

Cambridgeshire County Council's response to Network Rail's consultation on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Scheme (Ely South)

To: Highways and Transport Committee

Meeting Date: 27 July 2021

From: Steve Cox, Executive Director - Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): Ely North, Ely South, Littleport, Sutton, Soham North and Isleham, Southam South and Haddenham, Burwell, Woodditton

Key decision: No

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable

Outcome: The Committee is being asked to consider the response to Network Rail Consultation on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Scheme (Ely South) and provide comments and additions as required.

Recommendation: Committee is recommended to:

- a) Note and comments on Network Rail Consultation on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Scheme Consultation
- b) Delegate the agreement of the final consultation response to the Executive Director, Place and Economy in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee.

Officer contact:

Name: Jack Eagle
Post: Principal Transport and Infrastructure Officer
Email: Jack.Eagle@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 703269

Member contacts:

Names: Councillor Peter McDonald and Councillor Gerri Bird
Post: Chair/Vice-Chair Highways and Transport Committee
Email: Peter.McDonald@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Gerri.Bird@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 Network Rail are currently consulting over plans to increase rail capacity in the Ely area. The scheme is known as Ely Area Capacity Enhancement (EACE).
- 1.2 The focus of this element of the consultation is on the area named Ely south by Network Rail and includes several bridge structures and Kiln Lane level crossing. The area is shown on the map in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: Ely South Source Network Rail: <https://elyareacapacity.com/eace-programme-funding/>

- 1.3 The consultation material is available online here: <https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/our-routes/anglia/improving-the-railway-in-anglia/ely-area-capacity-enhancement/>
- 1.4 Network Rail are taking a phased approach to consultation this current consultation focused on Ely South area as shown in Figure 1. Network Rail’s timetable for consultation is shown in Figure 2 and detailed below:
 - Autumn 2020 public engagement about the EACE programme the County Council’s response to this was agreed at Committee held on 10 November 2020 <https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1533/Committee/62/Default.aspx>
 - Early 2021 Public consultation on Ely south area. This is the stage that is currently being consulted on and the draft response is provided in Appendix A.
 - Summer/Autumn 2021 Public consultation on the options in the rest of the Ely area. This will include the Queen Adelaide level crossings
 - Autumn/Winter 2022 preferred options with the EACE programme (currently unfunded)
 - Winter/Spring 2023 TWAO submitted (currently unfunded)
 - Autumn winter 2024 TWAO decision (currently unfunded)



Figure 2: Network Rail Consultation timeline: <https://phase2.elyareacapacity.com/consultation-timeline/>

2. Main Issues

2.1 Detail of the report. Include information here from the consultation. This phase of the consultation covers the Ely South area as shown in Figure 1. The key elements of this are:

- Soham branch line proposals
- Ely Dock Junction and Station
- Stuntney bridge
- Cutter bridge
- Common Muckhill bridge
- Bridge styles
- Kiln lane level crossing- vehicle and pedestrians
- Construction and the Environment

2.2 On the 8 February 2018 the Economy and Environment Committee at the County Council considered a report on a traffic study carried out in Queen Adelaide.
https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/678/Committee/5/Default.aspx

The committee resolved to:

- a) Note the proposals for wider regional and national benefits, of increased rail capacity through Ely North Junction;

- b) Note the potential impact on the whole community, residents and local businesses of increased frequency and duration of level crossing closures;
- c) Agree to oppose any measures that restrict traffic flow across the level crossings to the detriment of residents and local businesses until alternative solutions are put in place;
- d) Note the intention to explore opportunities with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to fund the options development for a road and / or rail solution and;
- e) Agree to continue to work with the Combined Authority, Network Rail and the Ely Area Task Force to develop a comprehensive solution that meets the needs of all Cambridgeshire residents and in particular the communities of Queen Adelaide, Prickwillow and Ely.

2.3 These resolutions will form the basis of the consultation response, and were highlighted to Network Rail when the County Council responded to the first phase of the consultation in November 2020

<https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1533/Committee/62/Default.aspx>

Another key element of the consultation response is the requirement for a greater number of additional train paths to be created by the EACE improvement scheme. Currently the proposals for increased passenger service appear to only cater for current outstanding franchise commitments. It is vital that the number of paths created by EACE fully caters for future demand.

