Appendix 17: Table 12.3 - Engagement since the close of the 2021 consultation – Correspondence responses

Matter raised	EWR Co Response
It was suggested that all stations should have accessible toilets.	We understand the importance of free and inclusive toilets in stations, that are accessible for a wide range of users, and how this is fundamental to customer experience. EWR Co aim to design facilities that are accessible and inclusive for a diverse range of end users, including disabled people, older people and people with children. For example, providing disabled persons' toilets, baby changing and gender neutral toilets. EWR Co will take into account feedback from representative groups to which facilities will be best to provide at each station.
(1) A suggestion was made for cycle paths to follow along the EWR route, linking towns and villages and that trains should accommodate bikes. (2) One person asked EWR to include horse riding as a recognised form of active travel. (3) Comments were received regarding the need for improved, secure cycle and motorcycle parking at stations in particular Bicester Station and Oxford City.	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. Options for active travel could include new and improved walking and cycling routes, to provide a door-to-door service between the station and a customer's origin or destination. More information will be shared at the statutory consultation. We will work with local authorities and other modal operators (such as bus or cycle hire schemes) to ensure connectivity to and from our stations, thus enabling a more seamless door-to-door journey. More information will be shared at the statutory consultation. EWR stations could serve as 'community travel hubs', integrating the railway with the wider transport network – including bus, taxis, walking, cycling and emerging micro-mobility modes. 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. **Cycle facilities** We always consider the end-to-end journey including how our services can connect with other transport links. As we develop our station designs the provision of cycle facilities will be key to promote active travel to and from the station. We would look to provide CCTV at each of the new

	stations to provide optimum security for customer's bikes. The facilities we provide at stations will consider a range of cyclist needs and could include: • Different types of cycle racks based on suitability, accessibility, space, demand and ease of use. • Easy to access, and use, cycle repair kits. • Secure, 'controlled access' storage shelters. • Charging points for e-bikes and other electric-powered micro-mobility modes. • Hire facilities for cycles and micro-mobility, including those that are electric powered. Parking including for motorbikes will be considered within the design of our stations. **Cycle paths** The integration of the new railway into the local transport network, including cycle paths, has formed a key consideration in the decision-making to date. While further design work is required, we have placed a particular emphasis on how it can encourage people to access the new EWR stations by cycle. This will require further consideration to identify the correct solution for each local area, which might include new bridges or underpasses so that people can cross from one side of the railway to the other. **Horse riding** We are considering horse riding within the design of our alignments and scheme where appropriate and active travel strategies, including provision to maintain bridleways where practicable.
(1) Increased diesel trains will impact air quality. Diesel fumes have been closely linked with asthma and other respiratory diseases and there was concern about the impact on the health of residents. EWR must provide mitigations to keep air pollution at current levels or make a commitment to	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 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.

purchase properties impacted by a decline in air quality post implementation. A request was made for copies of air quality assessments to be made available.	We have considered the potential air quality impacts of the alignment options and presented the outcome of this in the Consultation Technical Report. Going forward, 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 a full 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. 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. 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.
(1) There is strong support for the Aylesbury Spur. A common concern raised was that it might not proceed. The Aylesbury Spur was seen as vital due to growing developments in the area. One commented that Buckingham Council has already spent funds on the assumption that this link would be built.	We are continuing to explore options on how to connect Aylesbury, and are in discussion with our colleagues in the Department for Transport and Network Rail. We are working with the Government to understand whether there is a viable business case to continue work on an Aylesbury connection.

(2) The Aylesbury Spur would allow people to get more easily to Milton Keynes for shopping, sport and entertainment - including the people of Tring West. An enquiry was made into whether there is still funding included for the Aylesbury section.	
(1) Concerns were expressed about the relocation of the Addison Road overbridge and the construction on Bromham Road bridge. (2) Queries were raised about the statement that no significant alterations will be needed to the bridge where the Shepreth Branch Royston Line crosses the A1301 and evidence which led to that conclusion was asked. Enquiries were made regarding the new bridge near Winslow station. A suggestion was made to build bridges with existing connections.	Addison Road overbridge is being rebuilt by HS2 for the East West Rail CS1 scheme as it sits within the EWR/HS2 Integration Area. The new bridge was constructed to increase the track height and headroom to enable the potential provision of electrification (overhead line) equipment in future. A new span of Bromham Road Bridge, north of Bedford station, would be required to make provision for a wider railway corridor to pass underneath the bridge. We recognise concerns about the disruption that this may cause and will undertake a Transport Assessment to inform the development of the proposals. The assessment will help to inform our approach to reducing and mitigating the disruption of any works to the bridge and roads as far as reasonably practicable. EWR services would use the existing Foxton branch lines and the existing rail alignment under the A1301 Cambridge Road. We do not expect a need to significantly alter the rail alignment at this location and therefore do not expect to have to undertake any significant alterations to this bridge. Further rail alignment and structure surveys shall be undertaken at the next stages of design to confirm the scope, if any, of necessary works. Regarding the new bridge at Winslow station there is a bridge at the new Winslow station that allows connectivity between the station buildings and the platforms. In addition as part of the CS1 works multiple new structures have been built near Winslow station, some to divert traffic running at track level to provide a safe means to cross the new railway, some to lift or strengthen ready for potential provision of electrification whilst others have been built to support future highway widening.
One comment praised the Project for creating jobs for young people and providing inspiration for them to join the rail industry.	We are aware people want to understand the specific benefits EWR will provide their local communities and businesses. As the design develops, we will be able to provide more detail on what these benefits will look like, and EWR will work with local authorities and communities to refine and shape these plans in line with Local Plans and wider development.

	More broadly, EWR will offer new, reliable, sustainable transport for people and businesses across the entire area and improve connectivity between key towns and cities including Oxford, Milton Keynes, Cambridge and beyond. It will significantly reduce journey times and provide safer, cheaper transport that's better for the customer, greener for the environment and will provide value for the taxpayer. Oxford and Cambridge are home to leading universities, life sciences companies and a manufacturing cluster known for high-performance technology and motorsport engineering, but people and businesses in between these two cities are being let down by a lack of transport solutions. EWR will bring this vibrant mix of communities an affordable and sustainable public transport alternative, linking people with jobs and access to new homes across the region. The National Infrastructure Commission estimated that creating these transport links and supporting the entire area will be worth nearly £80bn extra a year to the UK economy.
Concern was expressed that six rail tracks would be needed at Bedford Midland station and additional tracks from Harston to Great Shelford, which would lead to the demolition of houses in those areas. People have pointed to the evidence from the SLC study that EWR could operate on four tracks from Bedford Station. A query was received whether EWR factored in the reduced demand for commuter travel in their predictions for the need for additional tracks? Concern was also expressed over the widespread use of the maximum gradient for new track throughout the route but in particular within the first 8km leaving upon Bedford. A person asked when the tracks on the Aylesbury section will be upgraded to a double track.	The capacity of the rail infrastructure in and around Bedford is constrained, which means demand for infrastructure capacity cannot be fully satisfied during certain periods or a period of the day. Therefore sharing it with EWR services would be very challenging and would have significant operation risks related to the knock-on delays and disruption to EWR services from other service operators and vice versa. It would not be possible to fit the new EWR services into the timetable on the current four-track MML. This is because the timetable is driven by constraints further afield, for example, the timing of the GTR services through central London to the south coast, and the need to 'weave' freight services through the station area on specifically timed paths because of the high occupancy of platforms by GTR services. If the lines north of Bedford are shared between EWR and non-EWR services, these constraints mean that Thameslink and freight services would likely be prioritised in times of disruption and perturbation, because of the need to reduce knock-on effects across the wider network, increasing the performance risk to EWR. The punctuality if EWR services is critical to minimising congestion and performance issues for other operators who route share in and around the Bedford area – which is already categorised as congested infrastructure due to the amount of trains that pass the area per hour. The impact of delays has the potential to affect the wider geographical railway network due to increased interactions with services on numerous corridors running out of London to destinations across England, Wales and Scotland. The risk of delays transferring from EWR to MML or vice versa is substantially decreased with additional track capacity and therefore a reduction of direct interaction with the MML. In addition, it would be less complex to develop a timetable that is flexible enough to work around the existing services on the approaches to both Oxford and Cambridge.

	As a result, in developing proposals for the north of Bedford, several track options have been explored (as detailed in 8.5.7 – 8.5.98 of the 2021 Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report). The application of our Assessment Factors, which include capital cost, railway operations and transport user benefit considerations as well as environmental impacts and opportunities has resulted in our emerging preference for the construction of two additional tracks to the east of the existing MML tracks. The information that respondents have provided have not changed our emerging preference at this location. No Network Rail report which suggests an alternative track arrangement north of Bedford, has been produced. Network Rail are supportive of our proposal to develop the six-track option north of Bedford station. Since the 2021 consultation, we have undertaken further timetable and performance modelling of the level of service that can be provided using the existing four-track railway north of Bedford Station. The modelling assumptions and scope were validated and agreed with various stakeholders including train operators and Network Rail. The findings indicate that, even if the freight capacity growth enabled by previous investment by Network Rail on the Midland Main Line (MML) as part of the Corby enhancement scheme was curtailed, operating EWR services on the existing MML four-track north of Bedford Station remains poorer in operational terms than the six-track option and would form a bottleneck on the MML, and would constrain future growth of rail services in the area. Consequently, the six-track infrastructure option remains the emerging preferred option due to increased confidence in the integration of the EWR timetable. This position is shared by Network Rail. We absolutely recognise that the emerging preferred option of six tracks has the potential for demolition of homes in North Bedford and impact on communities. We are aware that EWR may affect people's homes and businesses, particularly in the Poets area of Bedford. The environmental impacts will be described in the PEIR, which will be shared at the statutory consultation. 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. We are continuing to explore options on how to connect Aylesbury with our colleagues in the Department for Transport and Network Rail. We are working with Government to understand whether there is a viable business case to continue work on an Aylesbury connection.

There was a significant amount of concern relating to the lack of a business case at the consultation stage and that it should include information about freight and the economic and transport benefits. Some also felt that the business case should consider road improvement schemes as well as the benefits of a busway from Milton Keynes to Cambridge.	We want to provide a much-needed transport connection for communities between Oxford and Cambridge. We'll aim to deliver a safe and secure railway, which is quicker, greener, and cheaper for the taxpayer. We are developing a 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. 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. 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. **HM Treasury information** We will follow Government guidance, procedure and best practice when we create 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. 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.

	More information on cost estimates will be presented at our statutory consultation. EWR recognise that there could be benefits from other transport schemes such as road improvements, and a busway from Milton Keynes to Cambridge, however they are not part of the EWR Scheme.
(1) EWR Co were asked what they meant by a "Net Zero Carbon Railway" and asked for EWR's modelling of the carbon footprint from journeys by rail. (2) Concern was expressed that Route E was the least carbon efficient of the five proposed routes and that route E was concluded to be the most environmentally friendly route. (3) Concern was expressed at the failure to conduct carbon calculations and comparisons at the route selection stage in 2019. A query was also received about the parameters used for the assessments. (4) Another concern was that EWR will release large amounts of carbon during construction.	(1, 2, 3 and 4) - We will aim to deliver a net zero carbon railway, in line with existing and developing net zero carbon policy, legislation and commitments at a global, national and local level, which requires the UK to reach net zero Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by 2050. Any decision to grant development consent for EWR will need to demonstrate that it would not have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets. As detailed in the Consultation Technical Report (Section 3.5) provided as part of the 2021 non-statutory consultation, we have considered environmental factors, including GHGs, as part of developing the proposed route alignments for EWR. As the project advances, we'll continue to develop our approach to delivering on our net zero ambition and we will share further information on this at the statutory consultation. More information about Route Option E and the environmental impact is available in Chapter 4 of this report. In 2019, we consulted on five possible route options for EWR. Our decision to choose Route E as our preferred route resulted from the was firmly rooted in the feedback we received from local communities, in which it was identified as the most popular option. Route E also received the highest score on four of the five key assessment criteria: benefits for transport users, environmental considerations, supporting economic growth and supporting new homes. Detailed economic modelling indicated that Route E would provide the greatest benefits for transport users and would contribute to wider economic benefits. One of our reasons for selecting Route E was that Bedford would receive more benefits from EWR trains stopping in the town centre. We are updating the business case for EWR as the Project develops, which demonstrates the Project benefits. Further details will be shared at the statutory consultation. To help inform the options shared in the 2019 consultation and the preferred route option decision published in 2020, we carried out various types of analysis. This included a high-level appraisal of transport user-related carbon emissions, in line with the requirements of the Department for Transport's

