

My ref: XXX
Date: XXX
Contact: Nav Panesar
Email: NSIPs@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Frank Jordan, Executive Director
**Place and Sustainability
Environment, Planning and Economy**

Sent via email to: XXX

Consents Team
PO Box 761
ALC2660
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE29 9QR

Dear East West Rail Company Limited,

Non-statutory consultation by East West Rail Company Limited for East West Rail - Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements Development Consent Order (DCO) proposals

I am writing on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council (the Council) in response to the non-statutory consultation for the East West Rail - Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements proposals, which commenced on 14 November 2024 and closes on 24 January 2025.

Attached to this letter is a table containing the Council's initial views on the current proposals, across a number of technical specialisms. The Council maintains the position agreed at our July Committee based on the information available in the non-statutory consultation, and reserves the right to comment further in the coming months as the proposals develop and more detail becomes available.

The Council notes that there has been significant work by the East West Rail Company to develop their proposals and welcomes the opportunity to respond to the consultation. Although there have been some encouraging developments, specifically in relation to the partial electrification proposals, and the proposals to tunnel sections of the route, there remain concerns about the impact of the project on communities and in specific areas including ecology and biodiversity, the impacts of construction, connectivity and active travel provision, and the impacts on the highway network including Rights of Way.

The Council acknowledges and supports the responses of key stakeholders including England's Economic Heartland, Transport East, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, and Huntingdon District Council. It is essential that with a project of this size that all opportunities are fully explored to deliver the best possible outcomes for the residents and businesses of Cambridgeshire, including by future proofing infrastructure where needed. Within our detailed response support is noted for a potential eastern access to Cambridge Station, and also a potential new station at Cambridge East.

Meaningful engagement with the East West Rail Company is now expected to fully



understand the details of the proposals in advance of any future consultation and application for a Development Consent Order.

If you have any queries regarding this submission or require any further information, please contact NSIPs@cambridgeshire.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

Frank Jordan
Executive Director

DRAFT

East West Rail - Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements: Comments on the Applicant's Non-Statutory Consultation

This document sets out the comments by Cambridgeshire County Council (**the Council**) regarding East West Rail Company Limited's (EWR) Non-Statutory Consultation for the East West Rail - Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements proposals.

The following table contains comments across a number of technical specialisms.

