns were expressed that EWR will significantly add to the congestions and pollution in Bedford.<br><br>Specific concerns were also raised about traffic congestion at the Rodney House Roundabout or Bicester Village/Aylesbury roundabout and St Johns Street and that closure of the London Road level crossing will increase already congested roads. | We understand there would be impacts on traffic and transport in the Bedford area and in the area of London Road in Bicester from the construction and operation of EWR, and we will work to ensure any disruption to the community is reduced as far as reasonably practicable. We will explore how we can provide new opportunities for sustainable travel to and from the new station, and how we can make sure there is good access for pedestrians, cyclists, as well as good bus links. EWR will undertake a Transport Assessment of impact on the strategic and local highway networks, road safety, and local sustainable modes of transport, including public transport. Outcomes of this will initially be reported in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report published at the statutory consultation and then within Environmental Statement (ES) submitted alongside the DCO Application. The assessment will consider impact of construction on the road network, such as changes to existing traffic patterns because of predicted construction traffic and the suitability of roads, including those around the new station. This will include roads such as Rodney House Roundabout, Bicester Village/Aylesbury roundabout, and London Road and its surrounding area. Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation. |
| Comments were made that the railway line will allow passengers to arrive at destination much faster compared to other means of public transport and reach places such as Bedford Hospital.<br><br>Support was given for the proposals to relocate Bedford South (St Johns) station, which | We are pleased to see comments from the respondents about their support of the EWR Project and the emerging preferred option to relocate Bedford St Johns station.<br><br>We considered how EWR could serve the new Cambridge South station directly in our selection of an alignment that approaches Cambridge from the south. This is significant as services would provide convenient access to Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge Biomedical Campus site and the wider area, before continuing to Cambridge city centre.<br><br>Graven Hill, Langford & Ambrosden |

| | |
|---|---|
| would improve connections from the hospital and town centre for the staff and students.<br><br>It was suggested that public rights of way need to be retained to keep communities connected.<br><br>Concerns were expressed that no adequate consideration is given to the provision of replacement crossings after crossing closure, for example crossing at Woburn Sands used to reach the school.<br><br>People were concerned about the impact of disconnecting villages and severing access to shops, for example when closing the London Road crossing in Bicester. The proposed route will also prevent quick access to places such as Langford and Ambrosden and it was felt that Langford should not be cut off from Bicester. Concern was also expressed that access to Graven Hill should be maintained.<br><br>There was the view that traffic and pedestrian access along London Road should be maintained | We are committed to reducing and mitigating any disruption during the planning, construction and operation of EWR as far as reasonably practicable. We're continuing to consider the potential impacts of our proposals and how we can work with communities and their representatives to keep those who may be impacted up to date with activity and progress. This will include consideration of communities south of the railway line, living in communities such as Graven Hill, Ambrosden and Langford. As mentioned above, we will set out the steps we will take to reduce or mitigate any potential disruption during construction – such as noise and vibration, impacts on air quality, impacts on public rights of way (PRoWs), land and property requirements, visual impacts, road closures and impacts on traffic.<br><br>London Road level crossing<br><br>We recognise that there are businesses who could be affected by our proposals, including the Bicester Village outlet retail park, as well as a number of business parks and commercial estates in the area with direct links to London Road or Station Approach. We recognise local concerns and the importance of the concepts on local businesses and residents - that's why we encouraged people to respond to the consultation with their views. The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors (including 14 Environment and 15 Consistency with local plans), which are outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report. Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation.<br><br>Harston level crossing<br><br>Regarding speculated increase to traffic as the result of any closure of the level crossing at Harston, we are undertaking traffic modelling to understand the impacts of its proposals. An update will be provided at the statutory consultation.<br><br>Woburn Sands<br><br>We understand that safe, accessible alternatives to level crossings are important for all users. Any proposed changes to level crossings will be supported by a risk assessment and traffic assessment. The closure of School Crossing was undertaken by Network Rail. One of the options presented at non-statutory consultation proposed installing a new bridge at this location. As we develop options for each crossing proposals, we will carefully consider what alternatives are required if the crossing needs to close. We |

| | |
|---|---|
| through either a tunnel or a bridge.<br><br>Someone felt that it was a good idea to leave the bridge open at Woodleys, but that the road shouldn't continue after Bow Brickhill Road in Woburn.<br><br>Concerns were expressed that the closure planned for Station Road in Harston will increase traffic in London Road Harston which is already an unsafe road. Concerns were also expressed that Harlton Chalk Springs will be cut off.<br><br>A query was received about the plans for the footpath at the end of Lowfield's in Little Eversden. | recognise the community's concerns and will consider the feedback as we continue to develop proposals in Woburn Sands.Further information and proposals for mitigation will be presented at the statutory consultation.<br><br>Woburn Sands Option 1 would potentially need a road to cross over beyond Bow Brickhill Road. This is one of the negative impacts from this option and a consideration in the assessment of preferred options. The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors, outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report.<br><br>A Transport Assessment will consider the impacts on the highway network, road safety and local sustainable modes of transport, including changes to existing traffic patterns, because of closure of the level crossing and proposed new developments. These assessments will be used as part of the option selection process to determine if a crossing is to close and what proposal should be used to mitigate a closure of a crossing. Outcomes of the assessment will initially be reported in the PEIR published at the Statutory Consultation and then further developed within the ES. The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors, which are outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the non-statutory consultation Technical Report.<br><br>We are committed to providing a safe means to cross the railway and, where diversions are essential, minimising their impact on local communities as far as is practicable. Since the non-statutory consultation, and in response to Government's request that EWR Co explore opportunities for a more affordable railway whilst still delivering the identified benefits (please see the Economic and Technical Report published with this Consultation Feedback Report) we have carried out further options analysis at each level crossing. Where analysis has identified further potential options including looking further at the options for Woburn Sands crossing group and keeping Woburn Sands level crossing open, these are confirmed within the report. Before preferred options can be confirmed safety risk assessments and traffic assessments need to be completed. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented for comment at the statutory consultation.<br><br>Engagement with key stakeholders, consultation feedback and further concept development, will inform the designs for Woburn Sands level crossing, which will be tested against these factors to help determine the preferred option at this location. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We have considered the impact of the Project on existing highways, PRoW and private access roads as part of the design and assessment of route alignment options. We are seeking to maintain existing highway connections wherever feasible. Where it is not feasible to retain existing highways, ProW and private access roads in their current location, we will ensure that a suitable alternative is available which minimises the impact on communities.<br><br>Chalk Springs<br><br>We are aware of the high-value nature of many areas of the water environment through which the route will pass directly or near to, as well as the many surrounding conservation features that are sustained by the water environment.<br><br>We will identify surface water and groundwater features that have the potential to influence or be influenced by the proposed route. When assessing possible impacts from the scheme on the water environment, including watercourses, wetlands, aquifers and associated habitats, our assessment will consider effects both upstream catchments and downstream reaches that might be influenced by the route over the lifetime of the scheme, including the potential impacts of pollution generated during construction. Our assessments will consider quantity (under a range of conditions) and quality, as well as aspects such as geomorphology and the wider value that the water environment provides in terms of habitats and biodiversity. |
| People requested that the 2019 consultation is repeated on the basis that they say it as flawed and misleading. People did not know about the project, residents from North Bedfordshire were unaware that the route might go through their area and the consultation did not address the impact of route E on residents. | We take the views of local people, communities, and their representatives seriously and we will keep listening to feedback so that we can build a railway that meets the needs of the communities we serve and for the UK as a whole. All feedback received from the non-statutory consultation has been considered and used to inform the development of the railway design.<br><br>So far, we've held two phases of non-statutory public consultation – one in 2019 and a second in 2021. A Public Feedback Report was published in March 2020 that gave a summary of the 2019 consultation responses and how that feedback had been considered. A similar approach has been taken with this document for the 2021 consultation, and we expect this approach will also be taken for any future rounds of consultation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| People also commented that the Woodland Trust responses skewed the finding as comments were made by people nationwide rather than local people.<br><br>Some commented that people's ideas are not being listened to and questions were asked about how much consideration will be given to the views of those directly affected by the proposals either through the moving or removal of stations between Bletchley and Bedford or those whose homes might be impacted.<br><br>Queries were received as to why there has been no publication of the results of the non-statutory consultation which should include the numbers of responses and questions on each area of comment. People also asked for the timeframe for the next consultation. A further comment was made that the consultation should be open to all comments and not just specific issues. | In 2021, we ran an extensive programme of advertising and communications activities to publicise the consultation. This included posting consultation information directly to 270,000 households across the whole Oxford to Cambridge route, placing adverts in locations along the route, on local radio, on social media and in local print media. We also sent press releases to local media and conducted interviews with a range of media outlets which generated further coverage for the consultation. Local representatives were briefed in advance of the launch of the consultation.<br><br>We're committed to making sure that communities have the information they need to help make informed decisions about our proposals, with a level of detail appropriate to each stage of the project's development. We have continued to listen to all project stakeholders, including community groups, since the end of the last public consultation in June 2021.<br><br>We communicate with communities and individuals in a number of ways, including a regular email newsletter, public information events, the project website and via local media. In this way we reach stakeholders such as the Woodland Trust as well as allowing national and local people to provide feedback. We are also engaging directly with individual property owners/occupiers of land that may be directly affected by our proposals. We'll keep communications channels under review to make sure that it's easy for people to receive updates on our work as the project progresses.<br><br>Alongside this ongoing engagement there will be more opportunities for communities and other stakeholders to comment on the proposals during the statutory consultation, which will be undertaken before the submission of the DCO application. The Planning Inspectorate will then also carry out a public examination of the application, giving further opportunity for comment. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Criticism was received that EWR Co do not respond to correspondence. | We're committed to making sure that communities have the information they need to help make informed decisions about our proposals, with a level of detail appropriate to each stage of the Project's development. We have continued to listen to all project stakeholders, including community groups, since the end of the last public consultation in June 2021.<br><br>We communicate with communities and individuals in a number of ways, including a regular email newsletter, public information events, the project website and via local media. We are also engaging directly with individual property owners/occupiers of land that may be directly affected by our proposals. We'll keep communications channels under review to make sure that it's easy for people to receive updates on our work as the project progresses.<br><br>All enquiries received during the consultation period were responded to. We continue to strive to respond to all correspondence as quickly as possible and to take into consideration any feedback received.<br><br>Alongside this ongoing engagement there will be more opportunities for communities and other stakeholders to comment on the proposals during the statutory consultation, which will be undertaken before the submission of the DCO application. The Planning Inspectorate will then also carry out a public examination of the application, giving further opportunity for comment. |
| People criticised that they did not realise Route E would be chosen as the preferred option as it was simply too expensive. Requests were made to see the detailed costs.<br><br>In addition, much concern was expressed at the change of the cost-benefit figures for the southern approach from to 2019 to the 2021 consultation.<br><br>A query was raised whether the full costs of remodelling Bedford | As set out in our answer to the Business Case section of this chapter, we will follow Government guidance, procedure and best practice as we develop our business case. This includes, but is not limited to, the HM Treasury's Green Book and the Department for Transport's Transport Analysis Guidance. Developing the business case for the project is an iterative process and we will make sure that we have a broad range of evidence to give decision makers a good understanding of the costs, benefits and strategic merits of the scheme. This includes social and environmental impacts.<br><br>We continue to learn from other comparable infrastructure projects to inform our approach to delivering the railway. We'll use a range of techniques to estimate costs and monitor and manage risk. This will include approaches such as reference class forecasting, sensitivity analysis, quantified risk analysis and optimism bias, in building the commercial case. Value engineering and innovative approaches to design, construction, and operation of the railway, will help us to monitor and manage costs to minimise the likelihood of overspend.<br><br>Indicative estimates of upfront capital costs have incorporated the proposed remodelling at Bedford station. |