2.4 A draft response is provided in Appendix A

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 Communities at the heart of everything we do

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.2 A good quality of life for everyone

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- An increase in freight on rail would lead to a better quality of life due to a reduction in road noise and transport related emissions
- An increase in passenger rail service would have the benefits of improving access to key services and reduce road transport related emissions.
- It is likely that the scheme could impact on residents and business in the Queen Adelaide and the Kiln Lane areas. The proposed response highlights the County Council's position to oppose any measures that restrict traffic flow across level crossings to the detriment of residents and local businesses until alternative solutions are put in place.
- It is noted that other level crossing may be impacted on by the Ely Area Capacity Scheme including public rights of way (PROW). Good health is part of a good quality of life and exercise using local PROW is one way of achieving this. It is therefore

important that suitable solutions are found for all level crossings where changes are required by the scheme.

- The scheme will necessitate changes to the local public rights of way network, which provides the opportunity to improve access to the countryside for the benefit of residents' physical and mental health and wellbeing in accordance with the Cambridgeshire Health & Wellbeing Strategy and Rights of Way Improvement Plan. The proposed response sets out that CCC is desirous of working with Network Rail to ensure that appropriate improvements are achieved.

3.3 Helping our children learn, develop and live life to the full

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.4 Cambridgeshire: a well-connected, safe, clean, green environment

The report above sets out the implications for this priority in paragraph 3.2

3.5 Protecting and caring for those who need us

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

Cambridgeshire County Council are currently seeking an agreement with Network Rail for Network Rail to cover County Council staff costs while being engaged on this project.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There is potential that the County Council might have to procure specialist resource to assist with this project. All procurement rules would be followed and existing frameworks and contracts used if suitable.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

No significant implication within this category.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

No significant implication within this category has been identified at this stage. An Equality and Diversity impact assessment has been requested from Network Rail

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

No significant implication within this category.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

Network Rail held a briefing for local and key Councillors on 24 June 2021. A draft version of the report was shared with local Councillors.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There is a requirement that the Public Health Team are involved in the scoping of the Environmental Impact Assessment to ensure the health impacts are adequately addressed and mitigated.

4.8 Environment and Climate Change Implications on Priority Areas (See further guidance in Appendix 2):

4.8.1 Implication 1: Energy efficient, low carbon buildings.

Status: neutral

Explanation: the project does not impact on buildings. The impacts on this area will be considered in our consultation response.

4.8.2 Implication 2: Low carbon transport.

Status: positive

Explanation: It is expected that this project would lead in increases in both passenger rail and freight which would be a carbon decrease when compared with road transport. The impacts on this area will be considered in our consultation response.

4.8.3 Implication 3: Green spaces, peatland, afforestation, habitats and land management.

Status: Potentially negative

Explanation: All options will have an impact on the local environment to varying degrees (including Ely Pits and Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest SSSI and River Great Ouse County Wildlife Site). The level of impact will very much dependant on the scheme that Network Rail bring forward. It is thought that Network Rail would manage this process to minimise potential impacts. The impacts on this area will be considered in our consultation response.

4.8.4 Implication 4: Waste Management and Tackling Plastic Pollution.

Status: unsure

Explanation: It is not known how Network Rail will manage Waste The impacts on this area will be considered in our consultation response.

4.8.5 Implication 5: Water use, availability and management:

Status: unsure

Explanation: It is not known how Network Rail will manage water. The impacts on this area will be considered in our consultation response.

4.8.6 Implication 6: Air Pollution.

Status: positive

Explanation: as the scheme is expected to reduce fossil fuel road based transport this should lead to an increase in area quality. The impacts on this area will be considered in our consultation response.

4.8.7 Implication 7: Resilience of our services and infrastructure, and supporting vulnerable people to cope with climate change.

Status: neutral

Explanation: The proposals focus on Network Rail's infrastructure. The impacts on this area will be considered in our consultation response.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes

Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement? Yes

Name of Officer: Henry Swan

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law? Yes

Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?

Yes

Name of Officer: Elsa Evans

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?

Yes

Name of Officer: Sarah Silk

Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact? Yes or No

Name of Officer:

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health?

Yes or No

Name of Officer:

If a Key decision, have any Environment and Climate Change implications been cleared by the Climate Change Officer?