	(DfT's) Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) Unit A3. At that time, it was not a requirement to carry out capital carbon assessments as part of that process. Since the non-statutory consultation, we have carried out a qualitative appraisal of the embodied carbon for the route options we consulted on in 2019 and presented in 2020. In summary, this demonstrated that: • Route options with longer lengths of viaducts (such as those which cross longer lengths of flood plains) are likely to have higher embodied carbon. • Route options with a better cut-fill balance of material (where excavated material is re-used to build embankments and other structures) are likely to have lower embodied carbon. This is because there is less need to export surplus material for disposal elsewhere, or to import extra material during construction. In this regard, Route Option E performed well compared to other route options, including Route Option B passing to the south of Bedford and serving Cambourne. Minor differences in capital carbon emissions between route options do not have a major impact on EWR's Net Zero Carbon Railway ambition, and would thus not be considered a significant differentiator. As mentioned above, the PEIR will describe the likely environmental effects of EWR, both adverse and beneficial. It will include information regarding the methodology used to assess the significance of the carbon emissions associated with the Project, the carbon management and reduction approaches already in place, and those which will be used during construction and operation. We will share this at the statutory consultation. We will then submit an Environmental Statement as part of the DCO application and will include a full whole-life assessment of carbon emissions, including the embodied carbon of the materials used to construct the railway, which will make up a significant proportion of the total emissions. The significance of those emissions against regional, national and/or international carbon budgets and targets will be set out.
(1) Some commented that there was a lack of communication with residents living in properties under threat of demolition and nearby roads and a lack of clarity on	(1) 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.

timescales about the future of houses in the Poets area. (2) Some recommendations were made for the EWR website for example to add a community forum web page, Project information showing progress and targets including CS1 and making it easier to find documents. Suggestion were also made for a local Twitter account and a professional planning newsletter in addition to the general newsletter. Some challenges were received about some of the statements used by EWR Co such as '71% of local residents support a new transport link between Oxford and Cambridge' and 'Overall, rail freight delivers £2.45 billion in economic and social benefits to the UK every year'.	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. 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. 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. Statements and statistics used in our documents and website pages are taken from reputable and verifiable government and industry sources and checked by EWR experts. 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.
(1) Requests were received for information on the claims procedure including Compulsory Purchase Orders and claims for blight. (2) People asked what compensation there would be for residents and businesses for the various impacts of the Project including the	(1, 2) 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. 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.

construction phase, such as the increase in noise levels and traffic, the devaluation of properties and the impact on mental health. They also asked whether legal fees would be reimbursed. People also asked what EWR will put in place to help people wishing to move or struggling to sell their property due to the project, but that are not subject to a compulsory purchase order.	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. 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. 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. 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. 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.
There was concern that the compulsory purchase of homes will leave properties	The security and safety of homes, residents and communities will be considered during the compulsory purchase process and construction, with mitigations put in place as appropriate.

empty and encourage anti-social behaviour in an area.	
Concern was expressed that new roads created to accommodate EWR will create further congestion. Queries were also received about how EWR will reduce traffic congestion, in particular around the train stations. There was concern that the proposals from the developers do not address the volume of transport that will be generated by the new proposals. Major new routes will be required to access Milton Keynes and the main roads (M1, A5 etc).	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 including the M1 and A5, road safety, local sustainable modes of transport, including public transport of changing current barrier operations. 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. The assessment will consider impacts of the closure of level crossings at the various stages of delivery of the railway. This assessment will focus on the changes to existing traffic patterns because of predicted closures and the suitability of the surrounding infrastructure and environment to accommodate this additional demand. We will explore how we can provide new opportunities for sustainable travel to and from EWR stations, 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. Any mitigation will be set out in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which will be submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO). Compliance with the CoCP will be secured through the requirements of the DCO itself.
(1) It was felt that previous consultations had not been sufficiently promoted and that some people were unaware of the consultation and project. (2) A complaint was made that the 2019 consultation did not include information relating to freight, costing and environmental	(1, 2, 3) 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. 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

impacts. It was also stated that the impact of the proposed embankments was unclear at the time of the consultation. The point was made that had this been clear at the consultation then local people would have engaged much more. Concern was also expressed that it was not clear to many consultees that Bedford station may need to operate on six rail tracks or that the line would accommodate diesel trains with significant levels of freight. (3) A concern was expressed that the 2019 consultation was unfair. Queries were also made about the land purchases taking place during the consultation and the influence of private landowners and developers. (4) Some felt that a new consultation should be launched to consider the Northern approach into Cambridge and to include side by side carbon calculations for all routes and costs. There was much concern that the costs of the original routes presented changed without a satisfactory explanation. (5) A query was raised why the parish councils of Clapham, Ravensden and Wilden were not considered as a prescribed consultee in the 2019 consultation. (6) People queried when the findings from the 2021 consultation would be made available and when the next consultation is planned for.	document for the 2021 consultation, and we expect this approach will also be taken for any future rounds of consultation. 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. 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. 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. (4) Approaching Cambridge from the north was considered as part of the initial work led by Network Rail in 2018 - 2019 to identify a broad route corridor, and then again in further detail in 2019, both before and after the analysis of feedback from the non-statutory consultation. All EWR Co's work and assessment indicates that the best option remained for EWR services to approach Cambridge from the south. During the 2019 consultation we received a range of comments on the prioritisation of these southern approach route options, including a response from CamBedRailRoad (CBRR). Acknowledging this and using further technical information we then carried out additional work to assess the case for a northern approach prior to the preferred route option being selected and announced in 2020. As part of the second non-statutory consultation in 2021, we back-checked our decision and concluded there were not sufficient reasons to re-open the previous conclusion that approaching Cambridge from the South is the preferred option for EWR. We published extensive information on this in Appendix F of

(7) The need to consult was questioned once the route alignment and station locations are announced. (8) Concerns were raised about the length of non-statutory consultation, that the (second) consultation was obfuscated by the input of CBBR, a pressure group formed by a number of self-serving individuals with interests sited along the most economical route 'Option A'.	our consultation Technical Report. The information presented during the 2021 consultation went through a thorough review and assurance process and we consider the detail presented in Appendix F to be accurate. As mentioned, work undertaken since the 2021 consultation indicates that the NATC could potentially have a lower construction cost than the SATC. However, the 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. Due to the greater length of viaduct and embankments required in the NATC design presented within Appendix F of the Non-Statutory Consultation Technical Report, the NATC would have greater embodied carbon and require far more imported materials than the SATC. However, the updated NATC design has reduced bridge and embankment works and reduced works within Cambridge and the SATC is now expected to include a greater volume of earthworks than the NATC. This would mean that the revised NATC design would represent an improvement compared to the SATC in terms of overall embodied carbon. 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 select the SATC as our preferred approach to Cambridge. You can read more about our reasons for this in the Route Update Report. (5) The previous consultation was a Non-Statutory Consultation. We are required to consult widely with the public and with a range of prescribed bodies and stakeholder groups as set out by the Planning Act 2008 and associated Regulations. We will seek to go beyond this, however, by engaging with a wider range of interested groups and bodies across the region. Ahead of statutory consultation, we will engage local authorities along the route to understand what additional groups and organisations there are in the wider region we should consider engaging and consulting as part of the statutory consultation. We will then set this out in a Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). We will be seeking feedback on our preferred alignment as part of the statutory consultation where residents, communities and other stakeholders will be able to provide feedback on the updated route design. We ran the consultation for ten full weeks, which we considered to be reasonable for a project of this type and at this stage of development. Details about the consultation were available online

	throughout the period. There will be a further consultation in due course, which will give communities a further opportunity to comment on the proposals. We ran an extensive advertising and communications process to promote the 2021 consultation along the route. This included posting consultation information directly to 270,000 households, 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 outlets. Local representatives including parishes, councillors and Members of Parliament were also briefed in advance of the consultation launch so they could pass information to their constituents and communities. More than 9000 pieces of feedback were received by us, raising over 190,000 matters, all of which have been considered in detail. (6)(7) The statutory consultation will be held in the first half of 2024. (8) We do not believe that anyone, or any organisation (such as CBBR) had an undue influence in relation to the development of the proposals for the new railway. The consultation was open to anyone and we have and will take into account all relevant matters when taking decisions about the Project, including consultation feedback. All feedback we received following the 2021 consultation was analysed by an independent company before being carefully considered alongside our own technical research, development and design work to progress design work and inform the proposals. All feedback is considered fairly as part of our review process.
(1) Many questions were received about the cost of the Project and there was concern about the rise in estimated project costs. Some queried the Project's financial viability. (2) Various concerns were expressed regarding costs: - Concerns about the additional cost of £499.6M taking into account the creation of a grade-separated Shepreth Branch Junction	(1,2) As set out in our answer to the 'Business case' section of this chapter, we will follow Government guidance, procedure and best practice when we create 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. 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

- Concerns about the additional costs of the railway tunnelling under roads and rivers (Cam, Bourn Brook), Chapel/Money Hill. (3) There were significant concerns about the changes in cost profiles for route A to E and concerns that the public have been misled about the costs and recommendations surrounding route E. (4) Queries were received as to how EWR Co is modelling for the increases in running and energy costs and expected rail ticket prices, given inflation pressure, and whether EWR have re-adjusted the estimates.	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. The current cost estimates include for the full infrastructure design and include for the risk of additional works being required. More information on cost estimates will be presented at the statutory consultation. (3, 4) 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. 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. Although the NATC design presented at the 2021 consultation was expected to be more expensive to build, 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 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. We will continue work to assess the costs associated with EWR, including mitigation measures and capital costs, as the design of the route continues. Along with our operating partners, we will set fares to make sure that the service offers value for money and is inclusive to as many people as possible. Fares will be simple to understand and tickets easy to buy, in line with the rail industry's fares reform programme, which seeks to increase the trust in the railway and remove both economic and convenience barriers to travel.

A person was concerned that due to the current economy EWR will not be an affordable mode of transport.	The cost of constructing the route is not linked to fares, but fares will contribute to the operating costs as it does across the UK network. Along with our operating partners, we will set fares to make sure that the service offers value for money and is inclusive to as many people as possible. Fares will be simple to understand and tickets easy to buy, in line with the rail industry's fares reform programme, which seeks to increase the trust in the railway and remove both economic and convenience barriers to travel.
A request was received about the number of properties that would be demolished along the route.	We are aware that EWR may affect people's homes and businesses, particularly in the Poets area of Bedford, and we will aim to reduce and mitigate negative impacts such as those raised in the consultation feedback as far as reasonably practicable. We are still in the early stages of developing designs for EWR and we have further design and approval stages to move through before the plans are finalised and we can confirm the need to acquire any land. Nonetheless, at every stage of the Project we are committed to talking to all those who could potentially be directly affected by the railway. During the consultation, we contacted all potentially affected landowners, and we also ran a separate consultation, which included specific consultation questions around land, including the Need to Sell Scheme.
Suggestions were made to investigate the cost and use of diesel-electric hybrid engines, overhead line islands for battery powered trains or for battery powered trains to run like a shuttle.	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. 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. 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.
(1) There was concern that journey time calculations are skewed in favour of rail travel as most journeys do not begin and end at railway stations.	Journey times are taken from stations on route to enable reasonable comparison between railway alignment options and to provide an indication of the differences between key modes of travel. We consider that the best way to provide competitive journey times, while also encouraging people to use our services without reliance on the private car, is to use a combination of centrally located stations with

(2) People told us that a lack of stations, between Cambourne and South Cambridge, means that residents will still need to travel far for their nearest station and that this will not reduce congestion. (3) There was encouragement for EWR to engage readily with public transport services.	good access to other transport modes and connecting train services as well as implementing measures to integrate the new EWR stations into the wider local transport network, including footpaths and cycle paths. 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, notably within Cambridge. Consideration has been given to access to suitable road infrastructure, potential demand and viability of adjacent development in choosing station locations. There are no stations proposed as part of the SATC between Cambourne and Cambridge South. Whilst there is not considered to be sufficient demand at other locations on the SATC routes to justify an additional station stop in terms of cost and additional journey time, the SATC design does not preclude the possible construction of additional stations at a future time. We will work with local stakeholders to aim to develop an integrated planning approach, promoting and prioritising both active and sustainable transport modes, including the provision of secure cycle parking facilities and safe walking and cycling routes. As part of the station design, we will consider pedestrian and cycle access in and around the station, based on user needs. This will be presented in more detail at the statutory consultation. We will also continue working with other organisations, including bus operators, to seek to improve facilities, including interfaces and interchange with bus services at stations, and the provision of onward travel information. EWR stations are able to integrate into the wider transport network across all modes – including bus, walking and cycling. 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. While further design work is required, we have placed a particular emphasis on how it can encourage people to access the new EWR stations by cycle. This will require further consideration to identify the correct solution for each local area, which might include new bridges or underpasses so that people can

	cross from one side of the railway to the other, or potentially cycle paths running alongside the railway line where these would integrate into the wider area and improve connectivity.
(1) Suggestions were made to hold a community event in additional locations such as Little and Great Shelford, Bow Brickhill, Hauxton, Trumpington, St Neots, Clapham, Renhold, Wilden, Ravensden and in a location that serves the residents who live North of the A428, and work at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. (2) Comments were made that community events should not be arranged during school holidays and that updates should be made online so that people who cannot attend in person will have the opportunity to comment.	Between May and October 2022, we held a total of 10 public information events across the route, attended by almost 1,500 people, so that people could meet our team face-to-face, get updates on the project and ask us any questions they had. As part of ongoing stakeholder engagement further series of drop-in events are being arranged, and the locations mentioned by the respondent will be considered. We note the comment regarding arranging events during school holidays, but some clashes will inevitably be unavoidable. On-line material and the ability to comment online should be made available for future consultations.
(1) Many expressed the wish for EWR to be electrified from the start and if not possible that future provision should be made for electrification of EWR. Questions were asked about the cost and noise of electrification and the environmental impact. (2) It was suggested that decoupling the Eastern leg (not due to be electrified until around 2050) would enable EWR to be built fully electric from the start, without the need to run expensive hybrid trains.	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 would 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. This includes the use of greener traction power in the long term. While diesel trains are being used for the start of services to enable the earliest possible 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. As such, we are considering the most appropriate solution, including hydrogen power and full or part electrification, for the long-term train fleet and infrastructure. Information about this aspect of the Project will be provided at the statutory consultation.