| | |
|---|---|
| to accommodate a station and all its associated services including parking have been reflected.<br><br>People asked for the cost of the proposal to build four tracks from Shelford to Cambridge.<br><br>Comments were also received that there is a lack of costing for the two northern routes. | More information on cost estimates will be presented at the statutory consultation.<br><br><u>Costs of Route Option E</u><br><br>We assessed anticipated capital costs associated with Route Options A, B, C, D and E ahead of the Preferred Route Announcement in 2020. In this assessment we thought about how the infrastructure needed to support the railway, in particular the use of embankments and viaducts, earthworks and different earthwork profiles and gradients (height and slope). This work was included in the cost estimates made to support the selection of Route Option E and the preferred route in 2020. At the time, Route Option E was estimated to incur upfront capital costs of £3.7bn, which was the second lowest of all route options.<br><br>Since we announced Route Option E as the preferred route in 2020, there have been no changes in situation or circumstance that would require us to reconsider our decision.<br><br>Although the NATC design presented at the 2021 consultation was expected to be more expensive to build, the updated NATC as set out in the Economic and Technical Report, is expected to have a lower construction cost than the SATC. This is due to the reduction in the anticipated amount of four-tracking required to the WAML in Cambridge and reduction in embankments and viaducts between Cambridge and Cambourne. However, a SATC is expected to provide higher potential benefits in terms of unlocking growth, better connectivity and more flexible options to extend EWR services in the future; and remains our preferred approach to Cambridge.<br><br>We will continue work to assess the costs associated with EWR, including mitigation measures and capital costs, as the design of the route continues. |
| Some people felt that EWR have no justification for providing diesel as EWR Co should be aiming to be carbon neutral in line with public policy. | We will use existing diesel trains on CS1 stage of the railway between Oxford and Milton Keynes as this allows us to begin operations sooner than would be possible with trains powered by other means, including electrification. This is because additional infrastructure, such as overhead line equipment, is needed for electric trains to operate, and battery-powered trains are still being developed to improve their range.<br><br>No commitment on the traction power type to be used has yet been made by the Government, and electrification is only one of the options being considered. We will need to ensure the railway aligns with relevant policy and legislation for a net zero carbon UK by 2050. We are committed to running a sustainable railway in the long term, with an ambition to be a net zero carbon railway. This includes the use of sustainable traction power in the long term. Diesel trains are being used to enable the opening of the first |

| | |
|---|---|
| | part of the railway between Oxford and Milton Keynes sooner than would be possible with trains powered by other means, including electrification. Additional infrastructure, such as overhead line equipment, is required for electric trains to operate, and battery-powered trains are still being developed to improve their range. We are exploring how it can introduce new and emerging technologies, such as hydrogen power, in addition to electrification, into the long-term train fleet and infrastructure. We will be seeking input from rolling stock fleet bidders across the market to ensure they understand the company's environmental goals. |
| Some people criticised that no one knew of the drop-in events and a suggestion was made to do a leaflet drop to advertise events in future as information is not easily accessible to all – there are no local newspapers and not everyone uses the internet.<br><br>Comments were also made about the lack of information at the events, and that many acronyms were used. Some people found that they did not have the chance to speak to a project team member and that answers were guarded and that some questions on topics such as costs, timescales, preferred route options and freight could not be answered. Some found it disappointing that no new information was available at the events.<br><br>There was concern that the staff on the project did not know the | We chose to organise these events to restart face-to-face engagement to provide communities with a chance to speak with a range of topic specialists from EWR Co including members of the senior team. We wanted to offer an opportunity to ask questions and get a better understanding of the planning process being undertaken by the project, at an event outside of the formal consultation process.<br><br>We're sorry to hear if individuals didn't find the drop-in events useful. We aimed to make it clear we didn't have any new information to share at these events, as we were still reviewing the responses received during the 2021 consultation and considering how the feedback is used to inform plans for the railway. No new maps or plans were created for these events. The plans, maps and information used at these events had been taken directly from the information shared at our second non-statutory consultation that we undertook in March 2021. At the 2021 consultation we had identified the southern route into Cambridge as our emerging preferred option on maps and materials which were used at these events.<br><br>As these were information events, not a consultation, we chose not to send a postal notification of the events to every address along the route, as we did not feel this would be an efficient use of public funds. East West Rail has a duty to spend public money sensibly, and as such opted to publicise these events as thoroughly as possible without sending postal invites to the 270,000+ addresses in the mailing zone.<br><br>We instead opted to publicise these events in a range of ways:<br>· On 10 June we sent out our community newsletter, which has 7198 recipients inviting people to drop-in and speak to the team.<br>· An email was sent out to 670 locally elected representatives including our contacts at Parish Council's, the nominated Local Representative Group attendee, as well as local ward councillors.<br>· We contacted 232 Community Groups and organisations across the route with details of the events.<br>· Our emails to community groups and elected representatives also contained links to social media posts and information to advertise the events within other networks than those we can access directly. |

| | |
|---|---|
| area or understand the impact it will have.<br><br>Some positive feedback was received about the explanations and conversations had at the drop in events.<br><br>A suggestion was made for staff at future events to wear name badges with their specialism clearly shown.<br><br>There was criticism that the northern route was deleted from majority of the maps which gave a biased view for the EWR route from Oxford to Cambridge.<br><br>A request was received for an event in Milton Keynes and also in Great Shelford which is one of the villages most impacted by EWR's decisions.<br><br>Comments made that a public meeting would have been preferred as people in authority would have had to answer questions. | · We sent notifications to local media and worked with local journalists to promote the events. We also publicised the events in adverts online and in print.<br>· The information was also shared in posts on our own channels including the scheme Community Hub, the LinkedIn page, and the website.<br><br>We understand that community drop-in events may not be some individuals' preferred form of engagement and we welcome alternative suggestions for future engagement along our route.<br><br>We also welcome suggestions, like that of the name badges including topic specialisms, which we were able to introduce at events later in the schedule.<br><br>For these events, we contacted many venues across the proposed route. The ten venues were chosen as they had the most suitable availability and accessibility needed to host these types of events, as well as being accessible by public transport, to ensure those residents without access to a private car, can join the event.<br><br>The venues were also selected to serve a wider area and not just the community that is in direct proximity to the chosen venue. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Queries were received about the costs of electrification and the impact on the environment.<br><br>It was commented that diesel trains are not a good option for the environment and that the railway line should be electrified from the outset. | We are continuing to work with the Government to review long term traction options for the railway and electrification is one of the options being considered. We will need to ensure the railway aligns with relevant policy and legislation for a net zero carbon UK by 2050.<br><br>We are committed to running a sustainable railway. This includes the use of greener traction power in the long term. While diesel trains are being used to enable the opening of the first part of the railway between Oxford and Milton Keynes, we are exploring how to introduce new and emerging technologies in the long-term train fleet and will be seeking input from bidders across the market to ensure they understand the company's environmental goals. Information about this aspect of the Project will be provided at the statutory consultation.<br><br>We are considering the most appropriate solution, including hydrogen power and full or part electrification, for the long-term train fleet and infrastructure. We will consider resilience for all weather conditions, including lightning and any potential future impacts brought about by climate change, as part of the design for any of the infrastructure and its supporting systems.<br><br>We have an ambition to be a net -zero carbon railway, with reduced emissions, including carbon, nitrogen oxides and particulates. We're working to meet the Government's vision for the rail industry to remove all diesel-only trains from the network by 2040. We'll provide more information about this, as well as detail on the potential impacts of the railway at the statutory consultation. |
| | Following further review of the opportunities associated with a station at either St Neots or Tempsford, it emerged that a station at Tempsford is expected to have greater potential for development to support significant economic growth than a station at St Neots. Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant) would be north of Roxton and cross over the A421 and A1 south of the Black Cat roundabout, on a series of bridges / viaducts but would avoid the need to construct the large viaduct north of the Black Cat roundabout which would have been required for Alignment 1.<br><br>Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant) may be subject to adjustment and refinement as a result of our ongoing assessments and design development work. We will provide further details at the statutory consultation on the design that we propose to include in our application for development consent to enable you to comment on our proposals.<br><br>Assessing the potential impact of EWR on the environment is a fundamental part of our design process. We will carefully consider the setting and context of landscapes and historic views, to look at how the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | development can be designed to blend in with the local environment. This includes thinking about where to create embankments and where viaducts are potentially required; where landscape earthworks can be used to soften the appearance of embankments and integrate them into the wider landscape context; or how the sensitive placement of appropriate planting can be used to screen views from sensitive receptors, or to soften the appearance and presence of engineering earthworks.<br><br>Since consultation, we have been reviewing the design of the Section D route and looking for opportunities to reduce the height of embankments and viaducts within the design. Opportunities considered include taking the railway under roads in cuttings instead of building viaducts over them and making minor diversions to the railway alignment to allow the railway to be lowered. Roads would then be diverted over the railway on smaller overbridges, instead of building railway bridges/viaducts over existing highways. Further information will be made available at the statutory consultation. Visualisations can be found on our website. As stated in section 3.10 of the NSC Technical Report, the maximum gradient of the railway would be no steeper than 1 in 80 to reduce the risk of freight trains running at slower speeds.<br><br>We appreciate the concerns around the impacts on countryside and will work to identify and reduce impacts wherever reasonably practicable.<br><br>We continue to explore the use of tunnels for the scheme during the design process but only consider them to be a practical option in specific areas where they can provide a solution for addressing particular constraints. This is partly because they are more complex and expensive to build, operate and maintain than above ground structures, and also require additional surface structures for ventilation and exit in case of emergency.<br><br>We do not agree that using trenching technology would be a preferred construction method in comparison to the current design. It would create a large amount of excavated material, require significant construction and HGV movements to construct, have much higher levels of embedded carbon and have a greater impact on hydrology than the current design. In addition, this technique would have a significantly greater cost and programme and have much greater long term drainage requirements. Use of trenching would also provide a worse customer experience as trains would predominately be within a cutting. |
| One person was concerned that the biodiversity degradation of the Project had not been looked at | Use of sustainable materials:<br>We will seek to sustainably source what is needed for the construction and operation of EWR and to reduce waste as far as reasonably practicable. We will look at the value of materials, resources and waste |