Yes

Name of Officer: Emily Bolton

5. Source documents guidance

5.1 Source documents

Network Rail's consultation documents: <https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/our-routes/anglia/improving-the-railway-in-anglia/ely-area-capacity-enhancement/>

Minutes of Economy and Environment Committee held on 8 February 2018:

https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/CCC_live/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=eZJtmaZaQGE%2bt9YmDhmJLiyvD6Ldq7OeKi9s3ys4btJcqBz7BHmhbW%3d%3d&rUzwRPf%2bZ3zd4E7lkn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNih225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlG%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPIIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5oIA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCPMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d

Queen Adelaide Traffic Study Report presented to Economy and Environment Committee held on 8 February 2018

https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/CCC_live/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=%2fNXM3pn1khRyHWq41BTZngmdKcr7ikJxxeHha6U3P4uDLAKpHc%2fNiA%3d%3d&rUzwRPf%2bZ3zd4E7lkn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNih225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlG%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPIIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5oIA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCPMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d

Minutes of Highways and Transport Committee held on 10 November 2020

https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/CCC_live/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=AVSprFeJTtkiRO7Ci2mQP1%2fEzV%2b7pMfde8q%2bXdAJu2xe6RgyzAUykg%3d%3d&rUzwRPf%2bZ3zd4E7lkn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNih225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlG%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPIIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5oIA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCPMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d

Report presented with proposed consultation response to Highways and Transport Committee held on 10 November 2020

https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/CCC_live/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=mW6Frbq%2fLkgUIHPUIUba9BWKjmak%2fgSeeHLuc7V78Xla0PjzBI6bsQ%3d%3d&rUzwRPf%2bZ3zd4E7lkn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNih225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlG%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPIIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5oIA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCPMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d

[AfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d](https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/our-routes/anglia/improving-the-railway-in-anglia/ely-area-capacity-enhancement/)

Network Rail's Ely Area Capacity Enhancement website with consultation materials:
<https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/our-routes/anglia/improving-the-railway-in-anglia/ely-area-capacity-enhancement/>

5.2 Location

Reports are available online weblinks provided in section 5.1

Appendix A Draft Consultation Response.

1	What is your name?
	This response is submitted from Cambridgeshire County Council and reviewed and Highways and Transport Committee held on 27 July 2021
2	What is your email address?
	Transport.Plan@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk and Jack.Eagle@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk
3	Postcode (to identify concerns/opportunities by location)
	Not applicable
4	In general, I support the proposals to upgrade the railway in the Ely south area.
	Strongly support , support, undecided, Do not support, Strongly do not support
	Please explain why
	<p>Please note that this strong support is caveated on the basis that the County Council will oppose any measures that restrict traffic flow (including but not limited to motorists, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) across all level crossings to the detriment of residents and local businesses in Queen Adelaide, Prickwillow and surrounding area until alternative solutions are put in place.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council is strongly committed to increases in both passenger and freight rail service and improvement in the Ely area will allow for these services to come forwards. Increasing both freight and passenger services is in line with many of the County Councils objectives such as reducing carbon emissions, improving air quality, creating better access to services and delivery of housing growth. It should be noted that the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee resolved on the 8 February 2018: to Note the proposals for wider regional and national benefits, of increased rail capacity through Ely North Junction.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the protection of the communities of Queen Adelaide and Prickwillow MUST be at the forefront of any considerations.</p> <p>We understand the scope of works of the EACE is much wider than Ely and the surrounding area and involves many level crossings. The County Council will need to be fully involved as proposals for improvements at all level crossings are developed. To ensure that the needs of residents, business and other crossing users are fully considered and addressed in any new proposals.</p> <p>Capacity provided by EACE</p> <p>It is vital however that the additional capacity proposed through the EACE scheme is enough to cater for future demand. The detail shown in the consultation around train paths EACE will create is welcomed. In terms of passenger services these seems to be</p>

outstanding franchise commitments which should have been delivered some years ago apart from 1 x New service (additional service to be confirmed).

In terms of freight services there seems to be one additional freight path Felixstowe to the West Midland and the North proposed.

Given the large 'once in a lifetime' nature of the scheme it is vital that it provides adequate future capacity for both passenger and freight services.

A large range of stakeholders including but not limited to the County Council and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority are involved in these discussions. It appears that there has been no work carried out to investigate what future train paths may be required. This piece of work is required urgently.

Moreover it is important to note that the County Council is strongly supportive of the CPCA led project of Wisbech Rail reconnection and it is vital that train paths through Ely are provided for this service.