(3) Some recommended the use of hydrogen cells.	We are considering the most appropriate solution and possible costs, including hydrogen power and full or part electrification, for the long-term train fleet and infrastructure. We'll consider resilience for all weather conditions, and any potential future impacts brought about by climate change, as part of the design for any of the infrastructure and its supporting systems. New sections of the railway would be designed with passive provision for potential future electrification. 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. We will use existing diesel trains for the start of services on CS1 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. We'll seek to include specific measures within the design to reduce the impact of the Project on the surrounding environment during construction and operation. For example, measures to reduce railway noise may be mitigated by noise barriers and consideration of different track technologies and types of train that may be used in EWR's long-term train fleet. Whilst during construction the railway, including where electrification works are required, we will look at the methods and equipment to reduce potential noise impacts as far as reasonably practicable.
(1) Concern was expressed on the devastating impact of embankments and viaducts on the local landscape and the nearby villages. The embankments would create a barrier between several communities e.g. Haslingfield, Harlton, Barrington, Harston and Newton will be cut off from one another.	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. 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, further enhancing our understanding in this area

(2) Concerns were also expressed about the proposed route cutting through the historically important Chapel Hill at Haslingfield. (3) An objection was made to the proposed viaducts at St Neots and one respondent suggested that the railway needs to be at ground level or below not on a 30ft embankment. However, there was concern also that if the height of the embankments is reduced then the depth of the cutting into Chapel Hill in Haslingfield will need to be increased which will have a significant impact on the landscape.	from the 2021 consultation. 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. We appreciate the concerns around the impacts on countryside and will work to identify and reduce impacts, including at Chapel Hill wherever reasonably practicable. The preferred southern approach to Cambridge and the preferred route alignment, which performs best against the Assessment Factor criteria for the new railway, means that EWR would pass through Chapel Hill. We are developing the design and considering options to reduce the potential impacts on Chapel Hill. 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. In this area the railway needs to cross major roads, the East Coast Mainline and River Great Ouse, as well as through areas of floodplain. Therefore, constructing it at ground level or below ground would significantly increase impacts on existing infrastructure, costs, construction and operational risks and environmental impacts. 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.
Some people felt that not enough engagement took place during covid restrictions, and that better and direct	We were bound by UK Government guidance during the pandemic in 2021 that restricted meetings and events held in public spaces. As an alternative, we aimed to deliver an accessible online consultation with

communication is needed especially with residents of the Poets area as well as other directly affected residents.	opportunities for the public and stakeholders to ask technical teams and experts questions while receiving answers in a timely manner. In addition, we provided parish councils along the route with packs to enable them to share physical materials. Physical documents could also be ordered through an online order form on our website, or by getting in touch with our team. Physical copies of both Appendices and Technical Drawings were available upon request. Innovations such as the virtual consultation rooms, visited by 4,500 people, the consultation website, visited by 45,000 people, the online library where all documents were (and remain) available for download, and 18 webinars and 16 live-chat events, enabled thousands of people to view proposals at a time convenient to them. The virtual consultation rooms were designed to mimic and in-person consultation room as much as possible. With this in mind, and much like an in-person event, we decided to launch the rooms two weeks after the consultation started. This also gave time for the initial consultation summary booklets – over 270,000 in total across the route – to arrive and for people to consider them. We are aware that EWR may affect people's homes and businesses, particularly in the Poets area of Bedford, and we will aim to reduce and mitigate negative impacts such as those raised in the consultation feedback as far as reasonably practicable. We are still in the early stages of developing designs for EWR and we have further design and approval stages to move through before the plans are finalised and we can confirm the need to acquire any land. Nonetheless, at every stage of the project we are committed to talking to all those who could potentially be directly affected by the railway. During the consultation, we contacted all potentially affected landowners, and we also ran a separate consultation, which included specific consultation questions around land, including the Need to Sell Scheme. During May 2022, we contacted over 450 landowners and occupiers and held 45 in-person meetings with potentially directly affected landowners and occupiers in the Poets area of Bedford. Where land is acquired or proposed to be acquired, the Compensation Code sets out the circumstances in which compensation is payable. More information is available in the Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation on our website.

	If an individual is unable to sell their property due to EWR, they could be eligible to sell their property to us in accordance with the proposed Need to Sell Scheme which will be introduced at Route Update Announcement. In terms of impacts on homes during the construction process, further details on how we would monitor, control and manage these will be provided in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), or similar, which will be submitted to the Secretary of State as part of the DCO application. This would look at developing proposals that consider the impact on local residents, including the type of walls used to separate the railway from residential areas, the location of green space and additional planting to improve the aesthetic and to reduce noise. Compliance with the CoCP will be secured as part of the DCO itself.
(1) General concerns were expressed about the impact of EWR, the embankments, diesel trains and the construction will have on the environment along the route including the Cambridgeshire countryside and Harlton's ancient landscape. Concerns were also expressed about the impact of a grade separated junction/viaduct in green belt/ecological areas, and the impact on a Scheduled Monument in Great Shelford. (2) Many expressed concerns about the environmental damage that the East West Rail route will cause across Bedfordshire. (3) A concern was raised that the environmental assessments are inadequate as consideration was only given to locations with formal designations such as green belt, AONB, SSSIs and heritage assets. (4) It was felt that EWR contradicts the government commitments to protect green space and to tackle the climate crisis and	Assessing the potential impact of EWR on the environment is a fundamental part of our design process. We'll carefully consider the setting and context of landscapes and historic views, to look at how the development could 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 could be used to soften the appearance of embankments and integrate them into the wider landscape context; or how the sensitive placement of appropriate planting could be used to screen views from sensitive receptors or soften the appearance and presence of engineering earthworks. Environmental Benefit We consider the importance of environmental sustainability in the activities and the decisions made in order to ensure that the Project is designed, constructed, operated and maintained in an environmentally responsible manner that minimises negative environmental impacts as far a reasonably practicable. We are determined to be an industry leader on environmental sustainability across the whole life cycle of the Project. We aim not just to reduce impact but to realise opportunities to enhance the environment in line with the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan and our own vision for the East West Rail Project. We aim to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment; to be a net zero carbon railway; to ensure the resilience of the infrastructure; and to contribute to the wellbeing of communities and customers. The company will identify elements of the programme activities that could result in significant environmental effects, primarily by undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment in accordance with UK legislation, which will be informed by associated environmental assessment and environmental survey activities. Use of sustainable materials

concerns were raised about potential flooding. (5) Queries were raised as to how EWR will reduce pollution, including the impact on shrubbery land and the potential disappearance of woodland and forests. EWR were asked how they will mitigate the impact on the flora and fauna. Another comment was made about the amount of work the National Trust has done to increase biodiversity in the Wimpole area which would be irreversibly destroyed by the proposed rail line. The foraging by wildlife can be seen to go far and wide beyond the railway line.	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 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. This will follow key aims of designing out waste and pollution wherever practicable, reusing materials and products where possible, and making the most out of the natural environment. 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. Route Option E Selection Our assessment factor process looks at how well different route options meet the overall Project objectives. They help us to determine the benefits of each option for customers, as well as the broader communities EWR will serve. These assessment factors have been agreed with the UK Government and provide a robust framework for comparing the relative performance of options. Information about the selection of Option Route E is included in Chapter 4 of this report. Biodiversity We are committed to protecting the environment by finding approaches to delivery that either avoid or reduce any negative environmental impacts as far as reasonably practicable. As part of this, we have committed to delivering 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) along the EWR route.10% BNG requires that habitats for wildlife are enhanced and left in a measurably better state than they were pre-development. This approach supports the government's 25-year Environment Plan. 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. Further information on plans for achieving 10% BNG will be provided during the statutory consultation.

	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. 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. 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. 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. Flooding Our work is ongoing in this area, and we regularly engage with the Environment Agency, to share information, data and modelling to support this work. We aim to extend this engagement to include relevant LLFAs, Internal Drainage Boards and other key stakeholders. Further information on flood risk and drainage will be shared at the statutory consultation. In line with the requirements of current national planning policy, we will undertake detailed flood risk assessments to help inform the design process, especially where the route crosses major floodplains and has the potential to impact on flood risk elsewhere. These assessments will consider flood risk over the lifetime of EWR – accounting and planning for the effects of climate change – and will be informed by hydrological and hydraulic modelling where necessary. The design of EWR, in line with regulatory requirements, will ensure that the railway is resilient to flooding and that it does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

	We will look at ways to reduce flood risk by considering appropriate flood protection measures, including drainage design and flood compensation. Protecting local communities from flooding is one of the Project's key environmental principles. Additionally, in light of the increasing frequency and severity of extreme weather events associated with climate change, best industry practice and new standards, the condition and capacity of the railway drainage systems are also being reviewed with a view to reducing the future risk of the railway flooding
(1) A request was made for more information on the plans for freight but support was expressed for freight on the EWR route and to destinations further afield as this will diminish freight transport on the roads. (2) There was concern about the lack of clarity about the volume, frequency, and timing of freight services on the line including night-time due to the potential blight of noise and vibrations. People asked what monitoring will be put in place to assess noise levels. (3) A concern was raised that the proposed freight will impact property values. (4) A model was shared showing a potential benefit both financially and in energy saving (30% energy reduction) if an optimised design for freight and energy can be achieved which would also aid planning over longer distances for example from Felixstowe to Cardiff. The freight solution would connect Oxford and Cambridge in 68min.	(1, 2) EWR is principally intended to be a passenger route. It is, though, being designed to maintain current capacity for freight trains on the existing railway and we are considering the potential for future growth in demand for rail freight. We don't yet know how much freight would use the railway, as this is subject to government policy and market demand – and we haven't confirmed the exact operating hours for the railway. As set out in the 2021 consultation, we currently envisage that EWR could accommodate roughly one freight train per hour in each direction, although the actual number of freight services is a matter for the wider industry and freight operators. The preferred route approaching Cambridge from the south would enable freight trains to use the Newmarket line, enabling onward journeys. The design does not require additional infrastructure to be constructed within Coldham's Common or Cherry Hinton. In 2018, the Government challenged the rail industry to remove all diesel only trains from the network by 2040, and EWR Co are committed to running a sustainable railway. EWR Co are currently looking at how EWR Co 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 statutory consultation. 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 will 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. We will present emerging findings in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which will be available during the statutory consultation. The final results of our assessments will be set out in an Environmental Statement that's submitted alongside the DCO.

(5) A suggestion was made to consider Stewartby for a rail freight terminal as there is spacious industrial land near the M1 and it is completely flat. Concern was raised that rail freight terminals might be built on green belt land. (6) A request was made for further information on an eastern junction to assist freight trains from Felixstowe on north/south journies. (7) Clarification was requested on the frequency and impact of freight services for residents of South Cambridgeshire and neighbouring counties. (8) Concerns were raised about deliberately driving forward a design which inevitably routes a large number of freight trains through Cambridge station and onward via Coldhams Common, Cherry Hinton and points east.	We will 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. 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 Project, we will continue to work to identify and reduce any impacts that can't be avoided and work closely with people who could be affected. (3) Compensation is also available for properties in proximity to the new railway which may be affected by various physical factors of the operation of the railway once it is in use, this is referred to as Part 1 compensation for which we included a guide on the website – Guide to Part 1 claims Also, we will be introducing a Need to Sell scheme at Preferred Route Announcement to assist people with a pressing need to sell but unable due to the Project. We consulted on a proposed Need to Sell scheme at the same time as the main Non-Statutory Consultation and the details for the Guide to the Need to Sell scheme are available here: The Guide to the Proposed Need to Sell Scheme. 4) We will consider the model shared, however, EWR is principally intended to be a passenger route. It is, though, being designed to maintain current capacity for freight trains on the existing railway and we are considering the potential for future growth in demand for rail freight. This remit would not include constructing rail freight terminals or optimising the route for freight at the expense of passenger services. However, wider connectivity is important to us and are working closely with Network Rail on proposals including how best to link existing services with the wider rail network, including services to Felixstowe to Cardiff. This will be factored into the process to design future timetables. (5) Consideration of a freight terminal at Stewartby is not within the remit of the EWR scheme, but we will work with Network Rail and freight stakeholders to facilitate such schemes.