| | |
|---|---|
| adequately. Another person asked whether the carbon footprint of the proposals has been properly considered.<br><br>A suggestion was made to integrate environmental goals and specific targets into every team working on the Project.<br><br>Concerns were expressed that the building materials used will create more pollution in the environment and questions were raised about the environmental mitigations.<br><br>There was criticism that the environmental data used to select Route E was insufficient. A question was asked to see the comparative environmental analysis for all the proposed routes and there was disappointment in the quality of information provided on environmental and archaeological protections.<br><br>A comment was made that the plans must provide for electric cars as people prefer to use personal | throughout the Project lifecycle, by following a Circular Economy approach to design, construction and operation that re-uses and re-purposes as much material as possible. We will develop and implement sustainable procurement procedures and will evaluate the impact of the supply chain before awarding contracts, to consider sustainability of resources appropriately during the design and construction of EWR, as well as into operation and maintenance.<br><br>We will provide an assessment of the way we intend to use materials and the potential impacts of these within the Environmental Statement, submitted as part of the DCO application.<br><br><u>Biodiversity</u><br><br>We recognise the importance of biodiversity and protecting the habitats of local wildlife, including priority habitats such as woodland and ancient woodland, as well as parks and greenspaces. We'll think carefully about protected species and their habitats when designing the railway. As mentioned, we intend to build on the commitment of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain made in relation to the part of the route already built between Bicester to Bletchley, with an ambition of delivering 10% Biodiversity Net Gain along the EWR route. We'll consider enhancing some existing habitats and look at opportunities to create new habitats. Further information on plans for achieving 10% Biodiversity Net Gain will be provided at the statutory consultation.<br><br>We'll seek to avoid direct impacts on the most significant nationally and internationally designated environmental assets including NNRs, Ramsar Sites, SSSIs, SACs and candidate cSACs, SPAs and cSPAs, Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees. This includes the colony of barbastelle bats in the Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is located within the route option area and within 3-4km of the emerging route alignments between Bedford and Cambridge. Throughout 2022 we carried out a number of surveys to better understand the barbastelle population in the area. We'll carry out further bat surveys in 2023.<br><br>We'll design a programme of habitat surveys and species-specific surveys to help understand where species and habitats are in the landscape and how they use the landscape so we can avoid, reduce, mitigate and if necessary, compensate for identified impacts in the design of EWR as much as is reasonably practicable. As described, we'll develop a PEIR for statutory consultation with an ES being submitted as part of the DCO |

| | |
|---|---|
| transport if this can be environmentally friendly. | application, which will describe the likely environmental effects of the proposals and their mitigation, informed by the results of this survey work.<br><br>We are mapping where the new railway may cross and border habitats used by other important protected species, such as Great Crested newts, so that we can consider how best to avoid impacting them altogether or to mitigate impacts upon them.<br><br><u>Route Option E Selection</u><br>Our assessment factor process looks at how well different route options meet the overall Project objectives. These provide a robust framework for comparing the relative performance of options. This included considering the potential environmental impacts and opportunities of the options in a way that is commensurate with the stage of development of the Project. More information about Option Route E, including the carbon emissions and environmental impact is available in Chapter 4 of this report.<br><br><u>Electric Cars</u><br>At the next stage of design, we will undertake modelling work to help inform parking requirements. We will consider electric vehicle charging points and disabled persons parking spaces, as well as passenger drop-off and taxi facilities. |
| Concern was expressed that freight trains pass in close proximity to properties and through town centres, particularly through Cambridge, when that is not its destination. A comment was made that the northern route linking into Cambridge North station is preferable to avoid running freight trains through Central and Southern Cambridge. | In 2018, the Government challenged the rail industry to remove all diesel only trains from the network by 2040, and we are committed to running a sustainable railway. We are currently looking at how we can use new and emerging technologies within our long-term train fleet. Further details including a high-level overview on anticipated costs will be published at the statutory consultation.<br><br>We will seek to reduce any negative effects the new railway, including passenger and freight operations, could have on air quality, as well as any noise and vibration that could be generated by trains, wherever reasonably practicable. We'll assess changes in pollutants as the scheme develops, including nitrogen oxides and fine particulates, and the potential effects of noise and vibration as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process.<br>We'll present emerging findings in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which will be available at the statutory consultation. The final results of our assessments will be set out in an Environmental Statement that's submitted as part of the DCO application. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Some support for freight services on EWR was expressed as this will keep HGVs off roads.<br><br>Queries were received about the timetabling of the freight trains to understand how many freight trains can be expected and how late they might be running. People queried the references made to the 18 hours of freight a day and the implications for night-time services. Questions were also asked about the noise levels and permitted decibels.<br><br>There was concern that EWR have not been upfront about their intentions for freight and that freight services may be introduced at a later stage without a business case, considerations being made for the environmental impacts or an opportunity to comment on the proposals through consultation.<br><br>People also queries whether freight will require more infrastructure on the line out of Cambridge. | We'll consider specific measures to reduce the impact of the Project in the design of the works. This includes the impacts associated with potential future freight operations on homes, people's well-being, and the surrounding environment during operation. For example, the use of landscaping and screening could reduce visual intrusion, and noise barriers could be used to reduce noise impacts.<br><br>We will continue to consult with communities as our plans develop, including about freight and its potential impacts. We have also set up a number of local representatives groups (LRGs) along the route, to help facilitate discussions about localised impacts. For people that might be directly impacted by the scheme, we'll continue to work to identify and reduce any impacts that can't be avoided and work closely with people who could be affected.<br><br>Whilst the actual number of freight services which run is a matter for the wider industry and freight operators, we are designing the railway to maintain existing freight operating (including any interfaces with Felixstowe and Harwich New Docks) on its route and accommodate potential future growth in freight. Our work indicates that the volume of new freight flows over EWR will depend on additional investment taking place on the national network and as such, our current scope is likely to enable up to two new freight train paths per day per direction from Felixstowe, routed via Cambridge, through to Oxford and beyond. Significant investment in other enhancements, both on EWR and elsewhere on the network, would be required for freight to exceed these levels. We continue to work closely with the industry and stakeholders to inform our approach to freight.<br><br>Whilst the northern approach could carry freight as identified in the response, and whilst the impact of the revised northern approach does not require property demolitions, the southern approach still performs better in meeting the objectives of EWR.<br><br>We will undertake further rail demand modelling to understand passenger usage, where people travel to and from, and the benefits of their journeys. We anticipate that the majority of users will be business travellers and commuters, but leisure travellers will benefit from improved connections along the route. Anticipated rail demand will be set out in the business case to the Government when we submit our Development Consent Order (DCO).<br><br>We're working closely with the Department for Transport to select a sustainable traction power solution. The impact of that decision on the potential decarbonisation of freight operations is being considered as part of that process. Although a decision has not yet been taken on traction for the railway between Oxford and |

| | |
|---|---|
| Comments were made that there is little information about the freight implications arising from the increased capacity at Felixstowe and Harwich new docks. Someone suggested that freight trains would be much better served nearer to Ely and then onto Felixstowe.<br><br>People referenced plans published by an academic researcher showing how a Northern approach from Cambourne to North Cambridge could carry freight via two spurs without the need for the proposed four tracks at Cambridge and the consequent demolition of homes in the north of Cambridge. | Cambridge, we'll need to make sure that the railway aligns with relevant policy and complies with relevant legislation related to net zero carbon.<br><br>With regard to freight being an opportunity in regard to the Cambridge Sustainable Transport Zone, we will work with other transport projects, who are proposing the Cambridge Sustainable Travel Zone, to ensure opportunities for alignment are explored and are taken where possible.<br><br>With regard to the request for further information on an eastern junction to assist freight trains from Felixstowe on north/south journeys, we assume that this eastern Junction refers to a junction at Ely. This is out of the scope of the EWR project, although our designs would not preclude this, if it were to be taken forward in the future.<br><br>With regard to the request for clarification on the frequency and impact of freight services for residents of South Cambridgeshire and neighbouring counties and the concern raised about deliberately driving forward a design which inevitably routes a large number of freight trains through Cambridge station and onward via Coldham's Common, Cherry Hinton and points east, we note that , whilst the actual number of freight services which run is a matter for the wider industry and freight operators, EWR is primarily a passenger railway and is designing the railway to maintain existing freight operating on its route and accommodate potential future growth in freight. Our work indicates that the volume of new freight flows over EWR will depend on additional investment taking place on the national network and as such, our current scope is likely to enable up to two new freight train paths per day per direction from Felixstowe, routed via Cambridge, through to Oxford and beyond. Significant investment in other enhancements, both on EWR and elsewhere on the network, would be required for freight to exceed these levels. We continue to work closely with the industry and stakeholders to inform our approach to freight. |