Given the significant funding that local funders have provided to this project, £9.3m funding from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Strategic Freight Network. Network Rail has secured £13.1m funding from the Department for Transport. This total level of funding £22.4m is close to the original total capital cost for the scheme¹. It is vitally important that EACE caters for the full future demand of rail capacity in the Ely area and not just the existing outstanding franchise commitments. Given the likely disruption and the 'once in a lifetime' nature of EACE it really does need to capture for the long-term needs of rail capacity through the Ely area.

Increases in passenger services relevant to the EACE that the County Council wishes to see and are required to ensure future sustainable development are outlined below:

- Increases in frequency of Kings Cross-Cambridge-Ely-King Lynn service to half hourly (current undelivered franchise commitment)
- Increase in frequency of Ipswich to Peterborough Service current undelivered (franchise commitment)
- Increases in frequency of Norwich to Cambridge service to half hourly- currently hourly
- Increase in frequency of Birmingham New Street to Stansted Airport service (Cross Country) to half hourly. (Possibly only between Birmingham and Cambridge for additional trains).
- Half hourly service between Cambridge and Stansted Airport. Outputs sought:
 - Either by improving frequency of Birmingham New Street to Stansted Airport service to half hourly, or
 - Extension of Norwich to Cambridge service to Stansted Airport hourly.
- Improved reliability / frequency of direct services between Cambridge and Peterborough. Outputs sought:

¹ <https://www.newcivilengineer.com/latest/ely-rail-upgrade-could-cost-20-times-more-than-original-proposal-network-rail-confirms-22-09-2020/>

- Ideally by improving the frequency of the Birmingham New Street to Stansted Airport service to half hourly, and improving the reliability of that service.
- Alternatively, by provision of a new hourly service.
- Additional services to stop at Whittlesea and Manea. Outputs sought:
 - At least hourly stopping pattern in each direction throughout the day at Whittlesea
 - At least two hourly stopping pattern in each direction throughout the day at Manea.
- Increase capacity for a Wisbech to Cambridge service.

The benefits that would be created by delivering the above train services are numerous and are detailed by a number of studies and reports that are available. A report produced by Mott MacDonald² highlights the wider economic benefits of EACE. It is vital that this are considered as Network Rail develop the business case. The report estimates “show that increased connectivity in the station settlements may lead to a range of primary benefits which in total amounts to £119,700,000 over the 60 year appraisals period”. These are summarised in more detail as:

WITA-Wider Agglomeration impacts results for Core 60-year appraisal 2016 prices

Element	Amount
Manufacturing	£2.5m
Construction	£2.4m
Consumer services	£8.9m
Producer services	£32.9m
Labour supply impact	£11.3m
Move to more productive jobs	£39.5m
Reducing spatial inequality	£22.2m
Total Primary Benefits	£119.7m

There are further secondary indirect benefits which are less direct, and attribution is less tangible such as potential for 1,080 new dwelling, £104m property value uplift, 557 jobs around stations settlements, £44m GVA p.a. It should be noted that this work was based on the following rail service improvements: Ipswich to Peterborough becoming hourly and both the Kings Lynn to London and Norwich to Cambridge services become half hourly. If more train paths were enabled by the EACE these benefits would increase.

It is therefore vital that Network Rail urgently confirm the number of train paths that will be created by EACE scheme and secondly ensure that all future demand is catered for by the scheme. Currently the County Council does not believe this is the case and therefore demands an urgent conversation with both Network Rail and the Department for Transport.

Impact on Local Community

Given the likely changes needed to level crossings in the Queen Adelaide Area it is vital to take account Cambridgeshire County Council’s position as resolved at the Economy and Environment Committee 8 February 2018.

² Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Wider Economic Benefits January 2017 Mott MacDonald all prices 2016.

b) Note the potential impact on the whole community, residents and local businesses of increased frequency and duration of level crossing closures; c) Agree to oppose any measures that restrict traffic flow across the level crossings to the detriment of residents and local businesses until alternative solutions are put in place.

It is vital that the communities and businesses affected by the EACE are fully engaged and consulted as the proposals move forwards. In particular these are the areas of Queen Adelaide and Prickwillow, but all affected will need to be fully involved.

The County Council's position is that it will oppose any measures that restrict traffic flow across the level crossings to the detriment of residents and local business until a suitable alternative solution is put in place. As noted below there is also a need to consider accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians as well as those with reduce mobility in the Queen Adelaide area and their needs have to be catered for.