	(6) The EWR scheme does not include an eastern junction to assist freight trains from Felixstowe on north/south journeys. However, the preferred route approaching Cambridge from the south would enable freight trains to use the Newmarket, enabling onward journeys. (7) EWR is principally intended to be a passenger route. It is, though, being designed to maintain current capacity for freight trains on the existing railway and we are considering the potential for future growth in demand for rail freight. We don't yet know how much freight would use the railway, as this is subject to government policy and market demand – and we haven't confirmed the exact operating hours for the railway. As set out in the 2021 consultation, we currently envisage that EWR could accommodate roughly one freight train per hour in each direction, although the actual number of freight services is a matter for the wider industry and freight operators.
There was concern that the connectivity and economic growth claims are being used as a veil for house building on green spaces and prime agricultural land which was seen as unsustainable. EWR was called to be more disciplined in balancing the interests of developers and landowners versus local communities, the environment and access to the countryside.	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 have 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. 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. We consider the importance of environmental sustainability in the activities and the decisions made in order to ensure that the Project is designed, constructed, operated and maintained in an environmentally responsible manner that minimises negative environmental impacts as far a reasonably practicable. We are determined to be an industry leader on environmental sustainability across the whole life cycle of the Project. We aim not just to reduce impact but to realise opportunities to enhance the environment in line with the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan and our own vision for the East West Rail Project. We aim to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment; to be a net zero carbon railway; to ensure the resilience of the infrastructure; and to contribute to the wellbeing of

	communities and customers. The company will identify elements of the programme activities that could result in significant environmental effects, primarily by undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment in accordance with UK legislation, which will be informed by associated environmental assessment and environmental survey activities. This will include details on the mitigations that have been proposed to avoid and reduce potential environmental impacts. 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.
Concerns were raised about the impact of EWR on connectivity to shops, schools, green spaces, allotments and local amenities in Haslingfield, Harlton and Great Eversden and accessing ROW in Roxton. Several respondents raised their concerns about the negative impact on the lives and villages in South Cambridgeshire such as Toft, Cambourne and Hardwick. A suggestion was made to honour the brickmaking history in Marston Vale as has been done at Swinton station in Yorkshire, which has a display of 60 different types of locally produced bricks on show on its station forecourt. The suggestion was made to do something similar on the Bedford to Bletchley line. Other queries included: -Access between property and public right of way	**Access to countryside and environmental impact** We appreciate the concerns around the impacts on the countryside and access to green spaces, and we will work to identify and reduce impacts and protect the countryside wherever reasonably practicable. To help reduce impacts, we are following the environmental mitigation hierarchy which firstly seeks to avoid significant adverse effects on the countryside 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 BNG, supporting the UK Government's 25-year Environment Plan. Impact on local communities We understand that severance is a significant concern to people living in homes and villages, such as those north of Bedford, and in Harston, Roxton, Haslingfield, Harlton and Great Eversden, in the vicinity of the railway. In developing our proposals, we have aimed to minimise the negative impact this may have on communities, including Toft, Cambourne and Hardwick, and in particular people's homes, inevitably with an infrastructure project of this size, there will be some people who could be directly affected. We will continue to work to mitigate any impacts we cannot avoid and work closely with people who could be affected. 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 and still enable the benefits of Alignment 1

-An enquiry was made into whether EWR has any provision for grants to local communities affected by the EWR project. -Concerns raised for how the project will impact Harston. -Concern raised for how the project will impact Roxton. -Concern station locations could cause subsequent development which may impact local services, infrastructure and water resources -Concern was raised that the East West Rail link going through North Bedfordshire will impact the quiet countryside and bring no benefit to residents.	elsewhere on the route to be secured, thereby performing better than Alignment 9 in terms of environmental impact and cost. All Route Alignments options could have the potential to create some level of severance between communities and services, although measures are put in place to mitigate such severance at later design stages. The potential impacts on other villages/communities have been taken into account in the overall assessment of community impacts. The option appraisal detailed in Appendix E of the NSC Technical Report includes a variety of environmental assessment factors, including noise and vibration impacts, air quality, impacts to the community, visual impact, and agriculture and farmland. These were all taken into account in the assessment of route alignment options, and overall, Route Alignment 1 is considered a major improvement to the Reference Case (Route Alignment 8). We are committed to ensuring so far as reasonably practicable that EWR is able to mitigate disruption during the planning, construction and operation of the Project. This includes reducing the impact to communities from any crossing closures by providing reasonable alternatives where possible. 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 statutory consultation. We will prepare a Transport Assessment to consider the impact on the strategic and local highway network, road safety and local sustainable modes of transport, including public transport. It will also set out the impact of construction on the road network, including changes to existing traffic patterns because of predicted construction traffic. This will include consideration of access and impact to the A507. We aim to enable sustainable housing and economic growth. We are carefully considering how the development can be designed to blend in with the local environment. This will include considering the use of landscape earthworks to soften the appearance of embankments and integrate them into the wider landscape context or using sensitive placement of appropriate planting or façade treatments, such brickwork which responds to the local character, to either screen views from sensitive receptors, or to soften the appearance and presence of engineering earthworks. In relation to future developments, this would be considered through a separate planning process and is not being promoted by EWR. We have been monitoring the progress of new and emerging development plans across the area, including in Bedford Borough, Central Bedfordshire and the proposed Greater

	Cambridge Local Plan. The allocation of land for development is a matter for local planning authorities. Whilst the location of EWR stations might facilitate this, it is important to note that impacts on local services, infrastructure and water resources as a result of third party development is a matter for the assessment of those developments and not EWR Co. In addition, the railway is also intended to provide new connections for existing settlements, residents and businesses – not just future development. Station location and design The design of the route is at an early stage, however, we will continue to consider suggestions for station location and design elements and features as we develop the design further, including a possible reference to brick making on the MVL. Such consideration will include the impact on local services, infrastructure and water resources Benefits for communities Rural communities will benefit from improved connectivity either via new stations or improved access to existing stations in their local area. 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. 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 – making it easier to get from Milton Keynes to Leeds or Cambridge to Manchester, as well as improved connections to international airports at Luton and Stansted. We are considering the introduction of a community fund, however we are currently in the early planning stage for this and have not made a commitment or identified the details of this potential fund,

	including who could benefits and how and under whose control it could operate. We will develop our thinking and share proposals at a later stage. Access We are seeking to maintain existing PRoW and 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. 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. Since consultation we have moved the alignment slightly to the east and amended the design to run in cutting beneath the B1046 Comberton Road, between Comberton and Toft. This means with a minor realignment of the road a direct connection can be maintained between the two towns and the impact on Cambridge Meridian Golf Club has been mitigated. <u>Impacts on Harston</u> The design solution will consider impacts on Harston, particularly due to the proximity to the new rail line. We will seek to include specific measures within the design to reduce the impact of the Project on the surrounding environment during construction and operation. For example, measures to reduce visual intrusion may include the use of landscaping and screening, whilst railway noise may be mitigated by noise barriers and consideration of different track technologies and types of train that may be used in EWR's long-term train fleet.
(1) Concern was expressed about the effects of construction on nearby residents during the day and at night-time and the subsequent sleep deprivation some residents will experience. A request was made to restrict construction work during the day-time hours. It was also felt that adequate compensation should be offered to residents	(1) In terms of impacts on homes during the construction process, mitigation measures for construction impacts will be set out in a Code of Construction Practice or an equivalent document. This will include measures to control impacts related to construction noise and vibration, air quality, contaminated land, ecology, historic environment, construction traffic, tree protection, surface and groundwater management, waste management and general site operations. In addition, it will state permissible contractor working hours. Our teams will continue to engage with local people and communities to understand the arrangements which are least disruptive to people's lives and businesses.

who are disrupted by demolitions and construction works. (2) An enquiry was received as to when construction would start between Bletchley and Bedford and the rest of the line and how long it will take to deliver the project. (3) People asked for details of any road closures, cycle route closures or any traffic movements during construction and the effects on train services. (4) Concerns were raised regarding noise pollution and impact relating to wear and tear on the roads by HGV vehicles.	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. More information about our approach to safety and security, including reducing disruption to local communities and mitigating impacts is included in Chapter 3 Project-wide matters. 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. Further details will be provided for the construction programme at the statutory consultation. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. Comprehensive assessments will be carried out and will use industry-leading computer modelling, which can incorporate information on factors such as local geology and track height, to simulate potential noise and vibration impacts along the whole route as part of the assessments on any mitigations required. Impacts on sensitive receptors such as schools will be assessed as part of this work, which will be published as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during Statutory Consultation and presented in the Environmental Statement as part of the DCO Application.

	We have has sought to design the works to minimise the need for properties to be demolished where possible. Where land is acquired or proposed to be acquired, the Compensation Code sets out the circumstances in which compensation is payable, we provided a guide to compulsory purchase compensation Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation is also available for properties in proximity to the new railway which may be affected by various physical factors of the operation of the railway once it is in use, this is referred to as Part 1 compensation for which we included a guide on the website – Guide to Part 1 claims Also, we will be introducing a Need to Sell scheme at Preferred Route Announcement to assist people with a pressing need to sell but unable due to the Project. EWR Co consulted on a proposed Need to Sell scheme at the same time as the main Non-Statutory Consultation and the details for the Guide to the Need to Sell scheme are available here: The Guide to the Proposed Need to Sell Scheme.
A concern was raised about the impact on the wildlife and the green spaces. Consideration needs to be given to preserving deer habitat in the area between Great Barford and Renhold. A request was made to see results for bat surveys in Madingley Wood.	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 during the statutory consultation. We will seek to avoid direct impacts on the most significant nationally and internationally designated environmental assets including National Nature Reserves (NNRs), Ramsar Sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and candidate Special Areas of Conservation (cSACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and candidate Special Protection Areas (cSPAs), Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees. This includes the colony of barbastelle bats in 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 will carry out further bat surveys in 2023. We will use these to make sure that the design does not significantly affect the population of barbastelle bats. 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. 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. 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.
(1) A few residents asked for time tabling information and a few asked if EWR will run express services. (2) A few people queried whether EWR will be able to compete with car journeys considering journey times, cost of travel and the increase of electric vehicles on the roads. (3) Another query asked how much the travel time will be reduced from Oxford to Cambridge on EWR compared with the current journey route via London. (4) Journey times were queried between Bletchley and Bicester and whether these times will be convenient to transfers for Milton Keynes.	(1 & 2) Train services and timetables will be confirmed closer to the opening of the railway. Current assumptions are set out in the Economic and Technical Report (available on our website) for the different sections of the route. EWR Co considers that the best way to provide competitive journey times, while also encouraging people to use our services without reliance on the private car, is to use a combination of centrally located stations with good access to other transport modes and connecting train services as well as implementing measures to integrate the new EWR stations into the wider local transport network, including footpaths and cycle paths. We have considered the need to strike a balance between how the Project accommodates customers who need to use a private car to access stations, while not discouraging the use of active modes for first-mile last-mile access or adversely affecting the viability of other public transport alternatives. 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'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 Cambridge, we'll need to make sure that the railway aligns with relevant policy and complies with relevant legislation related to net zero carbon. Journey Times Between Bicester & Bletchley

	EWR Co is working closely with industry partners including Network Rail and other train operators to design a timetable that creates the best connectivity and journeys for passengers. This will include consideration to transfer times at Milton Keynes.
Several homeowners, potential homeowners and solicitors made enquiries into how EWR will affect properties in various locations such as St Neots, Cambourne, Little Shelford, Hauxton, Fairfields, Coates, Wilden, Beaconsfield, Haslingfield, Harston, Renhold, Houghton Regis, High Wycombe, Royston, Great Paxton, Bedford, Biggleswade and Calcedote. A comment was made that Cambridge County Council recently applied for a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) in respect of the Greater Cambridge Partnerships new dedicated busway between Cambourne and Cambridge.	Impacts on land and individual properties due to the construction of the preferred alignment will be set out in the statutory consultation. Where land is acquired or proposed to be acquired, the Compensation Code sets out the circumstances in which compensation is payable, EWR Co provided a guide to compulsory purchase compensation Guide to Compulsory Acquisition and Compensation is also available for properties in proximity to the new railway which may be affected by various physical factors of the operation of the railway once it is in use, this is referred to as Part 1 compensation for which we included a guide on the website – Guide to Part 1 claims Also, EWR Co will be introducing a Need to Sell scheme at Preferred Route Announcement to assist people with a pressing need to sell but unable due to the project. We consulted on a proposed Need to Sell scheme at the same time as the main Non-Statutory Consultation and the details for the Guide to the Need to Sell scheme are available here: The Guide to the Proposed Need to Sell Scheme. 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 will discuss the potential impacts with the owners of land and property likely to be required for the scheme and seek to mitigate these. If a business is located where land or a section of land is required by the Project, the business owner may need 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. The Greater Cambridge Partnership is currently preparing an application for a Transport & Works Act Order for the Cambourne to Cambridge (C2C) Better Public Transport Project which includes proposals for a Future Bus Network. We are liaising with C2C so that design interfaces between the schemes can be appropriately managed and opportunities explored.