| | |
|---|---|
| There were concerns about the impact the project will have on people's mental and physical health. | In developing our proposals, we have aimed to minimise the negative impact the Project may have on communities and in particular people's homes, but inevitably with an infrastructure project the size of EWR there would be some people who would be directly affected. We recognise that noise, vibration, increased traffic, air pollution and access to green spaces from both the construction and operation of a railway are important issues for local communities. As we continue to develop the proposals for EWR we will aim to avoid and reduce impacts where possible. Through this process we would also aim to reduce and mitigate impacts which could potentially affect residents' health and wellbeing.<br><br>For noise and vibration, this will include choice of trains, track technology and noise barriers. For air quality, this will include considering what vehicles and equipment would be used during the construction and operation of the railway, the routes construction vehicles would take to work sites, as well as how to manage work sites to avoid and reduce any dust creation. We will work with local authorities to understand existing and future traffic patterns, as well as different ways for customers to access stations.<br><br>Construction-related impacts on the environment will be identified and managed, as far as reasonably practicable, by a CoCP submitted alongside a DCO application. This will include measures to control impacts related to construction noise and vibration, air quality, construction traffic and access to public rights of way. |
| There was criticism that EWR are creating the railway to cater for housing developments.<br><br>A comment was made that the lack of affordable housing in the Cambridgeshire area affects the job market for example nurses not taking up job opportunities at Addenbrookes hospital. Concern as also expressed that | Following a study by the National Infrastructure Commission, the Department for Transport established strategic objectives applying both to elements of EWR between Oxford and Bedford and from Bedford to Cambridge. One of these objectives was to stimulate economic growth, housing and employment through the provision of new, reliable and attractive inter-urban passenger train services in the Oxford to Cambridge area. However, this is only one of the strategic objectives for the scheme and the project does not cater specifically to housing. The objective to provide a sustainable and value for money transport solution to support economic growth in the area will also help to address concerns that access to the cheaper transport presents challenges to attracting and retaining talent. Further information about the project objectives is available in the 2021 Non-Statutory Consultation Document.<br><br>New Housing |

| | |
|---|---|
| Cambridgeshire is already facing overdevelopment. A suggestion was made to build homes on the brownfield sites.<br><br>People were very concerned that no decision had been made on the route and that the uncertainty caused problems for those wanting to sell their property who also saw their property decreasing in value. | In designing route options for the railway to date, we have stayed informed about proposals for new housing across the route, including in these locations. In selecting the preferred route alignment following the 2019 consultation, we took account of how the new railway could serve developments in the Bedford and St Neots areas. We considered the potential impact of the scheme on existing housing – including housing that has been granted planning permission and is in the course of being built – when we looked at detailed potential route alignments.<br><br>We have also thought about how the railway might best support future housing development by providing cost-effective, sustainable and accessible public transport alternatives for new residents and settlements. This built on the preference for Route Option E and has been considered as part of the Contribution to enabling housing and economic growth Assessment Factor (2).<br><br>Property<br><br>For the owners of properties which will need to be acquired in part or wholly to construct the railway, full unaffected market value compensation will be provided in accordance with the Compensation Code as explained in the Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation.<br><br>When we submit our application for the Development Consent Order this will show the details of the land required. Landowners and leaseholders would then be able to use the provisions of Statutory Blight to require EWR Co to purchase the land identified and this is explained further in the guide on our website: Guide to Statutory Blight Notices.<br><br>Occupiers who receive a formal notice to end their tenancies would be entitled to receive compensation e.g. the cost of moving, in accordance with the Compensation Code subject to them having a qualifying interest, which is explained further in the guide on the website; Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation for which the link is as above.<br><br>Owners of properties in the vicinity of the railway, where no land is taken as part of the scheme, may be entitled to compensation when the railway is in operation under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973. This factors in the devaluation of property due to effects such as noise. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We will look at ways to reduce the impact of the construction and operation of the railway as part of the design development process. Once a detailed design has been created, we'll discuss the potential impacts with the owners of land and property likely to be required for the scheme and seek to mitigate these.<br><br>We consulted on a proposed Need to Sell scheme at the same time as the main Non-Statutory Consultation and introduced the Need to Sell Property Scheme which aims to assist eligible property owners who have a compelling need to sell while the EWR Project is in development and delivery, but who have been unable to do so other than at a substantially reduced value because of the EWR Project. The Need to Sell Property Scheme is separate to the statutory blight notice process and (as the trigger for statutory blight is the submission of a DCO application) it provides early support for eligible property owners who can satisfy the criteria of the Need to Sell Property Scheme. The details for the Guide to the Need to Sell scheme are available here: The Guide to the Proposed Need to Sell Scheme.<br><br>We have launched the Need to Sell (NTS) property scheme – to support property owners who have a compelling reason to sell their property but are not able to because of the construction of EWR. This includes owners who may have to sell their property at a reduced value or, if they are unable to sell their property, would face an unreasonable burden in the next three years.<br><br>Applicants will need to meet five criteria, which includes providing evidence that they currently have a compelling need to sell. The NTS scheme reflects non statutory consultation feedback and NTS consultation feedback, both received in 2021. More information can be found in the NTS Property Scheme Guidance and Application Form on our website. |
| Concerns were raised about the impact from construction around Bedford such as quality of life and construction traffic.<br><br>A request for more information on lorry movements during construction was received. | We take the safety of contractors, landowners and local residents and communities very seriously. During construction, EWR will ensure that health, safety, and wellbeing performance meets or exceeds minimum legal requirements and industry best practice. This includes at Bedford as well as the wider route. More information about our approach to safety and security, including reducing disruption to local communities and mitigating impacts is included in Chapter 2 Project-wide matters.<br><br>We are aware that construction activities and traffic could have an impact on local residents and businesses, such as through dust or noise – and we will manage this appropriately in accordance with best practice for projects of this type. Information on traffic levels and lorry movements will be presented at the statutory consultation, as part of the PEIR, and then within the ES, submitted as part of the DCO application. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We have also tried to make sure that when developing designs for the railway there is a good 'cut-fill balance' across the route. This means that spoil or earth that is extracted from the ground is used elsewhere on the scheme and not transported off-site to landfill. This can assist with management of excavated material by enabling greater volumes of this to be re-used during construction. Our aim is to help reduce cost, traffic disruption and embedded carbon by reducing the amount of spoil that must be disposed of elsewhere and the volume of material that must be imported in order to construct embankments. The preferred route alignment that we have chosen for Section D performs well in this regard.<br><br>Following consultation with all the relevant highway authority or other bodies, we will prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that includes measures aimed at maintaining safety for road users and reducing the impacts of construction traffic. |
| Comment were made that some areas such as Cambridge and the North-East over-ride the interests of the local communities along the proposed route and that little consideration has been given to the impact to the rural communities, for example the east of Bedford and Woburn Sands, including Edgewick Farm and the allotments.<br><br>Concerns were raised about the impact of EWR on the communities if villages are cut in half and children are not able to get to school. This was particularly true for the areas of Harlton, Haslingfield and Toft. | We understand that severance is a significant concern to people living in homes and villages in the vicinity of the railway. the scheme.<br><br>We are committed to ensuring so far as reasonably practicable that the project is able to mitigate disruption during the planning, construction and operation of the scheme, including areas of Harlton, Harston, Haslingfield and Toft. For level crossings, this includes reducing the impact to communities from any closures by providing reasonable alternatives where possible, and by considering the impact of changes in barrier downtime. During construction, provision will be made to maintain connections that are intended to be retained after the project is completed, even if they have to be temporarily diverted, including to key community facilities such as the school. Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation.<br><br>We are aware that the proposed changes to level crossings and access across the railway would impact the local communities along the MVL such as at Woburn Sands.<br><br>We recognise the importance of agriculture, community facilities, recreational facilities and open space such as the allotments and Edgewick Farm and are focused on finding solutions that avoid, reduce or mitigate adverse impacts on these. The new road within Option 1 would connect to Bow Brickhill Road south of the railway. However, as presented, it may be necessary to provide an extension of the new road that would pass through the allotments and connect to The Leys. This is one of the negative impacts from this option and a consideration in the assessment of preferred options as part of the environmental impact and opportunities Assessment Factor (14). Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We will prepare a Code of Construction Practice or an equivalent document for the Project, which will explain the steps we would take to reduce or mitigate disruption to local people, communities and the environment during construction. Additionally, we will explain our approach to construction and operation of the railway and provide further details of potential effects of this at the statutory consultation.<br><br>We recognise that access to the countryside is important and will work to reduce any disruption to public rights of way as far as reasonably practicable. To help reduce impacts, we are following the environmental mitigation hierarchy which firstly seeks to avoid significant adverse effects on the countryside, including PRoWs and, where this isn't possible, then seeks to reduce impacts. If this isn't possible, if necessary we would seek to provide compensation for any impacts, where feasible. At this stage we will primarily focus on seeking to avoid and reduce impacts, by making decisions that help us to 'design out' potential adverse environmental impacts. As mentioned, we have committed to delivering 10% BNG, supporting the UK Government's 25-year Environment Plan.<br><br>Benefits to local communities:<br>Rural communities will benefit from improved connectivity either via new stations or improved access to existing stations in their local area.<br><br>Despite being a short distance apart, journeys from towns such as Milton Keynes and Bedford to Oxford and Cambridge take a long time because of congested roads and the lack of public transport. By offering rail travel as an alternative, EWR can help to ease traffic on local roads by reducing people's reliance on cars. It will also give people more choice, offering more sustainable ways to travel and opportunities to relax or work while travelling.<br><br>EWR will also offer new journeys to local communities because of its key intersections with most of the UK's main rail lines – including the East Coast Main Line, Midland Main Line and West Coast Main Line. |
| Concerns were raised about the environmental impact Route E will have, particularly on the green fields in Great Barford and the Great Early Grove woodland. | We recognise the importance of biodiversity and protecting the habitats of local wildlife including priority habitats such as woodland and ancient woodland as well as parks and greenspaces. We will think carefully about protected species and their habitats when designing the railway. As mentioned, we intend to build on the commitment of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain made in relation to the part of the route already built between Bicester to Bletchley. We will consider enhancing some existing habitats and look at opportunities to create new habitats. Further information on plans for achieving 10% BNG will be provided at the statutory |