We also understand that other level crossing could form part the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement. There are specific comments below related to Kiln Lane and Well Engine Crossing as they are part of the focus for this consultation.

It is noted that other level crossing may be impacted on by the Ely Area Capacity Scheme including public rights of way (PROW). Good health is part of a good quality of life and exercise using local PROW is one way of achieving this. It is therefore important that suitable solutions are found for all level crossings where changes are required by the scheme.

The scheme will necessitate changes to the local public rights of way network, which provides the opportunity to improve access to the countryside for the benefit of residents' physical and mental health and wellbeing in accordance with the Cambridgeshire Health & Wellbeing Strategy and Rights of Way Improvement Plan. The proposed response sets out that CCC is desirous of working with Network Rail to ensure that appropriate improvements are achieved.

Highways Authority Role

As the Highways Authority the County Council will also have to be fully engaged. As it is likely that proposals will affect highways, various teams at the County Council will have to be involved and there will be a requirement for Network Rail to cover costs through this process.

Team included but are not limited to are:

- Asset Management
- Transport Management
- Transport Strategy
- Transport Assessment
- Rights of Way
- Bridges
- Historic Environment Archaeology
- Street lighting

- Floods and Water
- Traffic signals (if applicable)

There is also a need to consider accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians as well as those with reduced mobility in the Queen Adelaide area and their needs have to be catered for. Through negotiation and in accordance with its Rights of Way Improvement Plan, the County Council will seek to protect and, where possible, achieve enhancements to the public right of way and non-motorised user network in the affected area. The County Council will be pleased to enter discussions with Network Rail to secure positive outcomes for local residents and rights of way user groups affected by the scheme.

As Highway Authority, the County Council will require that it is consulted upon any changes to the existing highway network. If there are any resultant increased highways maintenance liabilities imposed upon the Council as a result of changes to the existing highway network or the adoption of new highways infrastructure, the Council will require appropriate compensations, via the provision of commuted sums and/or other means.

It is key that funding for the construction of the scheme is gained and confirmed as soon as possible so that the scheme can be constructed and the benefits of it gained as soon as possible. The timescales layout in the consultation materials are not ambitious enough and need to be reconsidered. It should be noted that the scheme was previously confirmed for delivery before the Hendy review in 2016.

Public Health Implications

There is a requirement that the Public Health Team are involved in the scoping of the Environmental Impact Assessment to ensure the health impacts are adequately addressed and mitigated.

5 Do you have any comments about the Soham branch line proposals we should consider?

We welcome the improves to the Soham branch line to increase capacity for train services. It is important that these improvements include active provision for the full doubling of the Ely to Soham line.

Wells Engine Crossing

The County Council objects to the proposed inclusion of Wells Engine for closure of the FP24 Ely level crossing.

As NR are aware, this Footpath level crossing was proposed in the Network Rail (Cambridgeshire Level Crossing Reduction) Order that received a SoS decision in October 2020 refusing to include this crossing in the Order on grounds that:

- NR was unable to provide flood event data to support their application, which made it impossible to clarify the likely impact of the proposal.
- The introduction of chain link fencing 'could affect the volumetric flow rate of water in or flowing to or from any drainage work' with a consequent potential effect on flood risk and drainage. The Inspector concluded that the development would not be appropriate for a functional floodplain (p223, Inspector's decision