A concern was raised about the proposals for the Hauxton level crossing, dividing Hauxton from the Shelford community.	Hauxton Road provides a link between the villages of Hauxton and Little Shelford. The level crossing is passed by 166 trains (both passenger and freight) per day. This is equal to around 11 trains per hour (one train every five minutes). Once the new EWR services become operational between Bedford and Cambridge, this will introduce an additional four trains per hour in each direction, five trains every 15 minutes (one train every three minutes), resulting in an increase in the time the barriers need to be closed to allow trains to pass. As a result, we have identified the need for an updated risk assessment for the Hauxton Road level crossing to account for the increased train services introduced by the Project. This will determine whether the crossing would continue to comply with rail industry safety standards, as the number of trains in each direction are set to increase. Depending on the outcome, we may need to close the level crossing to make sure that the enhanced services can operate reliably and safely. If a decision is made to close the crossing, we will consider how the connection could be maintained for general traffic use or use by sustainable transport users, such as pedestrians and cyclists. This could include creating a diversion, or a grade separated crossing, such as a bridge. We will consider how the Hauxton Road level crossing is currently used, and how its closure might impact local communities. There will undoubtedly be some disruption through dust and noise, but we will manage this appropriately, which we will set out in the Construction Management plan submitted as part of our application for DCO. We will continue to investigate the potential effects of a closure of the level crossing, including on the roads identified by the respondents, and develop potential mitigation strategies. If diversions are required, we will consider the potential impact to the local road network and the needs of road users including school children, buses, and the emergency services. We will consider the safety of diversions to both cyclists and pedestrians. We will continue to work with local highway authorities to identify and assess potential mitigations and our work will be informed by ongoing traffic modelling and surveys in the area. We will provide further details of our proposed solution at the statutory consultation, so the public and other stakeholders can provide their feedback. We will then consider this before submitting a Development Consent Order (DCO) to authorise our final proposals in this area.
It was a common theme that respondents requested that the London Road crossing is kept open, with concerns raised that closing	Potential to Keep London Road Crossing Open/ Suggestion to Close

London Road will increase congestion and deter people from going to the town centre which will have an adverse impact on businesses. Some people felt that it will sever villages in the area. A suggestion was made to close London Road level crossing due to safety reasons. There was some support for a bridge, with a weight limit in place to limit HGVs, as this will provide access to local residents to the town centre from Langford, Graven hill and Ambrosden. A concern was raised that closing the London Road level crossing will mean that some residents will increase their carbon footprint to access the town centre and that closing the level crossing for up to 50 mins in every hour will result in a significant increase in vehicle CO2 emissions. One comment was made that the track should be raised like the Bicester north line thereby allowing traffic to easily pass under it. There was concern that the proposed pedestrian bridge would adversely impact users who have mobility constraints and disabilities, and that there is a lack of options considering equality and accessibility. A design was proposed for a pedestrian	We understand that level crossings play an important role in local connectivity and allowing people to move around their communities and recognise concerns about the potential closure of London Road level crossing and impact this would have on connectivity. 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 statutory consultation which we expect to take place in the first half of 2024. Traffic Impacts We are aware that proposed changes to level crossings and road developments related to the Project may impact traffic in the local road network. As part of the Environmental Statement that will accompany the DCO application, we will prepare a Transport Assessment to consider the impact on the strategic and local highway network, road safety and local sustainable modes of transport, including public transport. It will also set out the impact of construction on the road network, including changes to existing traffic patterns because of predicted construction traffic. This will include consideration of congestion, access (including access restrictions), parking, and any health and safety impacts. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report will include information regarding the baseline for transport, access and non-motorised users, together with a preliminary assessment of impacts and will be published at the statutory consultation. Community Severance (including connectivity to Langford, Graven Hill & Ambrosden) 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 those south of the railway line, living in communities such as Graven Hill, Ambrosden and Langford Village. We will set out the steps we will take to reduce or mitigate any potential disruption during construction – such as, impacts on public rights of way (PRoWs), land and property requirements, road closures and impacts on traffic. Further detail will be shared at statutory consultation. Underpass or Bridge Design & Weight Consideration

underpass together with a mobility hub for busses, taxis, bicycles, and access to Bicester Shopping Village. Many people promoted a pedestrian underpass at London Road Bicester, however others pointed out that an underpass poses safety concerns at night, especially for women. A suggestion was made that a pumping station may not be needed for the motor vehicle underpass at London Road Bicester and request that EWR consider the higher ground areas of the underpass be drained with a land drain, and lower ground areas of the underpass be provided with a roof or canopy that was appropriately drained. A concern was raised about the height of a potential pedestrian bridge over London Road for disabled people and suggest that an underpass would be safer. A request was made that the new railway crossings at or near London Road are suitable for cars, cycles and pedestrians.	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 will include consideration to the types of vehicles (such as heavy goods vehicles) using the crossing. Weight limits will be considered as part of the option selection and design process. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented at the statutory consultation. Carbon Emissions The further design process to be carried out in advance of statutory consultation will consider many factors, including the respondents' concerns regarding a bridge or underpass, such as: • Cost of construction • visual impacts and mitigation, if required • impact on local heritage assets • space required for construction • accessibility of bridges and underpasses • impact on carbon emissions and air quality. • Environmental impact Further information will be made available at the statutory consultation. Raising the Track The 'Bicester Chord' (which links the EWR line to the Chiltern Line towards London) is already at the steepest acceptable gradient for trains. The junction with the EWR line is therefore a fixed point and there is not enough space for the railway to drop, or rise, to the level necessary before it reaches London Road. There are also watercourses in the area which currently pass under the railway which would need to be diverted if the railway were to be lowered, requiring the railway to be even deeper. It would also require the station to be rebuilt and various other railway features to be rebuilt or reconfigured across around 3km of railway. In addition, by placing the railway in a dip, with steep gradients either side, trains would consume more energy when pulling away from the station. Some of the section of line that would be affected also sits within a flood plain, meaning the new cutting would be prone to flooding and would require an extensive pumped drainage system. Further information about how we have considered

	alternatives to the level crossing will be presented at the statutory consultation which we expect to take place in the first half of 2024. Accessibility 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 access for disabled people across the railway. For any bridge or underpass design proposed, safety, visual impact and road noise will be some of the factors considered during the design process. The preferred option will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of assessment factors (including 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. Safety & Security Safety is a key priority for us and a primary consideration in the option design and selection process, not only for those using the railway but for all other users, including drivers and pedestrians. It is important that any proposals for the London Road level crossing have safety as a key principle within their design. We will undertake safety risk assessments which will inform the development of the design. Information on this will be shared at the statutory consultation.
A concern was raised about the proposed bridge to cross the railway on the Marston Vale Line as the bridge will be higher than the properties causing a visual impact.	Assessing the impact of the Project on the environment is a fundamental part of the design of the Project. This includes consideration of landscape and visual impacts. We are carefully considering how the Project can be designed to blend in with the local environment. This includes the consideration of visual impacts of new infrastructure such as bridges, potential ways to soften their appearance and integrate them into the wider landscape context or using sensitive placement of appropriate planting to either screen views from sensitive receptors, or to soften the appearance and presence of engineering earthworks.

	The preferred option for each level crossing will be selected following a rigorous process using a range of Assessment Factors, outlined in Chapter 5 and Appendix C of the Consultation Technical Report. This will include consideration of the environment as part of the environmental impacts and opportunities Assessment Factor (14).
It was felt that proposals for Woburn Sands needed further development and should be subjected to a consultation. One respondent queried whether EWR has considered putting a tunnel under the crossing as whilst it may reduce the usage of Cranfield Road there are other roads in the vicinity that may be used in lieu.	The two options presented at non-statutory were for a road bridge to the west or to keep the crossing open. These options are presented to keep connectivity between the two sides of the railway. Option 1 (road bridge) is for if we need to close the crossing. If the option (Option 2) to keep the crossing open is the option selected, we would not look to provide the road bridge as the connectivity will be provided by the level crossing. Analysis has identified Woburn Sands as having the potential to remain open, as confirmed within the Technical Summary. 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 a statutory consultation. Both options presented at the 2021 consultation would maintain vehicle access across the railway. We presented options for Woburn Sands level crossings that considered both vehicular access and access for pedestrians, cyclists, and other NMUs. This included closure of the level crossing, which included an offline bridge and new road, and retaining the level crossing. A bridge was proposed as part of Option 1 in favour of an underpass. This is due to the cost associated with construction and operation of an underpass at Woburn Sands, along with the increased complexity, being outweighed by the transport benefits compared with a bridge at this location.
Comments were made that local plans, including Greater Cambridge Local Plan, are highly relevant to planning and developing EWR and the suggestion was made to reconsider route alignment in the light of the Local Plan policies.	In designing route options for the railway to date, we have continued to liaise with planning authorities and monitored planning applications, committed development, and emerging local policy consultations to stay informed about proposals for new housing across the route. In selecting the preferred route alignment following the 2019 consultation, we took account of how the new railway could serve developments in the Oxford to Cambridgeshire area. We considered the potential impact of the Project 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. We have also formally responded to third-party planning applications and policy consultations, where appropriate to do so. 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 formed a key part of the approach to selecting a preferred route alignment. We have been monitoring and inputting into the progress of new and emerging development plans across the area. Existing or proposed projects will continue to be considered as part of the EWR assessments. In addition to considering how EWR might best support future housing development by providing cost-effective, sustainable and accessible public transport options for new residents and settlements, we also considered how the railway might interact with existing housing and current projects. We are aware people want to understand the specific benefits EWR will provide their local communities and businesses. As the design develops, we will be able to provide more detail on what these benefits will look like, and we will work with local authorities and communities to refine and shape these plans in line with Local Plans and wider development.
Some people felt that the maps, including those used at the community events, were out of date, too high-level and lacking in clarity. Requests were also received for larger maps e.g. the Bletchley area and the various route options.	We appreciate individuals' feedback on the maps used at our community drop-in events. At the time of the drop in events, the maps presented proposals which were at an early stage in the design process. At the next statutory consultation, we will present more detailed designs and consider how we represent elevation and terrain in future maps.
A suggestion was made that EWR Co reconsider which intermediate stations are served by the EWR services along the Marston Vale Line to serve Cranfield and Marshalls who will move to that location. It was queried if a decision has been made on improvements on the Bletchley and the Marston Vale Line.	Moving the MVL line away from the existing line 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. Moving the railway away from the communities would undermine the purpose that it serves and reduce its accessibility to potential rail users. Although we're not responsible for providing onward travel links and access to the stations, we'll consider this within our proposed options. We'll engage with England's Economic Heartland on door-to-door connectivity to provide access to local towns. 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 Consultation Technical Report. This will include consideration of access to the railway with the Assessment Factors for transport user benefits (1) and short distance connectivity (6) Further information will be presented at the statutory consultation.