| | |
|---|---|
| Concerns were raised that the demand for the railway won't be enough to justify the impact on the countryside.<br><br>Concerns were raised that the route to the East of Bedford maximises environmental damage. A further comment was made that the southern route would be less disruptive to the environment and the communities, yet another person commented that the environmental impact of a southern approach into Cambridge is too high.<br><br>There was also a concern about the impact on rural land alongside the railway and the impact on water and wildlife.<br><br>There were concerns for the impact the route will have on wildlife and someone raised a concern that a new road from Sheepike End would impact the area where a red listed bird is breeding. | consultation, alongside further detail on the potential impacts on rural land alongside the railway and the water environment.<br><br>In relation to Great Barford and Great Early Grove woodland, the preferred Route Alignment (RA1 with a Tempsford variant) would be some distance from these areas and is not expected to result in impacts.<br><br>We will design a programme of habitat surveys and species-specific surveys to help understand where species and habitats are in the landscape and how they use the landscape so that we can avoid, reduce, mitigate and if necessary, compensate for identified impacts throughout the design of EWR as much as is reasonably practicable. This will include surveys to understand where potential protected birds may be nesting. As described, we will develop a PEIR for statutory consultation and an Environmental Statement DCO submission to describe the likely environmental effects of the proposals and report the results of survey work.<br><br>We recognise the importance of ecological connectivity and reconnecting fragmented areas of habitat to strengthen them and promote movement of wildlife. Green bridges, wildlife tunnels, restoring woodland and creating new green areas and parks will be considered to mitigate severance of habitats, maintain historic features, improve connectivity, and positively integrate with landscape character. We will map where the new railway may cross and border habitats used by other important protected species, such as badgers, great crested newts and bird species, in order to consider how best to avoid impacting them altogether, or to reduce impacts on them as far as reasonably practicable.<br><br>Regarding the options for approaching Bedford, we considered the potential environmental impacts and opportunities of the route options presented during the 2019 non-statutory consultation and undertook a more detailed assessment of these impacts when selecting the preferred route option in 2020. Based on this assessment, we concluded that Route Option E via Bedford town centre and Cambourne had the fewest problematic areas, alongside Route Option B.<br>The decision to select Route Option E was based on a number of factors of which environmental impacts and opportunities were one. For example, the feedback to our 2019 consultation ranked Route Option E as the best performing on this assessment factor. None of the feedback we received in response to the 2021 non-statutory consultation has provided any new information on the environmental impact of Route Option E which would cause us to re-open this decision. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Regarding demand, while no consensus has formed about long-term rail demand in the UK, we have started testing the possible impact a long-term increase in working from home could have on the route. However, EWR is addressing a fundamental lack of east-west connectivity in the region and the benefits should not be considered based on potential short-term fluctuations in demand. It is a long-term investment that will provide sustainable economic growth, will help to attract investment and will connect communities along the route for decades to come. |
| One person said that the plans for EWR increases journey time instead of reducing it. | All options to optimise journey time have been and will continue to be considered at all stages in the design of the railway system. We aim to provide a frequent passenger service through designing a flexible railway, with two railway tracks for EWR service use throughout, allowing the new services to offer attractive journey times. The indicative target maximum journey times are based on indicative route and infrastructure studies and are being validated as the Project progresses. We have taken into account journey times in the assessment of route alignment options, as set out in within the Design Considerations sections 7 and 9 of the NSC Technical Report Appendix E. |
| A person commented that they say no real benefits for EWR to go through Bedford Town Centre.<br><br>Some people queried the benefits of EWR to communities in East & South Cambridgeshire. | We're aware people want to understand the specific benefits EWR will provide their local communities and businesses. As the design develops, we'll be able to provide more detail on what these benefits will look like, and we'll work with local authorities and communities to refine and shape these plans in line with Local Plans and wider development.<br><br>By introducing EWR services to Bedford, people in the town centre and surrounding areas would benefit from direct connections east to Cambridge and west to Bletchley and Oxford. Similarly, by bringing EWR services to Cambridge, people in the city centre and surrounding areas, including residents of Harston Village would benefit from direct connections west to Bedford, Bletchley and Oxford. The introduction of EWR services would reinstate a vital route that was lost to local people in the last century. New rail connections can bring many benefits such as growth, urban regeneration and less congestion on the roads. We are keen that the investment in the rail line brings lasting benefits to Bedford and Cambridge and surrounding areas. Supporting jobs and prosperity locally are important objectives for us and we are very interested to hear from you about how our proposals can support the towns, cities and villages along the route.<br>We expect the new rail link to support significant local economic growth that will benefit individuals, communities, educational and research establishments, and businesses across the whole region from Oxford |

| | |
|---|---|
| | to Milton Keynes, Bedford and Cambridge. EWR will provide increased connectivity to households and businesses across the route. For households, residents will benefit from decreased journey times to areas along EWR and workers will be better connected to additional job opportunities along the route. Furthermore, businesses will be able to attract an increased pool of labour due to the reduction in journey time from areas along the EWR route. Even for villages which do not have a station, these benefits could provide indirect benefits in terms of greater job opportunities. |
| Someone commented that the Hauxton Level Crossing is used by many carers who support elderly people in that area.<br><br>Concerns were raised that closing the Lidlington and London Road level crossings will have an impact on the villages and traffic, particularly emergency vehicles.<br><br>There was some support to close the London Road crossing to motorised vehicles and to provide a cycle/pedestrian underpass that links London Road with the town centre providing segregated cycle lanes.<br><br>Queries were received as to the methodology used to assess the impacts of closing a level crossing including the use of local traffic modelling and traffic accident data. | For crossings that we propose to close we undertake safety risk assessments of the crossing and transport assessments of the crossing and area. The safety risk assessment will inform us of the risks the crossing such as the traffic accidents at the crossing. A Transport Assessment will consider the impacts on the highway network, road safety and local sustainable modes of transport, including changes to existing traffic patterns, because of closure of the level crossing and proposed new developments. These assessments will be used as part of the option selection process to determine if a crossing is to close and what proposal should be used to mitigate a closure of a crossing. Outcomes of the assessment will initially be reported in the PEIR published at the statutory consultation and then further developed within the ES. The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors, which are outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the non-statutory consultation Technical Report.<br><br>We appreciate that level crossings play an important role in local connectivity allowing people to move around their communities, so recognise local people's concerns about our proposals for upgrades to level crossings along the MVL such as Lidlington Level Crossing. Accessible and safe alternatives to level crossings are important for users so that everyone can make the journeys they require to access local facilities.<br><br>We appreciate that level crossings play an important role in local connectivity allowing people, including elderly people to move around their communities, so we recognise concerns about Hauxton Level Crossing. If this crossing does need to close, we will provide accessible and safe alternatives so that everyone can make the journeys they require to access local facilities.<br><br>We provided several options for pedestrian connectivity during the consultation and have taken all consultation feedback into consideration as we developed the proposals, including how pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders can make the journeys. We will continue to consider how non-motorised users (NMU) cross the railway as we continue through the option appraisal and selection process into the next level of detail in the design. Since non-statutory consultation we have carried out further options analysis at Lidlington, including in respect of the potential for the crossing to remain open, as confirmed within the Economic and Technical Report. Before preferred options can be confirmed safety risk assessments and traffic assessments |