	<p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cambridgeshire-level-crossing-reduction-transport-and-works-act-order)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there were to be a flood event, users would have to make a very significant diversion of which they would be unaware when travelling from the south until reaching the site. It would be impractical for the highway authority to provide signage at such times. • FP24 Ely is a promoted route, part of the Fen Rivers Way, and well-used. Part of the rationale for the development of 3,000 new homes in north Ely was the access to the countryside, important for physical and mental health in accordance with the Ely Local Plan and the Cambridgeshire Health & Wellbeing Strategy. In addition, East Cambridgeshire District Council are working on a tourism strategy depending on walking routes. • The potential effect of flooding could therefore significantly reduce the convenience and suitability of the route. <p>CCC is unaware of any flood data being made available since the 2017/18 public inquiry, and therefore it maintains its objection to the proposal.</p>
6	Do you have any comments about the Ely Dock junction proposals we should consider?
	We have no detailed comments about Ely Dock junction other than the requirement to include active provision for the full Ely to Soham line doubling scheme.
7	Do you have any comments about the Ely Station proposals we should consider?
	If access for all passengers is not be adversely affected and passenger disruption will be kept to a minimum whilst works are carried out, we have no detailed comments on this proposal. From what is proposed we do not think there will be a major impact on Ely Station from these proposals.
8	Do you have any comments about the Stuntney Road Bridge we should consider?
	<p>We welcome the proposed additional capacity for train services that would be created by this and would hope that the scheme that created the greatest capacity could be delivered.</p> <p>Whilst understanding that the headroom under bridge will not be affected if anything could be done to increase awareness of the very low bridge this would be welcomed as despite what is already in place bridge strikes do frequently occur. Bridge strikes cause considerable disruption to both the rail and road network so if anything could be done to reduce this risk it would be welcomed. One possible solution may be a barrier with chains hanging from it to alert drivers of the low bridge. The County Council would like to work with Network Rail to enable a solution that reduced bridge strikes.</p>
9	At Cutter Bridge is your preference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 single deck bridge • Option 2 two bridges side by side • Undecided
	Please explain why

	<p>We have chosen option 2 as this creates greater capacity for both passenger and freight trains and looks like it would create greater reliance when dealing with any future problems or incidents on the railway.</p> <p>It should be noted that two bridges side by side would create a slightly longer distance for those using the footpath and cycle way under the bridge. The route under Cutter Bridge is part of National Cycle Network Route 11 and access to this needs to remain and head clearance needs to be considered.</p>
10	At Cutter Bridge do you prefer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truss bridge • Archway bridge
	Please explain why
	We have no preference currently.
11	At Common Muckhill Bridge is your preference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 single deck bridge • Option 2 a truss bridge with a centre pier • Undecided
	Please explain why
	We have no preference currently.
12	If Option 1 at Common Muckhill Bridge is chosen, would you prefer
	<p>Truss bridge</p> <p>Archway bridge</p>
	Please explain why
	We have no preference currently.
13	At Kiln Lane, for the footbridge, would you prefer?
	<p>Option 1 Standard bridge</p> <p>Option 2 Spiral</p> <p>Option 3 Serpentine</p> <p>Option 4 Wave</p> <p>Currently we have no preference.</p>
	Please explain why
	There is a need to ensure that any bridge option that is taken forward ensure that there is DDA access for all users with the provision of ramps at suitable graduates and rest/waiting areas provided as required.

	<p>The County Council preference would be for the option that has the least impact from an environmental perspective, caused least disruption during construction and provided the greatest level of future proofing. e.g. rail electrification, future track doubling etc.</p> <p>This proposal has clear implications for FP12 Ely and the wider rights of way network. FP12 is part of the long distance promoted route, the Hereward Way, and is also a strategic off-road route in and out of Ely. CCC seeks discussions with Network Rail and stakeholders to identify opportunities for improved access for non-motorised users and to agree the most suitable outcome for the proposals in accordance with NPPF para 98, CCC Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the Cambridgeshire Health & Well-Being Strategy.</p>
14	At Kiln Lane, for vehicle access is your preference
	<p>Option 1 a road viaduct over the railway line</p> <p>Option 2 a road bridge over the river from Queen Adelaide Way</p>
	Please explain why
	<p>The County Council preference would be for the option that has the least impact from an environmental perspective, caused least disruption during construction and provided the greatest leave of future proofing. e.g. rail electrification, future track doubling etc.</p> <p>It should noted that: “Roads that only provide access to industrial estates or commercial uses or business parks will not be adopted as highway maintainable at public expense.” More information is available online https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/roads-and-pathways/highways-development</p> <p>We would be interested to know if Network Rail has investigated possible options to relocate the business and other users of the site accessed via Kiln Lane level crossing? Potentially it might be cheaper and have less impact if suitable sites could be found for relocation instead of constructing a bridge over rail or river.</p>
15	If you wish to be contact by Network Rail with further information or to discuss the feedback you have provided on the Ely Area Capacity Enhancements Programme
	We would be happy to be contacted by Network Rail to discuss this feedback and the Ely Area Capacity Enhancement Programme in more detail. Cambridgeshire County Council officers currently have regular contact with Network Rail Staff.
	Further comments
	<p>General comments</p> <p>The County Council general approach is that it that it prefers options that have minimise the environmental impact, minimise disruption to both the rail and road network during construction and use, and provide the greatest level of future proofing and provision for future improvements.</p> <p>During the construction of the Ely Area Capacity Scheme there could be considerable disruption to both road and rail users. It is important that these are minimised. The County Council would require future conversation regarding traffic management during construction. It should also be noted that elements of this project have the potential to impact on river navigation and Ely as a tourist destination. The County Council’s likely</p>

preference is going to be the option that causes least disruption to all users during in construction.