	We are still developing our proposals for Bletchley and the MVL, and the latest developments on these locations is available in the Route Update Announcement Report. Further information on the proposals for Bletchley and MVL will be available at the statutory consultation.
Some residents viewed the Need to Sell scheme as inadequate and commented that the suggested categories are unreasonable. There was dissatisfaction with the outlined 'blight' compensation and requirements residents are expected to meet to qualify. Residents have asked for an update on the NTS scheme and who/when residents will be eligible.	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. 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 the EWR Co website: Guide to Part 1 Claims. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 about the noise, pollution and vibration of an increase in rail traffic including freight as well as construction traffic – the Poets area being an example. Someone asked if there will be acoustic screening erected along the residential areas on the existing and currently operational section of the track, for example between Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands stations. EWR was asked to provide significant sound mitigation infrastructure to keep noise levels to current levels, both inside and outside of dwellings which could include acoustic barriers, externally applied sound insulation and triple glazing. One individual requested a noise buffer on the tracks to reduce the sound of the trains in Bletchley. A comment was made that increased proximity to the tracks and more overnight freight services will result in significant degradation in quality of life through noise pollution and will represent an	We recognise that noise from both the construction and operation of a railway is an important issue for local communities, including between Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands stations, and the Bletchley 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. We don't think it would be appropriate to adopt a blanket policy for noise mitigation as, at this early stage in the development of the Project, it's not possible to identify specific mitigation measures that might be appropriate for specific properties. However, we are committed to developing proposals for measures that will seek to reduce noise and vibration as far as reasonably practicable. This includes: • Choice of trains. • Track technology. • Noise barriers – which form one of a number of mitigations that may be appropriate where tracks may create noise and vibration. 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, including in the Poets Road, Oxford and Oxford Parkway areas, 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.

environmental health concern, including sleep deprivation.	Construction and operational noise levels generated from the proposed works will also be presented as part of the PEIR at the statutory consultation. A full Environmental Statement will then be 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. We will 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.
A person asked for clarify on whether EWR is intended for passenger, freight, or both. A comment was made that trains finishing at 10pm will impact on tourism as access to the evening cultural economy will not be possible. Request for information was made regarding route franchise options. It was queried if the railway line between Bletchley & Bedford is part of EWR.	EWR is principally intended to be a passenger route. It is, though, being designed to maintain current capacity for freight trains on the existing railway and we are considering the potential for future growth in demand for rail freight. We don't yet know how much freight would use the railway, as this is subject to government policy and market demand – and we haven't confirmed the exact operating hours for the railway. As set out in the 2021 consultation, we currently envisage that EWR could accommodate roughly one freight train per hour in each direction, although the actual number of freight services is a matter for the wider industry and freight operators. Regarding the operating hours of the new railway, EWR Co proposed operational hours for passenger services in Appendices A and B of the 2021 Consultation Technical report, which referred to a potential pubic facing timetable (planned trains in passenger service), to provide some initial guidance. There will also be less intensive train movements as required outside these hours for infrastructure maintenance, inspection, freight, and other activities as part of the national rail network. We will continue to work on the concept of operation to inform the operational timetable. The operation Along with our operating partners, EWR will set fares to make sure that the service offers value for money and is inclusive to as many people as possible. Fares will be simple to understand and easy to buy, in line with the rail industry's fares reform programme, which seeks to increase the trust in the railway and remove both economic and convenience barriers to travel.
(1) People preferring a northern route into Cambridge was a common theme as this benefits the rapidly expanding villages in that	(1-4) 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

part of Cambridgeshire with a suggestion of a station north of Cambourne. (2) It was suggested that a northern approach could include a train station at Cambourne and Northstowe, to allow freight to pass by the north of Cambridge without entering the city. This would negate the need for a four-track railway line into Cambridge. (3) It was suggested that the approach from the North into Cambridge would reduce construction time, costs, and traffic to the south. It was felt that a Southern approach would be more disruptive to existing rail services. There was a view that a Southern approach would be too near to houses and other buildings such as Haslingfield Endowed Primary School. (4) It was suggested that a simple tweak to the Liverpool Street services could be sufficient to free up space to avoid the need to provide four tracks north of Cambridge station. This would in turn remove the biggest factor inhibiting the Northern Approach. (5) Many felt that the consultation in 2019 had been inadequate or misleading and that a new consultation should be launched to consider the Northern approach into Cambridge.	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. Since the consultation, we have looked again at a northern approach to Cambridge (NATC) and an updated NATC design was developed as part of our Economic and Technical Report work, including a potential station at Oakington/Northstowe. 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 removes the need to demolish commercial and residential property, avoids the need to build on Common Land, and removes the need re-build a number of road and river bridges in Cambridge. 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 select the SATC as our preferred approach to Cambridge. You can read more about our reasons for this in the Route Update Report on our website. In developing our proposals, we aimed to minimise the negative impact this may have on communities and in particular people's homes, inevitably with an infrastructure Project of this size, there will be some people who could be directly affected. We will continue to work to mitigate any impacts we cannot avoid and work closely with people who could be affected. NATC was considered a minor worsening for the Assessment Factor Community consideration due to the closer proximity to the route to communities than the SATC and crossing of a number of designated rights of way. Comprehensive assessments will be carried out and will use industry-leading computer modelling, which can incorporate information on factors such as local geology and track height, to simulate potential noise and vibration impacts along the whole route as part of the assessments on any mitigations required. Impacts on sensitive receptors such as schools will be assessed as part of this work, which will be published as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during Statutory Consultation and presented in the Environmental Statement as part of the DCO Application.

A comment was made that a northern approach to Cambridge aligns with the existing and proposed new developments to the north of Cambridge. A comment was made that the northern approach to Cambridge allows freight to bypass Cambridge. A comment was made that the 4 tracking needed between Shrepreth Junction and Cambridge station for a southern approach to Cambridge will be costly and disruptive to existing rail traffic. A comment was made that 4 tracking between the proposed Milton Junction and Cambridge stations is not necessary for a northern approach to Cambridge. Criticism was received that EWR Co have not done a thorough re-examination of the northern route into Cambridge. A comment was made that a southern approach to Cambridge will impact the peaceful countryside and split wildlife habitats.	As part of the updated NATC design, we considered a freight chord heading north to Ely at Milton Junction, which would allow east/west freight traffic to bypass Cambridge. However, this would increase the cost of the NATC and it would not be possible for freight trains to access this chord without significant upgrades to other parts of the existing rail network. Accordingly, this matter would not cause us to re-open the decision to prefer the SATC. Our proposed SATC would involve four tracking the WAML from Shepreth Branch Junction to the Cambridge station throat. This would provide EWR with two dedicated track which would ensure that the four EWR trains per hour can operate without affecting existing services. Our operational modelling has confirmed that a four-track solution provides for four EWR services per hour, avoids impacts on existing services, and provides some capacity for future growth. This cost and construction impact of these works has been included within the design development and assessment. Regarding the movement of wildlife, 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, SuDs, 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 appreciate the concerns around the environmental impact and will consider the importance of environmental sustainability in the activities and the decisions made in order to ensure that the Project is designed, constructed, operated and maintained in an environmentally responsible manner that minimises negative environmental impacts. (3) The construction programme for NATC is expected to be similar to SATC, however, the updated NATC design would be expected to have a lower construction cost. Both NATC and SATC would be expected to help reduce traffic, although the SATC would be expected to reduce more traffic in south Cambridge than NATC. Both SATC and NATC would require work to the existing railway and cause a degree of disruptive to existing rail services. EWR will develop the design and construction planning to mitigate impacts to the existing railway where possible. In developing our proposals, we aimed to minimise the negative impact this may have on communities and in particular people's homes, and sensitive receptors such as schools including at Haslingfield. However, inevitably with an infrastructure project of this size, there will be some people who could be directly affected. We will continue to work to mitigate any impacts we cannot avoid and work closely with people who could be affected.

	In operation, the inclusion of the two new tracks between Cambridge Station and Shepreth Junction will afford the forecast capacity for EWR trains and ensure that existing services are not impacted. (5) 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. So far, we have 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. We are 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. We have also been actively encouraging people to get in touch to share their views and comments so that we can build a railway that meets the needs of the communities we serve. We already 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 maybe directly affected by our proposals. We will keep communications channels under review to make sure that it's easy for people to receive updates on the company's work as the Project progresses. 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.
A concern was raised that CS1 was meant to reopen in 2017 and that it has been delayed.	Further details will be provided for the construction programme and schedule for opening the railway at the statutory consultation.

Enquiries were received about when services will start to run.	
Queries were received about EWR's plans to build a bypass at Woburn Sands. General concerns were raised that EWR will impact connectivity by cutting off roads, footpaths and bridleways.	The two options presented at the 2021 consultation were for a road bridge to the west or to keep the crossing open. These options are presented to keep connectivity between the two sides of the railway. Option 1 (road bridge to west connecting Newport Road to Bow Brickhill Road) would need to be adopted if we need to close the crossing. If Option 2 (keep the crossing open) is selected we would not look to provide the road bridge as connectivity would be provided by the level crossing. 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. We must consider the safety of the public and workers at all stages of design, during the construction and operational phase. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.
Several respondents queried the type of line and rolling stock that will be used.	We are working on a Rolling Stock Strategy, taking into account existing fleets and the future demands of the network. This is being done in conjunction with GBR Transitions Team and DfT to ensure a holistic view is taken.

(1) There was some support for route E due to the selection of Bedford Midland Road Station as opposed to Bedford St. Johns and the journey saving times and some stakeholders support the preferred route along the A428 corridor. Concern was raised that Route E is the most expensive and has the highest environmental impact. Some believed that the environmental data used was insufficient to help select the least damaging route. Also, suspicion was raised at the cost changes for route E.	(1) We are pleased to see comments from respondents about their support for the EWR scheme, the route options, and the specific proposals. The use of route alignments or route options close to these roads has been considered in the selection of a preferred Route Option and also in designing alternative route alignments. We acknowledge that there are potential benefits from building a new railway close to other transport infrastructure. For example, the selection of an alignment that broadly parallels the route of the A428 dual carriageway being promoted by National Highways between Black Cat and Caxton Gibbet could help to reduce some adverse impacts of the combined schemes. Visual changes to the landscape would be concentrated in the A428 corridor rather than in areas not already subject to development, and there may be the opportunity to combine landscaping and other environmental mitigation measures. However, it would be difficult for the new railway to be located in close proximity to the A421, A428 and A14 roads because of the existing settlements along the route. For instance, this would mean that selecting an alignment in these areas would 'sandwich' these villages between these busy roads and the new railway, increasing the impacts on these local communities from the combined infrastructure. (2) Environmental impacts and opportunities were assessed and formed a key factor which we took into account when selecting the preferred route option in 2020. The feedback to our 2019 non-statutory consultation also ranked Route Option E as the best performing on this assessment factor. When considering carbon impact specifically, whilst potential emissions arising from the operation of trains are important, it is also necessary to consider potential emissions that arise when constructing the scheme as well. The Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions associated with the creation, maintenance, refurbishment and decommissioning of the railway are referred to as capital carbon. This includes GHG emissions from the use of materials, such as concrete and steel; the use of construction plant, such as excavators; and the transport of materials and plant to construction sites. For the purposes of route option appraisal, only the creation of assets is considered.

	To help inform the options shared in the 2019 consultation and the preferred route option decision published in 2020, we carried out various types of analysis. This included a high-level appraisal of transport user-related carbon emissions, in line with the requirements of the Department for Transport's (DfT's) Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) Unit A3. At that time, it was not a requirement to carry out capital carbon assessments as part of that process. Since the non-statutory consultation, we have carried out a qualitative appraisal of the embodied carbon for the route options we consulted on in 2019 and presented in 2020. In summary, this demonstrated that: Route options with longer lengths of viaducts (such as those which cross longer lengths of flood plains) are likely to have higher embodied carbon. Route options with a better cut-fill balance of material (where excavated material is re-used to build embankments and other structures) are likely to have lower embodied carbon. This is because there is less need to export surplus material for disposal elsewhere, or to import extra material during construction. Minor differences in capital carbon emissions between route options do not have a major impact on EWR's Net Zero Carbon Railway ambition, and would thus not be considered a significant differentiator. 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.
Many suggestions for route alternatives were made: - EWR to follow the old varsity line. - a St Johns station on the Rope Walk retail site - EWR to run east of Bedford via the old route east of Bedford St Johns to a new alignment around Willington to link with the	As part of the Affordable Connections Project (ACP) (a review of the strategic need for the Project and to investigate solutions which could deliver the majority of the original benefits and outcomes at a lower cost), we reviewed the potential for alignments approaching Bedford from the south and east, and following the route of the decommissioned Varsity Line, which ran between Bedford and Cambridge via Sandy. We note respondents' comment that an alignment which approaches Bedford from the east via a relocated Bedford St Johns station would enable some east-west freight to avoid Bedford station. However, it was concluded that the preferred route remained a route approaching Bedford from the