| | |
|---|---|
| A person commented that the pedestrian crossing at Woburn Sands should remain open to allow school children to cross. | need to be completed. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented for comment at the statutory consultation. Access across the railway and to the station, businesses, and residents in close proximity will be considered during the development of proposed options. These proposals will be informed by ongoing engagement with England's Economic Heartland on first mile last mile connectivity. We would also endeavour to provide ongoing access during construction, subject to safety considerations.<br><br>Since the non-statutory consultation, and in response to the Affordable Connections Project we have carried out further options analysis at each level crossing along the EWR route. Where analysis has identified further potential options these are confirmed within the Economic and Technical Report. This includes the potential to keep Bicester London Road level crossing open to local traffic. Before preferred options can be confirmed, safety, risk and traffic assessments need to be completed. The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors (including enabling housing and economic growth) outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented for comment at the statutory consultation.<br><br>Emergency service access is an important consideration as we develop our proposals for the level crossing. The emergency services were invited to participate in the 2019 and 2021 non-statutory consultations. Following the detailed design of the concept for London Road level crossing, the emergency services will be engaged on a one-to-one basis to ascertain their feedback and to discuss any mitigation required.<br><br>We are committed to providing a safe means to cross the railway and, where closure of crossings is essential, minimising the impact on local communities as far as is practicable. A number of vehicular bridge schemes are being further considered (including a route to the east via Gavray Drive) and further information will be made available at the statutory consultation. |
| A preference was expressed for trees and shrubs to screen the railway instead of manmade barriers and a preference for brick clad on the new Long Road bridge. | Assessing the potential impact of EWR on the environment is a fundamental part of our design process and is a consideration within the environmental impacts and opportunities Assessment Factor (AF14) – for a description of assessment factors see the NSC documentation “Technical Report Appendices. C. Assessment Factors: definitions and considerations”. We will carefully consider the setting and context of landscapes and historic views, to look at how the development can be designed to blend in with the local environment. This includes thinking about where to create embankments and where viaducts are potentially required; where landscape earthworks can be used to soften the appearance of embankments and integrate them into the wider landscape context; or how the sensitive placement of appropriate planting can be used to screen views from sensitive receptors, or to soften the appearance and presence of engineering earthworks. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We will look at developing landscape mitigation measures that are closely integrated with the ecological requirements of both the project and the wider area to make sure that the environmental legacy of the works is positive and to support our commitment to 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.<br><br>We will develop an understanding of what features give the existing landscape its character, and what stakeholders value about the landscape the most. This will help to inform our design work and, where practicable, the landscape design will respond to and reflect those features. |
| People pointed out that the maps used by EWR did not show some villages and roads, such as the road between Great Barford to Wildon, Birdsfield road, Main Fak in Green End Road and Roxton Road.<br><br>In addition, the maps presented implied that the railway will be built through flat, open space without houses and farms being affected which is an inaccurate reflection and therefore requested EWR to use Ordnance Survey maps instead.<br><br>It was also suggested that the guided busway bridge over to Addenbrookes should be clearly shown on the maps and also the difference between road and foot crossings. | We appreciate individuals' feedback on the maps used at our community drop-in events including comments in relation to Great Barford to Wildon, Birdsfield road, Main Fak in Green End Road and Roxton Road). At the time of the drop in events, the maps presented proposals which were at an early stage in the design process. At the statutory consultation, we will present more detailed designs and consider how we represent elevation and terrain in future maps. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Several people requested more information on the NTS Scheme. | For the owners of properties which will need to be acquired in part or wholly to construct the railway, full unaffected market value compensation will be provided in accordance with the Compensation Code as explained in the Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation.<br><br>Where no land is taken, under Part I of the Land Compensation Act 1973 compensation may be claimed for reduction in the value of the property due to physical factors caused by the use of a new or altered railway, which is explained further in the guide on our website: Guide to Part 1 Claims, including an explanation of what constitutes a qualifying interest.<br><br>When we submit our application for the Development Consent Order this will show the details of the land required. Landowners and leaseholders may then be able to require EWR Co to purchase the land identified. and this is explained further in the guide on the EWR Co website: Guide to Statutory Blight Notices.<br><br>Occupiers who receive a formal notice to end their tenancies would be entitled to receive compensation, in accordance with the Compensation Code, subject to them having a qualifying interest; This is explained further in the guide on the website; Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation, for which the link is as above.<br><br>We will look at ways to reduce the impact of the construction and operation of the railway as part of the design development process. Once a detailed design has been created, we'll discuss the potential impacts with the owners of land and property likely to be required for the Project and seek to mitigate these.<br><br>If a business is located where land or a section of land is required by the Project, the landowner may require EWR Co to acquire the whole plot if the rest is deemed incapable of reasonable beneficial use. The landowner will be able to engage a surveyor to advise the owner of their options and to act on their behalf in relation to the compensation claim. The surveyor's reasonable costs will be reimbursed as explained in the Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation for which the link is as above.<br><br>We consulted on a proposed Need to Sell scheme at the same time as the main Non-Statutory Consultation and introduced the Need to Sell Property Scheme which aims to assist eligible property owners who have a compelling need to sell while the EWR Project is in development and delivery, but who have been unable to do so other than at a substantially reduced value because of the EWR Project. The Need to Sell Property Scheme is separate to the statutory blight notice process and (as the trigger for statutory blight is the submission of a DCO application) it provides early support for eligible property owners who can satisfy the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | criteria of the Need to Sell Property Scheme. The details for the Guide to the Need to Sell scheme are available on our website.<br><br>We have launched the Need to Sell (NTS) property scheme – to support property owners who have a compelling reason to sell their property but are not able to because of the construction of EWR. This includes owners who may have to sell their property at a reduced value or, if they are unable to sell their property, would face an unreasonable burden in the next three years.<br><br>Applicants will need to meet five criteria, which includes providing evidence that they currently have a compelling need to sell. The NTS scheme reflects non statutory consultation feedback and NTS consultation feedback, both received in 2021. More information can be found in the NTS Property Scheme Guidance and Application Form on our website. |
| Concern was expressed that people in the Poets area of Bedford will be affected by noise and disruption and queried whether noise has been factored into the design.<br><br>Concerns were raised about the noise from trains, particularly freight services, but also during construction.<br><br>A query was received about the noise mitigations and what levels of noise would be deemed excessive. | We recognise that noise from both the construction and operation of a railway is an important issue for local communities. We considered the potential for noise impacts when making our Preferred Route Option Announcement in 2020 and in developing alignment options in 2021, and we recognise the importance of this issue for communities in Bedford and the Poets area. We will develop a noise policy, which will set out a plan designed to establish and mitigate noise and vibration to seek to avoid any significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life.<br>We are committed to developing proposals for measures that will seek to reduce noise and vibration (including from Freight trains and during construction) as far as reasonably practicable. This includes:<br>• Choice of trains.<br>• Track technology.<br>• Noise barriers – which form one of a number of mitigations that may be appropriate where tracks may create noise and vibration.<br>We will carry out comprehensive assessments and we'll use industry-leading computer modelling, which can incorporate information on local geology to simulate potential noise and vibration impacts along the whole route, as part of the assessments on any mitigations required. As stated, the PEIR will describe the likely environmental effects of the proposals. This process involves identifying potentially significant adverse impacts resulting from the proposals, allowing them to be avoided or reduced where possible, as well as identifying any potential beneficial environmental impacts. The PEIR will include information regarding the existing baseline noise environment, together with construction and operational noise limits having had regard to the appropriate guidance and legislation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | An Environmental Statement will then be prepared and submitted as part of the Development Consent Order application. Additionally, further detail will be provided on the freight strategy, and the approach to avoiding or reducing potential noise and vibration impacts from freight trains which may run on EWR, during the statutory consultation.<br><br>Construction related impacts on the environment will be identified and managed as far as reasonably practicable, by a CoCP submitted alongside a DCO application. Compliance with the CoCP will be secured through the Requirements of the DCO itself. This will include measures to control impacts related to construction noise and vibration.<br><br>**Freight:**<br>We recognise concerns about the impact of noise and vibration and is committed to considering measures that will reduce these. This includes choice of trains, track technology and noise barriers. Additionally, further detail will be provided on the freight strategy, and the approach to avoiding or reducing potential noise and vibration impacts from freight trains which may run on EWR, at the statutory consultation. |
| Further information was requested about the case for a Northern route.<br><br>Various preferences were expressed concerning a Northern approach into Cambridge such as EWR following the A428 or following the old Varsity line.<br><br>There were several concerns also, one of them being that the village of Newton will be cut off by the northern route and also the impact it would have on Oakington.<br><br>A suggestion was made for the railway to pass through | At the 2021 consultation, we expressed our preference for EWR to take a southern approach to Cambridge (SATC), serving Cambridge Station and the new station at Cambridge South. This consisted of a route which served a station to the north of Cambourne and then travelled southeast joining the Shepreth Branch Line to the south of Harston. We invited your feedback on this preference.<br><br>Since the consultation, we have looked again at a northern approach to Cambridge (NATC) and an updated NATC design was developed as part of the Affordable Connections Project. By relaxing the requirement to operate an even-interval clockface timetable, and in response to your feedback, a revised NATC was developed which would enable four EWR trains per hour to use the same route as previously considered, but with significantly reduced infrastructure. The four-tracking which was previously required through Cambridge would be reduced to use the existing two tracks from the proposed Milton Junction to Coldham's Lane. Between Coldham's Lane and Cambridge Station, the West Anglia Main Line (WAML) would be increased to four tracks. This option would remove the need to demolish commercial and residential property, avoid the need to build on Common Land, and remove the need re-build a number of road and river bridges in Cambridge.<br><br>However, we still believe that the SATC would provide greater opportunities to unlock economic growth across the region (and at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus in particular) and would deliver greater overall connectivity and greater flexibility to extend EWR services in the future. For these reasons, we continue to |

| | |
|---|---|
| Longstowe, on the Northern Route. | select the SATC as our preferred approach to Cambridge. You can read more about our reasons for this in the Economic and Technical Report accompanying this document.<br><br>As part of the ACP work we reviewed the potential to follow the Varsity Line through Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire. Further information can be found in the Economic and Technical Report. We found that, although a shorter route overall, it would not serve Cambourne and would deliver significantly fewer benefits than the current preferred alignment, Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant). It would also have a significant impact on housing within Cambridge and on the guided busway.<br><br>Locating the railway to follow the existing A428 road corridor between Cambourne and Cambridge would be likely to have significant impacts on the existing settlements located along these routes, not least because it would 'sandwich' these communities between the new railway and the adjacent dual carriageways.<br><br>We will undertake road traffic modelling during the next stage to understand any potential impacts of the closure of Station Road. It is noted that an alternative route would be provided to maintain connectivity between Harston and Newton.<br><br>We have considered the amount and location of stations along the route. Including additional stations along this section of the route would create longer journey times, and may mean that the Project would not meet its key objectives. One of the key objectives of EWR is to enable sustainable housing and economic growth. The proposed EWR station locations have been chosen to support the delivery of new housing and help create new jobs along the corridor, as well as helping to ease some of the upwards pressure on the housing market. Consideration has been made of the accessibility to suitable road infrastructure, potential demand and viability of development in choosing station locations and a station and alignment north of Cambourne are preferable in this regard. Longstowe would be located a significant distance away from the new railway which means that it would not be possible to provide a station here. |
| Comments were made that the demand for travel has changed since Covid and queried whether the numbers used continue to be justified. EWR Co were also asked where the 90% passenger usage figure quoted in one of the newsletters came from. | While no consensus has formed about long-term rail demand in the UK, we have started testing the possible impact a long-term increase in working from home could have on the route. However, EWR is addressing a fundamental lack of east-west connectivity in the region and the benefits should not be considered based on potential short-term fluctuations in demand. It is a long-term investment that will provide sustainable economic growth, will help to attract investment and will connect communities along the route for decades to come. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | We will continue to monitor these figures and to factor them into our iterative business case process. During Covid-19, rail demand was significantly reduced as people preferred to avoid public transport. However, since the end of the pandemic, DfT have publicised that rail passenger numbers have increased to nearly the pre-pandemic levels. |
| Some support was received for a southern approach into Cambridge. | We notethe respondent's support for a southern approach to Cambridge and the benefits it would provide. |
| Disappointment was expressed that the actual route alignment has not been decided on yet. | EWR have gone through an extensive process to arrive at a route update announcement including a significant consultation exercise. Details of Details of the preferred alignment and our approach are contained within the Route Update Report. Further details will be set out at the statutory consultation. |
| Concerns were raised about road safety with the current road options, particularly for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooters who use the same roads.<br><br>A comment was made that when considering the safety of users when crossing the railway, the needs of horse-riders and their horses should also be considered. | We will consider the safety of the public and workers at all stages of design, during the construction of the railway and its operational phase. This has been considered to date and will continue to be considered as the project progresses as part of our Assessment Factor for Safety, which is described in the 2021 Technical Consultation Document. The safety of workers, road users, non-motorised users, supply chain and local people has been prioritised so any risks can be identified and reduced wherever possible. Mitigation measures for construction impacts will be set out in a CoCP or an equivalent document.<br><br>We understand that horse riders have unique needs in crossing the railway. Temporary access during construction phase will be planned carefully to provide suitable diversion routes for non-motorised users (NMUs). Where equestrian routes may be affected we will share alternative options with user groups in the development of our designs. We are committed to considering all users, including sensitivity to noise in respect of equestrian routes such as bridleways. Further information will be presented during the statutory consultation. |
| A suggestion was made for a real expressway from the town centre to the A421 roundabout to bring workers and shoppers into Bedford town centre and empty it efficiently in the evening, beyond the populated part of South | Whilst BFARe has suggested providing new connecting lines south of Bedford to allow some EWR services to serve the town centre, this would still have disadvantages. Bedford town centre would see a significant reduction in services per hour to Cambridge, Bletchley and Oxford, reducing the attractiveness and convenience of the new railway for prospective passengers. A significant amount of additional infrastructure would be needed, including a complex viaduct over the River Great Ouse and the A421 dual carriageway south of Bedford. Finally, timetabling would be more complex due to there being multiple junctions in close proximity which would adversely affect performance and reliability of EWR services. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Bedford. Roundabout and traffic light free.<br><br>A suggestion was made to improve Marston Vale line with a suburban rail service for south Bedford and out to Marsh Leys industrial estate. The slower stopping service should have 2 new stops at the edge of the industrial estate.<br><br>The observation was made that several of the routes proposed appear to go directly through the proposed Black Cat Road development. A suggestion was made for the railway to run parallel with the new A428 from the black cat to Caxton Gibbet junctions, as archaeology surveys had already been undertaken and the impact had already been assessed. Another comment was made that since there is already construction underway along the A428 it will not exacerbate the environmental impact. However, it was also suggested not to follow the A428 as it loses the advantage of the railway. | We note the comments on route alternatives; however, nothing presented as part of this feedback has led to us re-opening alternative routes.<br><br>Our Project objective is to improve east-west public transport connectivity by providing rail links between key urban areas between Oxford and Cambridge. As such, we would only propose to undertake highway improvement works to mitigate potential impacts from increased traffic movements during the construction and operational stages of EWR. A real expressway is not required for these reasons, so was not progressed.<br><br>We will consider traffic impacts and mitigations as part of traffic and transport assessments. The Transport Assessment will consider, and where appropriate and proportionate mitigate against, the impacts on the strategic and local highway networks, road safety, local sustainable modes of transport. Outcomes of this will be reported in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report published at the statutory consultation and the Environmental Statement submitted alongside the DCO Application.<br><br>Improve Marston Vale line with suburban rail service<br><br>We are not proposing to provide a suburban rail service for south Bedford beyond the stations previously consulted upon at the non-statutory consultation along the MVL. Moving the MVL line away from its existing route is not a feasible option because it would not represent good value for money for the taxpayer, due to the increased amount of design, engineering works, materials and land take required to deliver. It would also have significantly higher environmental impacts than upgrading the current line.<br><br>We are not considering providing new stations for the Marston Vale Line other than those which have already been proposed within the non-statutory consultation, as the extra land take and cost of constructing new stations is not warranted at other locations such as Marsh Leys. This is in line with our Project objective to improve east-west public transport connectivity by providing rail links between key urban areas (current and anticipated) between Oxford and Cambridge.<br><br>Any route passing through the south of Bedford would need to overcome a significant number of sensitive and complex environmental constraints, including floodplain, the new Wixams development, high quality agricultural land, heritage assets and ancient woodland. It would also require remediation of the former Elstow landfill site. We would provide connectivity to Bedford south of the River Great Ouse through a Bedford St Johns station, and Bedford station would provide access to the town centre and other key destinations from the north of the River Great Ouse. |