Flood Risk and Ecology Team comments

Flood Zone Compensation

It is noted that there are parts of the scheme which will require additional infrastructure. Where this infrastructure is within a floodplain, the applicant must ensure that there is flood zone compensation. This means that for every cubic meter of flood zone taken up by infrastructure, like for like compensation must be provided to ensure that no functional floodplain is lost to the development. It should be noted, this is related to main rivers and therefore is a consideration for the EA to provide formal comment on formally.

Additional Impermeable Areas

The proposals may result in additional infrastructure, resulting in an increase in impermeable area and potential changes to landform (embankments or viaducts). Any development or additional infrastructure must consider the impacts on surface water drainage from the land. This will require management of surface water in line with national and local guidance. The proposals should not increase the risk of flooding to any adjacent land or property and look to better any situations where possible.

It should be noted that most the water management information will be covered in the formal submissions and likely discussed more in detail during the EIA. We do not necessarily have a preference on routes or designs; however, we expect that surface water is managed suitably and sustainably from the chosen design option.

Ecology comments

All options will have an impact on the local environment to varying degrees (including Ely Pits and Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest SSSI and River Great Ouse County Wildlife Site). The level of impact will very much dependant on the scheme that Network Rail bring forward. It is thought that Network Rail would manage this process to minimise potential impacts. Network Rail are only proposing to 'minimise' not completely avoid / compensate for impact to SSSI and there's no consideration of impact on the River Great Ouse County Wildlife Site.

The proposed changes to Kiln Lane have the potential to impact on the important birds / bird assemblages for which Roswell Pits Site of Special Scientific Interest has been designated, as well as impact to the River Great Ouse County Wildlife Site. Therefore Network Rail will need to demonstrate how they have taken into consideration other solutions, including 'do nothing', enhancements to the existing barrier crossing and relocation of the industrial estate. And demonstrate that their selected design is sustainable and will cause no adverse impact to the wildlife sites and their species of interest. The EIA must be based on sound, detailed ecological survey work, supported by detailed evidence of air quality and hydrology.

Historic Environment Team comments

Our records indicate that the proposed works are located in an area of high archaeological potential on the eastern edge of the historic city of Ely. Known heritage assets of archaeological interest in the vicinity include mercantile and industrial activity along the waterfront of medieval Ely, including pottery production. Evidence for post medieval and 19th century industry may also survive in the vicinity. The proposals include new bridges

and embankment works which may result in impacts to these heritage assets. Ancillary works such as compounds and the siting of plant may also result in substantial disturbance.

Network Rail's supporting document lists heritage as a relevant topic for scoping under Environmental Impact Assessment. We would advise that in addition to designated heritage assets, this should include assessment of the potential impacts on undesignated heritage, including sub surface archaeological features and deposits. EIA should also include an assessment of measures required to address any adverse impacts of development.

Inclusion of Upgrading Level Crossings Between Ely and Ipswich – Resource impact

It is noted that it is the intention to integrate the upgrading of level crossings between Ely and Ipswich under the umbrella of the EACE programme. This is likely to significantly increase the scope of the TWAO and hence the resources required from the County Council to both comment adequately upon the TWAO and to support its potential implementation. The County Council would seek funding from NR for such resources as are required.

Impacts on Public Rights of Way

1. Cutter Bridge maintenance liabilities

At this location, Public Footpath Ely 23 runs over a supported structure that is part of the rail bridge over the River. Clarification is required as to where the responsibility for maintenance of the structure and path surface lies.

2. Common Muckhill Bridge

Public Footpath Ely 14 passes under this bridge. Network Rail need to take this into consideration with their proposals.

3. Cutter and Common Muckhill Bridges – retaining existing provision

Any renewal of these bridges needs to ensure the existing widths and appropriate heights of the Public Footpaths are retained.

4. Cutter and Common Muckhill Bridges – Closures during construction

Temporary closures to enable the replacement of the bridges must be kept to minimum, since FP14 Ely is an important leisure route.