North-South main line in the Tempsford area. - a north-east curve from St Neots onto the east-west rail would enable South Peterborough direct access to Addenbrookes, Cambourne, Cambridge and possibly Stansted/East Anglia. - a link to the existing Hitchin to Cambridge line as this would be far shorter and cheaper. The line could leave the Marston Vale line at Lidlington or Milbrook and then east across open country to Ashwell and Morden and a junction with Hitchin to Cambridge line. - a route along the A421 was supported by a few people as this route is straighter, flatter and shorter It was suggested that freight trains could bypass the town and Bedford Midland Station could still be connected. This route was seen as more carbon-friendly also. - the shortest way between Bedford and Cambridge could be to reuse the Bedford-Sandy route (new Bedford St. John station on the original alignment with no reversal), and a new approach to Sandy south of the town with a near 90 degree crossing of the ECML with elevated platforms. Then continuing onto Cambridge with a much more Southernly approach. - a route between the A1 and Bedford to follow the Bedford southern bypass road with a station at Wixams, as there is a connection to Bedford Town Centre, is flatter and clear of houses.	north via Bedford station due to the benefits associated with serving Bedford town centre. Additionally, a relocated Bedford St Johns station to the Rope Walk retail estate would be located further from the town centre, and would require commercial property acquisition, affect Bedford's bus garage and the retail estate. The ACP also reviewed the potential to follow the Varsity Line through Bedford and Cambridgeshire directly to Cambridge. Although a shorter route by not connecting to Cambourne or following the A428 road corridor, this route was considered to deliver significantly fewer benefits than the emerging preferred routes presented at NSC. 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. 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. As noted reusing the Varsity line would be likely to have a direct impact on the Mullard Observator site and its operations. Moving the observatory would be complex and add significant cost to the Project. The route would require removing all services from the Trumpington to Cambridge Station busway to enable EWR to run which would not help to encourage a model shift towards public transport. This route would also impact housing and a school in west Cambridge as well as the Trumpington park and ride. The above contributed to our preferred route remaining Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant) using the Southern Approach into Cambridge. Old North Road station will not be re-opened as it is not part of Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant). The ECML is nearly at capacity, with plans to maximise this already in place by the industry. Running additional services on the ECML is unlikely to be possible from a capacity perspective. In addition, providing a direct rail connection between the ECML and EWR lines would be complex and increase the costs of the Project. However, the EWR ECML Tempsford station will provide an efficient passenger interchange between the two lines, enabling the journeys suggested by the respondent. Alternative route corridors including via Sandy, Bassingbourn and/or Hitchin were assessed as part of the 2019 consultation and Route E via Bedford Midland, Tempsford area / south of St Neots and Cambourne

- re-instate the original line to run through the undulating lands of Bucks and Beds, emerging in a fairly straight line, through flatter Cambridge countryside to arrive at Cambridge station. Areas of encroachment, at Sandy, Potton and the Mullard Radio Astronomy telescopes at Lord's Bridge, can be re-claimed and compensation paid. With regard to the Mullard Radio Astronomy telescopes, a question was asked whether it had been considered to re-siting a rail track in parallel? - re-instate the old track-bed (Trumpington-Cambridge) in favour of rail services to replace the guided busway, and trains could run into Cambridge station. Several stations along the old route could be reclaimed, with Old North Road station serving Cambourne, where car parking and cycle track could be provided. - a western approach to Cambridge through Girton Interchange. This approach could allow entry into Cambridge from all directions and already has plans for integrated sustainable Public Transport. It can accommodate major landscaped Railway Pick Up and Park & Ride parking and potential future overflow to the northern side of the A14. It has easy access for cycles and pedestrians along Huntingdon Road and through to adjacent villages. - EWR to travel parallel with the M11 motorway and the Barton rifle range. Also noting that after Barton there are two	was chosen. Our decision to choose Route E as our preferred route was firmly rooted in the feedback EWR Co received from local communities, in which it was identified as the most popular option. Route E also received the highest score on four of the five key assessment criteria: benefits for transport users, environmental considerations, supporting economic growth and supporting new homes. Revised indicative estimates of upfront capital costs suggested that the cost to deliver Route E (£3.7 billion) would be similar to the cost for Route A (£3.6 billion) and lower than the cost for the other shortlisted route options (£3.9 billion – £4.3 billion). Terminating the route at an interchange at Girton would not provide a high-quality rail connection to Cambridge station, and further integration with wider national rail networks to facilitate onward journeys. Instead, passengers would be reliant on the current road network to reach the centre of Cambridge, Cambridge Station and onward journeys. However, it would be difficult for the new railway to be located in close proximity to the A421, existing A428, A14 and M11 roads because of the sensitive environmental features and existing settlements along these routes. For instance, this would mean that selecting an alignment in these areas is likely to 'sandwich' settlements between these busy roads and the new railway, increasing the impacts on local communities from the combined infrastructure. It is also noted that following these roads would require significant diversions to the preferred route Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant), increasing journey time and costs, and would require EWR to approach Cambridge from the north or Bedford from the South. We've been tasked by Government to deliver much-needed transport connections for communities between Oxford and Cambridge. A direct connection from Cambridge and Bedford to Milton Keynes Central does not currently form part of our remit to provide these transport connections. There are no proposals to provide a Bletchley Chord as part of East West Rail, however the delivery of East West Rail does not preclude this option from being developed in the future.

relatively clear countryside route options with little impact on nearby housing. - the local shuttle service calling at intermediate stations between Bedford and Bletchley being extended to Milton Keynes Central.	
(1) Many people asked if EWR would extend the route or provide connections, such as: - a connection from Winslow to Aylesbury Parkway and on to Marylebone. - an extension to serve a wider area such as Huntingdon and Haverhill, Swindon, Quainton and Stansted - connecting EWR to the HS2 service. - connecting Oxford to stations on the East Coast Main Line, and connect the EWR route to Kings Cross. - Connecting North Bicester and to Birmingham. - EWR to link to the GWR network via Didcot. - providing access to European destinations as well as local commutes between the region's cities and market towns. (2) A proposal was sent through to restore the railway between Cheltenham and Kingham to link to EWR from Oxford, together with suggestions on how to address some of the challenges along this line.	East West Rail is a nationally significant railway Project which aims to deliver much-needed transport connections for communities between Oxford and Cambridge. We do not plan to extend the route. However, none of the alignments that we have proposed would preclude services being extended to these destinations in future. As such this is not a differentiating factor. Our route would be able to provide convenient interchange onto existing rail services: Great Western, Chiltern and CrossCountry at Oxford, the West Coast Mainline at Bletchley, East Midlands and Thameslink services at Bedford Midland, Great Northern, LNER and Thameslink at ECML Station and Greater Anglia, Great Northern/Thameslink and CrossCountry at Cambridge. The route connects to Oxford Station which would enable onward travel to Cornwall. Our scope is currently between Oxford & Cambridge however wider connectivity is important to us and are working closely with Network Rail on proposals including how best to link EWR services with the wider rail network. This will be factored into the process to design future timetables. We note respondents' suggestion that an alignment which approaches Bedford from the east via a relocated Bedford St Johns station would enable some east-west freight to avoid Bedford station. As part of the Affordable Connection Project, we reviewed the potential for alignments approaching Bedford from the east, and following the route of the decommissioned Varsity Line, which ran between Bedford and Cambridge via Sandy. It was concluded that the preferred route remained a route approaching Bedford from the north via Bedford station due to the benefits associated with serving Bedford town centre. Additionally, Bedford St Johns station would be located further from the town centre, and would require commercial property acquisition, affect Bedford's bus garage and the retail estate.

(3) A concern was expressed that National Rail's plans outline potential future services from Cardiff to Norwich through Lidlington, using the EWR tracks. East of Bedford via St Johns would enable east-west freight to avoid Bedford Midland. A query was whether there were any plans for the Cambridge to Oxford Line to link up with a main station that takes GWR trains to Cornwall. There was a query if there is going to be a link line from the Bristol to London line.	
1) Criticism was received that there is no information about how each of the 15 assessment factors to evaluate the route options were scored in an objective and comparative manner. (2) Suggestions were made to go through the existing St Neots station site which already has capacity for two extra lines without the need to make any alterations to the existing platforms, footbridge or ticket office building. (3) A couple of people commented that a southern route into Bedford is favourable and a station South of Bedford. (4) A request was made for a map of proposed routes around Bedford.	(1) 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. Our preferred options are 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 of option selections will be presented at the statutory consultation. At the 2021 non-statutory consultation, we provided extensive information - including a 286-page consultation document and a detailed 428-page technical report. We undertook a thorough assurance process prior to the publication of the documents and will continue to do so for all future materials. When producing the documents for the consultation we endeavoured to include significant signposting throughout. The 24-page summary document included more than 30 signposts to various other published documents, contact channels and useful assets. As part of this, we provided multiple tiers of documentation with varying levels of detail and complexity to ensure they are accessible and as easy as possible to interpret. (2) Enabling housing growth and contributing to transformational growth within the region is a key part of our purpose. The use of a station within St Neots is not expected to enable the same level of housing

(5) There was a query as to why the current proposed route went from one of the most expensive to one of the cheapest. (6) A request was made for revised calculations/costings for why route E was chosen. A couple of people queried why the original route to Sandy is no longer the preferred route. A query was raised as to whether EWR Co will review cheaper, shorter options that are focused on connectivity since government dropped the 1 million housing target. Also, EWR should consider and consult on an alternative route alignment that would serve the growing developments to the north of Cambridge, such as Northstowe.	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, we are committed to increasing prosperity and connectivity across the region 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. (3) 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. 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 considered 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. 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. (4) Only one route was consulted on in 2021 and that is the route which was published in 2020. Prior consultation in 2019 had optionality around the approach to Bedford and these are all available on the EWR website. (5) The differences in estimated upfront capital costs from the 2019 and 2021 consultations are primarily driven by: the amount of viaduct that could be required for crossing flood plains and other difficult ground, the volume of earthworks that could be required due to local terrain and existing infrastructure

	interface points, the amount of existing infrastructure and waterways that would need to be crossed and require bridge structure and the amount and type of land that could be required. (6) The preferred route option report on the EWR website outlines our Preferred Route Option between Bedford and Cambridge, and the reason for that selection. The Preferred Route Option was selected following consultation on the five route option areas between January and March 2019. Those route option areas were selected following earlier consultation on the route corridor via Sandy. In 2019, we consulted on five possible route options for EWR. Our decision to choose Route E as our preferred route reflected the feedback we received from local communities, in which it was identified as the most popular option. Route Option E also received the highest score on four of the five key Assessment Factors: transport user benefits (1), environmental impacts and opportunities (14) (equal to Route Option B), and contribution to enabling housing and economic growth (2). Route Options A, C and D, which would serve Sandy station, scored less favourably. Details of the comparative assessment undertaken to select Route Option E, are provided in the Preferred Route Option Announcement Report in 2020. Detailed economic modelling indicated that Route E would provide the greatest benefits for transport users and would contribute to wider economic benefits. For Bedford, Route E would serve Bedford station and Bedford St Johns station directly, providing convenient access to other rail services, transport modes, local homes, businesses and facilities, such as Bedford Hospital. Having reconsidered in light of 2021 consultation feedback, the preference remains unchanged to select Route E. Costs: 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 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. As part of the Affordable Connections Project (ACP) (a review of the strategic need for the Project and to investigate solutions which could deliver the majority of the original benefits and outcomes at a lower cost), we reviewed the potential for alignments approaching Bedford from the south and east, and

	following the route of the decommissioned Varsity Line, which ran between Bedford and Cambridge via Sandy. It was concluded that the preferred route remained a route approaching Bedford from the north via Bedford station. The ACP also reviewed the potential to follow the Varsity Line through Bedford and Cambridgeshire directly to Cambridge. Although a shorter route by not connecting to Cambourne or following the A428 road corridor, this route was considered to deliver significantly fewer benefits than the emerging preferred routes presented at NSC. The Southern Approach to Cambridge 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. Therefore, a Northern Approach to Cambridge, potentially including an additional station on route such as at Northstowe/Oakington is not a Preferred Alignment and will not be presented at the statutory consultation.
Some believed that the decision for the Southern route was based on exaggerated claims and that arguments for the southern route are questionable and misleading. Many said that it would destroy rural and cultural land in South Cambridgeshire. Concerns were expressed about the Southern route proposed by EWR Co impacting on many villages in South Cambridgeshire including Harlton and Haslingfield. It was suggested that there are better options following existing transport corridors that present with the following advantages: - The route largely follows existing transport corridors – A428 and M11. - It is far less damaging to existing settlements as there are no villages immediately to the north of the A428 or to the west of the M11.	Although the NATC design presented at the 2021 consultation was expected to be more expensive to build, 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 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. 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. The NSC emerging preferred options Route Alignments 1 and 9, and EWR Co's preferred alignment 1 (Tempsford variant), would run in a transport corridor alongside the northern side of the new and existing A428 west of Cambourne. Running EWR Co. parallel to the A428 could allow the scheme to benefit from a 'shared travel corridor', meaning that it would cover a route used regularly to connect people to places. This could also help to reduce some adverse impacts of the scheme. Visual changes to the landscape could be concentrated in the A428 corridor rather than in areas not already subject to development.