| | |
|---|---|
| A suggestion was made to transform the proposed Bedford branch line (the twin track Marston Vale line that runs parallel to the overburdened Ampthill Road) into a double deck transport artery i.e. a dual carriageway on top of the railway.<br><br>Suggestion was made to re-route the line around Lidlington.<br><br>A preference for a western approach into Cambridge was mentioned. | We have previously explored the possibility of creating a rail 'bypass' at Lidlington, whereby the line would be re-routed away from the village centre. As explained in the consultation materials, this option was not taken forward because the preliminary design work demonstrated this had significant cost and environmental implications that could not be justified by the benefits that the option would deliver.<br><br>We are working closely with the new A428 Black Cat Improvement scheme and where appropriate share environmental data. EWR crosses this road east of the Black Cat roundabout. Running EWR parallel to this new road could manage impacts within an existing and developing travel route. Visual changes to the landscape could be concentrated within the same area as the A428 rather than areas that are currently relatively untouched by infrastructure development.<br><br>A western approach to Cambridge was considered prior to EWR Co's 2019 consultation and not carried forward. The reasons for this decision were set out in the 2019 consultation documents. It would have a significant impact on communities in Trumpington and on the existing guided busway in order to route to Cambridge Station |
| Some queried the rationale and data that supports the route options.<br><br>A request was made for the calculations to be published for the routes from Cambourne to Cambridge to assess value for money.<br><br>Feedback was received that the preferred route is not energy efficient and not suitable for a train line. | In order to ensure the options being developed and consulted on meet the Project Objectives, and that there is a robust evidence base and consistent approach supporting decision making, a range of Assessment Factors have been developed. Assessment Factors are a set of topics in relation to which relative performance of options can be compared. Further detail on Assessment Factors is outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report.<br><br>We provided extensive information - including a 286-page consultation document and a detailed 428-page technical report to support the rationale for the scheme. We undertook a thorough assurance process prior to the publication of the documents and will continue to do so for all future materials. We did not withhold or provide misleading or manipulated information, and we do not believe anything significant was missing or incorrect from the materials that would materially change the design of the scheme or that would have affected respondents' ability to understand and engage with the consultation.<br><br>Costs:<br>We assessed anticipated capital costs associated with route corridor options A, B, C, D and E ahead of the Preferred Route Announcement in 2020. In this assessment we have thought about how the infrastructure needed to support the railway, in particular the use of embankments and viaducts, earthworks and different |

| | |
|---|---|
| | earthwork profiles and gradients (height and slope). This work was included in the cost estimates made to support the selection of Route Option E and the preferred route in 2020. At the time, Route Option E was estimated to incur upfront capital costs of £3.7bn, which was the second lowest of all route options.<br><br>Since we announced Route Option E as the preferred route in 2020, there have been no changes in situation or circumstance that would require us to reconsider our decision.<br><br>We will continue work to assess the costs associated with EWR, including mitigation measures and capital costs, as the design of the route continues.<br><br>Energy Efficiency:<br>Our assessment factor process looks at how well different route options meet the overall Project objectives. These provide a robust framework for comparing the relative performance of options. Regarding the operational efficiency of the line, both Route Options B and E result in similar gradient and radius in the route and, accordingly, operational carbon emissions are also unlikely to be a material differentiating factor. More information about Route Option E, including the carbon emissions and environmental impact is available in Chapter 4 of the Consultation Feedback Report. |
| A question was raised whether the footbridge at Shepreth Junction will be moved North or heightened. | The footbridge at Shepreth Junction may need to be altered to accommodate the increased number of tracks. Information will be provided at the statutory consultation. |
| Someone queried whether the southern route with a triangulation junction on the existing line is being considered. | In our preliminary selection of Route Option E in 2020, we took into account whether EWR should by-pass Bedford to the south or should serve the town centre directly. If EWR services don't call at Bedford and Bedford St Johns stations then there would be no direct access to the town centre – with its housing, jobs and local facilities such as Bedford Hospital. Also, connections to other transport modes and rail services, including Thameslink and Midland Mainline services, would be less convenient, as would be the case if changing to a connecting service at the new station to reach the town centre. Additionally, any route passing to the south of Bedford would need to avoid housing and commercial developments at Wixams, which would require work on the site of the former Elstow landfill site. This work wouldn't be required for a route alignment passing through Bedford station. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | If services were to reverse at Bedford station, through a triangular track junction, this would increase journey times and be more complex operationally, which would reduce the resilience of the services and make timetabling more difficult. |
| Some believed that the southern route is costly, will sever communities and will not benefit anyone and as such it should be reconsidered. | The NATC design presented at the 2021 consultation was expected to be more expensive to build than the SATC. Following additional work undertaken since the non-statutory consultation, the updated NATC is expected to have a lower construction cost than the SATC. This is due to the reduction in the anticipated amount of four-tracking required to the WAML in Cambridge. However, a SATC is expected to provide higher potential benefits in terms of unlocking growth, better connectivity and more flexible options to extend EWR services in the future; and remains our preferred approach to Cambridge.<br><br>We have published further details on the reason for progressing with the southern route on our website, including in appendix F of EWR CO 2021 Consultation Technical report regarding the northern option that was annexed to the 2020 NSC report, and the ACP Report and Route Update Report regarding the revised northern approach and comparison to the southern approach.<br><br>We have considered the impact of the Project on existing highways, PRoW and private access roads as part of the design and assessment of route alignment options. We are seeking to maintain existing highway connections wherever feasible. Where it is not feasible to retain existing highways, PRoW and private access roads in their current location, we will ensure that a suitable alternative is available which minimises the impact on communities. EWR therefore does not agree that the SATC will sever communities.<br><br>Whilst the SATC would be closer to more settlements than the NATC, more of the NATC would be within the built-up area of Cambridge itself and a greater number of properties are expected to be close to the NATC alignment. The NATC is expected to perform worse in terms of community impacts due to the closer proximity of the route to communities than the SATC and number of PROW crossed.<br><br>We will provide increased connectivity to households and businesses across the route. When businesses become closer in effective proximity (e.g. you can travel between businesses quicker than you previously could), then productivity gains can be made through closer links to suppliers, to a more dynamic and specialised labour market, and knowledge spill-overs occur. Furthermore, businesses will be able to attract an increased pool of labour due to the reduction in journey time from areas along the EWR route. For |

| | |
|---|---|
| | households, residents will benefit from decreased journey times to areas along EWR and workers will be better connected to additional job opportunities along the route.<br><br>The SATC is expected to provide greater opportunities to unlock economic growth across the region (and at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus in particular) and would deliver greater overall connectivity and greater flexibility to extend EWR services in the future. For these reasons, we continue to select the SATC as our preferred approach to Cambridge.<br><br>We have published further details on the reason for progressing with the southern route on our website, including in appendix F of EWR CO 2021 Consultation Technical report regarding the northern option that was annexed to the 2020 NSC report, and the ACP Report and Route Update Report regarding the revised northern approach and comparison to the southern approach. |
| People felt that more stations were needed to benefit the villages, with preferences expressed for a Southern Parkway Station and a station at St Neots. Further suggestions for station locations were East Ville Road, mid-Amphill Road or mid-Elstow Road, the Interchange Retail Park, and the Marsh Leys Warehouse.<br><br>A person commented that A modern station, ought to have cafes and convenience shops with wide pedestrian, wheelchair and cyclist underpass. | One of the key objectives of EWR is to enable sustainable housing and economic growth. The proposed EWR station locations have been chosen to support the delivery of new housing and help create new jobs along the corridor, as well as helping to ease pressure on the housing market. Consideration has been given to access to suitable road infrastructure, potential demand and viability of adjacent development in choosing station locations. Whilst there is not currently considered to be sufficient demand at other locations on the EWR route to justify an additional station stop in terms of cost and additional journey time, the design does not preclude the possible construction of additional stations at a future time.<br><br>Enabling housing growth and contributing to transformational growth within the area is a key part of EWR's purpose. The use of a station within St Neots is not expected to enable the same level of housing development as we anticipate would be unlocked by a new station between St Neots and Sandy, which is why the preferred location for an ECML station is south of the existing St Neots station. However, EWR is committed to increasing prosperity and connectivity across the area, and therefore options to efficiently connect existing communities, such as St Neots, with EWR remains important and we will continue to develop proposals to enable easy accessibility for these communities, including through the provision of improved first mile / last mile connectivity, to our proposed network. In addition, routing EWR through St Neots station would increase the length of the alignment, thereby increasing cost and journey times.<br><br>Route options passing to the south of Bedford were considered before the selection of a preferred route option in 2020. Route Option E was selected as it would deliver higher transport user benefits by serving Bedford and Bedford St Johns stations directly. This would provide access to other rail services, transport |

| | |
|---|---|
| | modes, local homes and businesses and facilities such as Bedford Hospital. An alternative station location at Bedford South would not deliver these benefits.<br><br>We note suggestions for additional stations at Southern Parkway, East Ville Road, mid-Amphill Road or mid-Elstow Road, the Interchange Retail Park, and the Marsh Leys Warehouse. We're not considering providing new stations other than the stations proposed at the 2021 consultation, as the extra land take and cost of constructing a new station is not warranted in these locations.<br><br>Station facilities<br>We will look at the provision of potential refreshment and retail opportunities within our stations. We will assess each station location individually to help understand the communities needs and wants. This includes the potential to create local retail opportunities. We will also do intend to provide drinking fountains at all of our new stations. |
| A suggestion for an eastern access to Cambridge Station from Rustat Road was made. | Our main priority is to improve connectivity between Oxford and Cambridge. We will consider the existing capacity of the existing station and model the forecast growth resultant from EWR services being introduced into Cambridge. The modelled numbers, distribution, and flow of passengers using any revised station layout (including an Eastern access from Rutat Road) shall determine the required necessary works at the station to keep its use safe, easy, and accessible subject to further design. Where it is deemed necessary, appropriate, and value for money to enhance the station to support our main priority the details of station modifications and enhancement shall be presented at the statutory consultation. Opportunities for the station including potential additional entrances. |
| A suggestion was made to provide a multistorey car park on the south side of Prebend Street in Bedford. If this was cheap or free then this would encourage car drivers heading to the town centre, main line railway station, hospital and Borough Hall to complete their journey on foot or cycle. | Although sustainable modes will be prioritised, we recognise that access by car will still be required, so we will also consider the local road network around Bedford station and any potential mitigations required, including in the location suggested, as well as how much parking the new station will need. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Someone requested to see the results for the bat surveys that were carried out. | We have carried out a number of surveys to better understand the barbastelle population in the area and plan to carry out further bat surveys as the design develops to ensure that the design does not significantly affect the population of Barbastelle bats. These bat surveys will complement a wider programme of habitat surveys and species-specific surveys designed to help understand where species and habitats are in the landscape and how they are used, enabling the project to avoid, reduce, mitigate and if necessary, compensate for identified impacts throughout the design of the railway.<br><br>The results of survey work will be reported in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and Environmental Statement (ES). |
| Some people were pleased that EWR will provide employment opportunities for young people.<br><br>Another person said that they supported the project but would prefer no home demolitions.<br><br>Further support was received as the project will help commuters to and from Milton Keynes and Cambridge, and provide a direct train to Cambridge and Oxford from Bedford Station. Some urged to see the railway built as soon as possible.<br><br>There was scepticism that there is political influence from the Mayor of Bedford regarding the route going through the North of Bedford. | We note comments from respondents about their support for EWR. EWR will be vital in delivering a range of benefits for communities, businesses, academia and the wider economy. It will support economic growth through the provision of cheaper, greener and faster transport in an area constrained by poor east-west connectivity, and attract both investment and top talent to the UK. Capitalising on the clear strengths in knowledge-based industries across the region is essential for long term sustainable growth, economic resilience, and international competitiveness.<br><br>It would also increase connectivity for households and businesses across the route. This will help businesses effectively become closer to suppliers, to a more dynamic and specialised labour market, and so provide more opportunity to share knowledge. Businesses will also be able to attract an increased pool of labour because of the reduced journey time from areas along the EWR route. For households, residents will benefit from decreased journey times to areas along EWR, and workers will be better connected to additional job opportunities along the route.<br><br>We will, where possible, look to quantify the impact of East West Rail on the wider economy, specifically its impact on economic growth, investment, jobs, housing, and connectivity across both the region and the country. This will form part of the strategic and economic case for the scheme and will be included within the business case process.<br><br>EWR could support the national levelling up agenda by providing the right environment for business growth across an area where new business formation, innovation and entrepreneurship is strong. This will help new business growth and survival, but also assist in retaining businesses and investment in the UK, encouraging further investment and scaling up across other parts of the country. Many businesses and industry sectors that EWR will support already have strong links to other parts of the country considered priority areas for levelling up. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | In our preliminary selection of Route Option E in 2020, we took into account whether EWR should by-pass Bedford to the south or should serve the town centre directly. If EWR services don't call at Bedford and Bedford St Johns stations then there is no direct access to the town centre – with its housing, jobs and local facilities such as Bedford Hospital. Also, connections to other transport modes and rail services, including Thameslink and Midland Mainline services, are less convenient, as would be the case if changing to a connecting service at the new station to reach the town centre.<br><br>Our decision to select Route Option E was a subject of the assessment factor process, which looks at how well different route options meet the overall Project objectives. These provide a robust and fair framework for comparing the relative performance of options. We refute respondents' claim that the Route Option selection process was due to influence from the Mayor of Bedford. |
| Some people queried the case for EWR given the reduction in people commuting, the current economic climate, increase in costs and the housing in the ARC region not going ahead.<br><br>Some argued that the results of the IPA report show the Project is wasting public funds. | Developing the business case for the Project is an iterative process and we will make sure that we have a broad range of evidence to give decision makers a good understanding of the costs, benefits and strategic merits of the scheme.<br><br>We will learn from other comparable infrastructure projects to inform our approach to delivering the railway. We'll use a range of techniques to estimate costs and monitor and manage risk. This will include approaches such as reference class forecasting, sensitivity analysis, quantified risk analyses and optimism bias, in building the commercial case. Value engineering and innovative approaches to design, construction, and operation of the railway, will help us to monitor and manage costs to minimise the likelihood of overspend. More information regarding the business case for EWR can be found in Chapter 2 of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report. |
| There was support for Quenton Road Station, Calvert Station and other local stations between Winslow and Bicester, to link with HS2.<br><br>Concerns were raised that any reduction in services to London | We are not considering providing new stations (including at Quenton Road & Calvert) for the line between Bicester and Bletchley, other than the new station currently under construction at Winslow, as the extra land take and cost of constructing a new station, balanced with the benefit it would bring, is not warranted in these locations.<br><br>The ECML station is not designed to be a replacement for Sandy station or to have a negative impact on Sandy station.<br><br>Haslingfield: |

| | |
|---|---|
| from Sandy station would impact Sandy's viability.<br><br>It was pointed out that Haslingfield residents will have to drive to Cambourne to use EWR services to get into Cambridge which means driving in the opposite direction.<br><br>A query was received why no route appears to connect with the existing St Neots station.<br><br>A preference was voiced for a new East-West / North-West interchange train station south of Bedford. | EWR would provide connectivity between major areas of housing and employment. It would not be possible to connect to all conurbations along the route, whilst maintaining fast journey times. However, we will aim to align with other projects and services to contribute to an integrated transport solution for the region.<br><br>We will explore how we can provide new opportunities for sustainable travel to and from the stations that EWR serves. This will include ensuring that there is good access for pedestrians, cyclists, as well as good bus links. We will undertake a Transport Assessment of impact on the strategic and local highway networks, road safety, and local sustainable modes of transport, including public transport. Outcomes of this will initially be reported in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report published at the statutory consultation and then within Environmental Statement (ES) submitted as part of the DCO Application. The assessment will consider impact of construction on the road network, such as changes to existing traffic patterns because of predicted construction traffic and the suitability of roads, including those around the new station.<br><br>St Neots:<br>Enabling housing growth and contributing to transformational growth within the area is a key part of EWR's purpose. The use of a station within St Neots is not expected to enable the same level of housing development as we anticipate would be unlocked by a new station between St Neots and Sandy, which is why the preferred location for an ECML station is south of the existing St Neots station. However, EWR is committed to increasing prosperity and connectivity across the regionar, and therefore options to efficiently connect existing communities, such as St Neots, with EWR remains important and we will continue to develop proposals to enable easy accessibility for these communities, including through the provision of improved first mile / last mile connectivity, to our proposed network. In addition, routing EWR through St Neots station would increase the length of the alignment, thereby increasing cost and journey times.<br><br>Station South of Bedford:<br>In our preliminary selection of Route Option E in 2020, we took into account whether EWR should by-pass Bedford to the south or should serve the town centre directly. If EWR services don’t call at Bedford and Bedford St Johns stations then there would be no direct access to the town centre – with its housing, jobs and local facilities such as Bedford Hospital. Also, connections to other transport modes and rail services, including Thameslink and Midland Mainline services, would be less convenient, as would be the case if changing to a connecting service at the new station to reach the town centre. Additionally, any route passing to the south of Bedford would need to avoid housing and commercial developments at Wixams, which would require work on the site of the former Elstow landfill site. This work wouldn’t be required for a route alignment passing through Bedford station. |