- The topography of the route is generally at a consistent level. - Fewer roads are crossed relying less on high embankments. - The junction with the existing line is no more difficult than that proposed by EWR. The proposal shows a similar radius bend and is close to an existing, very much tighter radius, bend and near to the station so trains will be moving slowly at this point anyway. - It has two straight sections and two bends. - It is probably shorter, quicker and cheaper than the EWR route.	However, it would be difficult for the new railway to be located in close proximity to the A421, existing A428, A14 and M11 roads because of the sensitive environmental features and existing settlements along these routes. For instance, this would mean that selecting an alignment in these areas is likely to 'sandwich' settlements between these busy roads and the new railway, increasing the impacts on local communities from the combined infrastructure. It is also noted that following these roads would require significant diversions to the preferred route Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant) increasing journey time and costs, and could require EWR to approach Cambridge from the north, which is not our preferred approach to Cambridge. We're seeking to maintain existing highway and PRoW connections wherever feasible, and to provide a suitable alternative which reduces the impact on communities where it is not. Since the consultation, we've been considering how EWR can be designed to blend in with the local environment through measures such as landscaping and screening to reduce visual intrusion. That's why we've been reviewing the design of the Section D route and looking for opportunities to reduce the height of embankments and viaducts, take the railway under roads in cuttings instead of building viaducts over them, or make minor diversions to the railway alignment to allow the railway to be lowered. RA1 is a longer route and would take approximately one and a half minutes longer than the Reference Case (RA8), and was classed as minor worsening for Transport user benefits Assessment Factor (AF1). These journey time related Assessment Factors are weighed up against other Assessment Factors including environmental impact and affordability. RA1 was estimated as the lowest cost shortlisted alignment, with cost estimates over 10% lower than the cost of the Reference Case (RA8) and judged as being a minor Improvements for the Capital costs Assessment Factor (AF3).
Concern was expressed about the congestion around Bedford station.	At the next stages of design development, we will focus on increasing capacity and improving the way passengers move around Bedford station. We will consider a variety of aspects including the sizing of ticket hall and station entrance, car parking and how these station components can operate efficiently and safely. We will carry out traffic surveys and transport modelling to help inform our design process, including car parking arrangements during the construction stage. As part of the Environmental Statement that will accompany the DCO application, we'll prepare a Transport Assessment to consider the impact on the strategic and local highway network, road safety and local sustainable modes of transport, including public transport. This will also set out the impact of construction on the road network, including changes

	to existing traffic patterns because of predicted construction traffic. The likely environmental impacts of the proposals will be described in the PEIR, which will be presented at statutory consultation. If required, mitigation measures will be set out in the CoCP which will be submitted to the Secretary of State as part of the DCO application. As mentioned, compliance with the CoCP will be secured through the DCO itself.
A concern was raised that the two options for the location of Bedford St. Johns station may have an impact on the waterway, as the rail over the river bridge would be relocated. The current bridge has very limited navigation headroom for the passage of boats. Plans are that this waterway will eventually link with the Grand Union Canal which will lead to a considerable increase in river traffic in future. Any new structure over the river should maintain at least the current navigation headroom or improve it. If the existing bridge is to be retained, any remedial works to it must not reduce the navigation headroom over the river.	We note the respondents' concern about the navigation headroom for the passage of boats under the existing railway bridge crossing the River Great Ouse in Bedford. The emerging preferred option for the relocation of Bedford St Johns station presented in the 2021 consultation would relocate it to the west, closer to Bedford Hospital and between Ampthill Road and Cauldwell Street. EWR Co reconsidered options for the relocation of the station in light of the feedback received during the 2021 consultation and as part of the Affordable Connection Project and relocating the station to the west remains our preference. A key feature of this option and associated alignment is that it makes use of the existing rail bridge over the River Great Ouse and would not require construction of a new bridge. If remedial works are required to the river bridge, we will take into account navigation headroom below as part of design development.
A concern was raised about the lack of a Ticket Office & Staffing at Bletchley station and how the need will increase as EWR generates more journeys. It was also said that parking should be cheaper. A request was made for topographical survey data at Bletchley Station. A request was made for an update on the eastern entrance to Bletchley station for East West Rail.	As we continue to develop our design proposals for Bletchley station, any facility upgrades will be designed to improve customer experience. As we would not be the station operator it is not within our remit to deliver changes to facilities such as toilets, lighting, waiting areas, retail shops and ticketing areas. However, we'll be sharing communities' feedback with London North-Western Railway who would be the operator of the station. We would not be providing topographical survey data as part of the consultation process for East West Rail services. We will be providing relevant designs and drawings at both statutory consultation and DCO application that provide a sufficient level of detail for people to understand and respond too. We note the support from respondents for both an eastern entrance to the station, and whilst providing an eastern entrance to Bletchley station does not currently form part of our scope, we continue to consider if there are opportunities to take such an option forward in future. Further information and proposals for station facilities at Bletchley Station will be presented at the statutory consultation.

It was suggested that an eastern entrance to Cambridge Station could be provided by extending platforms 7 and 8. Concern was expressed about the potential impact of additional platforms at Cambridge station on the Royal Mail Cambridge Delivery Office on Clifton Road.	We will need to build additional platforms at Cambridge Station to accommodate the new EWR service. Existing services in operation will not be affected by the additional platforms. We will need to make alterations to existing platforms, as well as create new through platforms likely to be located on the east side of the station. Designs for the station will be presented at the statutory consultation for comment. Regarding the Royal Mail Delivery Office on Clifton Road, we are currently developing designs for the preferred southern approach, including required land at Cambridge Station. An update will be provided at the statutory consultation.
Questions were asked about the decisions regarding the future of Fenny Stratford and Bow Brickhill stations.	While Concept 1 would retain the Fenny Stratford & Bow Brickhill Station, we recognise that Concept 2 would close both stations and this would affect local communities and businesses. If Concept 2 were to be delivered, some residents may need to travel a little further to their nearest station. Part of the development of this proposal would be developing plans for improved pedestrian and cycle routes, as well as working with local stakeholders on better public transport connections. 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. This will include consideration of short distance connectivity and rail passenger connectivity. Further information will be presented at statutory consultation. Since the 2021 consultation, and in response to Government's request that we 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 on our website) we've carried out further options analysis of the concepts and station proposals. Where analysis has identified further potential options, including what services would be provided at which stations. We'll further develop the options for each individual station, including the provision of station improvements where required, based on the service pattern to be provided. This work will be carried out at the next stage and presented for comment at the statutory consultation.
A suggestion was made to include Didcot as a termination point for passengers to reach Wales and the West as an alternative to catching a connecting train at Oxford.	Our scope is currently between Oxford & Cambridge however wider connectivity is important to us and are working closely with Network Rail on proposals including how best to link EWR services with the wider rail network. This will be factored into the process to design future timetables.

Several commented that EWR will not benefit the communities in between Cambourne and south Cambridge as there are no stations for them to use the railway. A suggestion was made to include a railway station at Comberton, Eversden, Haslingfield and Harston.	EWR 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, a more dynamic and specialised labour market, and knowledge spill-overs. 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. 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, notably within Cambridge. Consideration has been given to access to suitable road infrastructure, potential demand and viability of adjacent development in choosing station locations. There are no stations proposed as part of the SATC between Cambourne and Cambridge South (including locations such as Comberton, Eversden, Haslingfield and Harston). Whilst there is not considered to be sufficient demand at locations between Cambourne and Cambridge on the SATC routes to justify an additional station stop in terms of cost and additional journey time, the SATC design does not preclude the possible construction of additional stations at a future time.
Queries were received about a decision on the St Neots new station and on the construction site location. The distance the proposed works south of St Neots will be from the junction of Chawston Lane coming off the A1 Road was queried.	One of our core priorities is to increase connectivity across the Oxford to Cambridge area, supporting economic growth, housing and employment. Therefore, understanding how station location options might influence the development potential of their surrounding areas has been taken into account when comparing the route alignment options. Following our further review of the opportunities associated with a station at either St Neots or Tempsford since the 2021 non-statutory consultation, we have concluded that a station at Tempsford is expected to have greater potential for placemaking, which also aligns with Homes England's view. It is expected to have greater potential for development in support of significant economic growth, than a station at St Neots. We are committed to increasing prosperity and connectivity across the area, and therefore options to efficiently connect existing communities, such as St Neots, with the proposed new Tempsford station and

	our proposed network in general remains important. We will continue to develop proposals to enable easy improved accessibility first mile/last mile connectivity (I.e. how people travel to and from the station) for communities. Alignment 1 would cross A1 road to the north of the Black Cat roundabout and approximately 500m south of Chawston Lane. However, our preferred alignment Alignment 1 (Tempsford variant) crosses the A1 south of the Black Cat roundabout, over 1km south of Chawston Lane.
A suggestion was made for Millbrook station to be renamed “Millbrook for Cranfield” and for the new Winslow station to be renamed "Buckingham and Winslow", to put the historic county town back on the railway map.	We are open to renaming stations where there are good reasons for change, and where these reflect community aspirations. We will work with local communities and their representatives to identify these stations and potential names later in the project's development. Renaming stations will not be part of the scope of the DCO application, therefore this will be considered at the detailed design stage.
Queries were received about Sandy Train Station, whether it will be closed, and how travellers will connect to Tempsford.	ECML station is not designed to be a replacement for Sandy station or to have a negative impact on Sandy station. It is expected that passengers will be able to access EWR services at Tempsford through various means including ECML rail or local bus and active travel connections.
Concern was expressed about the status of Waterbeach Station.	Waterbeach Station is not within the scope of the EWR project.
A query was made into who will operate the Winslow station when it is operational and whether cycle routes and bus services will be incorporated in the design. One query asked how the Winslow station roof will be blended into the natural surroundings in a green design, whether planters will be placed on the platforms, and whether hanging baskets and mature trees will be replaced. It was asked if there will be network rail plans to connect the station at Winslow to London directly via Aylesbury.	We will work with the station operator, Network Rail and Buckinghamshire Council on connectivity and travel plans including consideration to the provision of cycle routes to and from the station and the integration of local bus services to serve the station. The design and construction of Winslow Station was carried out by the East West Rail Alliance and there are no plans for us to change the external appearance at this stage. We are currently working with the train operator on the design of the internal fit out of the station. We are continuing to explore options on how to connect Aylesbury with our colleagues in the Department for Transport and Network Rail. We are working with Government to understand whether there is a viable business case to continue work on an Aylesbury connection. Retail space has been designed into Winslow station. It will be down to the Station Facility Owner to confirm how retail space is used.

A question was asked about retail space at Winslow Station.	
Requests were received on the plans for Woburn Sands.	During the consultation, the plans we shared indicated options that could be developed further, and we're utilising the feedback received, as well as the Assessment Factors set out in consultation material to choose which options to progress. This includes consideration of infrastructure, construction activity and the service provided during and after construction. At the statutory consultation, the public will have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on more detailed plans including proposals for Woburn Sands station and level crossing.
EWR received many emails expressing their support for the project and the positive benefits it will bring to the area and encourage EWR's engagement with local communities. Support was received for the new rail travel opportunities for Bow Brickhill via Bletchley and as such avoiding the need to go via London. One respondent expressed that this is an essential part of key infrastructure going forward and enable social and economic connectivity for the area.	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. It would also increase connectivity for households and businesses across the route. This will help businesses become closer to suppliers, a more dynamic and specialised labour market, and 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. We will, where possible, look to quantify the impact of EWR 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. 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.
Questions were raised about the necessity of EWR. Some people felt that following the pandemic people will continue to work from home in large numbers and that there won't be any substantial demand for passengers between Cambridge and Oxford. Some criticism was received that the EWR link between Bedford and Cambridge doesn't benefit local business nor residents.	While no consensus has been formed about long-term rail demand in the UK, we'll be 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 its benefits should not be considered based on potential short-term fluctuations in demand. It is a long-term investment that would provide sustainable economic growth, help to attract investment and connect communities along the route for decades to come. 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. During Covid-19, rail demand was significantly reduced as people preferred to avoid public transport for obvious reasons. However, the Department for Transport have recently publicised that rail passenger numbers have now increased to pre-pandemic levels. We'll continue to monitor these figures and to factor them into our iterative business case process. 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. By introducing East West Rail services to Bedford and Cambridge, people in the centre of the towns and cities and surrounding area, including residents of Harston Village, would benefit from direct connections from/to Cambridge, Bletchley and Oxford. New rail connections can bring many benefits such as growth, urban regeneration and less congestion on the roads. At EWR Co, we are keen that the investment in the rail line brings lasting benefits to the town 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 town, cities and villages along the route. 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.
There was a positive comment about Oxford being connected to Cambridge, Bedford and Milton Keynes. Several people asked whether EWR is planning on running a direct line between Milton Keynes and Cambridge or if passengers will have to change at Bletchley.	We will provide direct connectivity between Milton Keynes and Cambridge.