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
Air Quality		<p>The Council expects EWR to consult Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on this matter regarding the scheme site and any associated infrastructure that falls within the respective District Council's boundary.</p> <p>The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation, in particular as it relates to public health.</p>
Communities, Skills, Employment, Socio-economics	Whole project	<p>The Council would welcome more opportunities for local communities to benefit from this development through local apprenticeships and development of skills for underprivileged groups in connection to the construction and running of the railway, for example through the provision of a community benefit fund. Mitigation of the disruption and loss of land by providing a community fund for those local communities affected. Enable the communities to use this fund to create opportunities for community led action, local support groups, as examples of positive mitigations.</p> <p>The Council would also recommend EWR link into local schools and colleges to interest young people in careers connected to this project and provide work experience and internship opportunities.</p> <p>The Council would also welcome EWR funding a community rail partnership, should the scheme be consented, to continue the community focused approach, making sure the local communities affected continue to have focus on their recovery and can start to have a positive relationship with the finished project.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council would encourage EWR to consider, within the active travel and improved transport links to the new stations, the improvement of funding for public transport (e.g. buses). Rural Cambridgeshire residents struggle with transport and not everyone is able to walk, wheel, cycle the distance safely to a new station. Better bus links would encourage better connectivity for these isolated communities to access this new service. This would have an improved effect on access to employment, education and social connections.</p>
Noise		<p>The Council would expect EWR to consult Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on this matter regarding the site and any associated infrastructure that falls within the respective District Council's boundary.</p> <p>The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation, in particular as it relates to public health.</p>
Climate and Carbon		<p>The Council is pleased to see the ambition for EWR to be a net zero passenger railway along with strengthened consideration for options to electrify the route.</p> <p>However, there is insufficient detail to enable the Council to adequately comment on the proposals. The Council requires sight of the carbon calculations used to calculate emissions relating to the construction, operation and maintenance of this project at the next stage of consultation. This will need to provide sufficient detail to enable the Council to scrutinise the assertions related to carbon within the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission.</p> <p>Where high level information on carbon emissions is provided, this is currently qualitative and lacks sufficient detail on the sources of emissions included (or excluded) within the calculations. Notably, it is disappointing to see the highest carbon options being preferred at 11.3.4.4 and 12.2.5.4 of the Technical Report – this appears to be inconsistent with the wider stated net zero goals of EWR. The Council will expect to see robust and credible carbon management plans should these options be progressed.</p> <p>Finally, climate resilience is not listed as a topic in the Environmental Statement despite being a pillar of EWR's Environmental Sustainability Strategy. Ensuring EWR infrastructure is built to be resilient to our changing climate is crucial, therefore full details relating to how EWR will achieve this should be included within the next iteration of the Environmental Statement.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Officers would be open to having more detailed discussions with EWR if further detail on the above concerns would be helpful.</p>
Health		<p>The Council have considered the following documents to create this response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following fact sheets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assessment factors ○ Approach to management of Construction ○ Accessibility and Inclusion ○ Our approach to Freight and ○ Our approach to Noise and Vibration and two of the main reports • Connecting people, building communities consultation document • Transport update report <p>This response focuses on the sections of the proposed line within Cambridgeshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East of St Neots, • Croxton to Toft, • Comberton to Shelford and • Cambridge. <p>However, the Council appreciates both the potential benefits and impacts of construction and operation for the wider communities to the west in areas such as Tempsford and beyond.</p> <p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider access to employment opportunities, particularly both in logistics, construction industries • Potential air quality benefits through reduced vehicle emissions due to increased freight movements by rail rather than road. • Further potential reduction in car journeys and hence vehicle emissions through modal shift to rail, due to improved journey times. • Improved connectivity both east to west and north to south, because of the new station at Tempsford including platforms for the East Coast mainline. <p><u>Analysis of Fact Sheets</u></p> <p>Assessment Factors</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council is concerned that the Assessment factors fact sheet makes no reference to human health within any of the fifteen factors. This is particularly concerning as one of the factors relates to Local Plans and another focuses on transport user benefits such as modal shift as well as the environment. All of which have references to health and wellbeing that the East West Rail could potentially contribute towards. The Council also suggest EWR reference to the Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) which draws on local evidence that would be useful in the final drafts of a number of supporting documents, facts sheets, reports etc.</p> <p>Conversely, the assessment factors do include important factors such as: unlocking economic growth and short distance connectivity into key employment hubs from housing centres, along with ability to interchange.</p> <p>Approach to Construction</p> <p>The Council welcomes the fact sheets listing a wide range of construction impacts that are related to health along with mitigation measures such as: directing light away from sensitive receptors, appropriately fenced working areas, environment incidents.</p> <p>Furthermore, in terms of the air quality measures proposed the Council supports the aim to minimise dust through sheeting and water spraying along with minimising the use of diesel equipment. - to be replaced by sustainable energy such electric vehicles and electric plant.</p> <p>Other measures referred to aim to minimise the impact of the delivery of materials/collection of waste, via vehicle routing. The fact sheet also makes positive reference to the use of workforce travel plans. All of which can potentially have a positive health benefit. As could protective measures relating to flood risk and waste.</p> <p>Accessibility and Inclusion</p> <p>The commitment in the fact sheet to identify gaps between industry standards and best practice in terms of accessibility is most welcome. As is the work of the Accessibility Advisory Panel, consisting of 12 local residents from across the EWR Oxford- Cambridge route and all of whom have “lived experiences of disability and accessibility challenges”.</p> <p>Freight</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The significance of East West Rail to freight movements is well illustrated within the factsheet. Stating <i>“It is estimated that without additional investment outside east west rail over 250,000 lorry journeys every year – around 980 lorry journey per day year.”</i></p> <p>The Public Health benefit of such a modal shift of freight to rail, using electric rather than diesel powered trains is likely to be considerable due to the likely improvement in air quality close to the major current road network. Reducing the current numbers of HGV’s using the network, the majority with diesel engines, producing pollutants such as PM10 and PM2.5 particulate matter, directly linked to several health-related conditions from cancer to respiratory disease is much appreciated.</p> <p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>The fact sheet confirms that EWR will comply with <i>“the Noise Policy statement for England, - avoiding significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life”, minimising impact on health and quality of life and where possible contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life”</i></p> <p>It is useful to see confirmation that EWR are in the process of carrying out a detailed assessment of noise and vibration, including base line surveys and computer modelling the results of which will be set out in detail within the Environmental Statement (ES). The fact sheet also usefully lists a series of mitigation measures that will be set out in the Code of Construction practice along with operation measures.</p> <p>This includes a series of proposed protective measures such as: controlled working hours, location of machinery and haul roads away from areas they would cause disturbance, noise barriers, monitoring noise and vibration to enable corrective measures where necessary.</p> <p><u>Connecting people, building communities report</u></p> <p>Chapter 4 requests consultees feedback on the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size and Location of stations • Aspects of Alignment • How railways will cross roads and rivers • Best solutions for existing level crossings • How we could avoid or reduce environmental impacts and enhance and improve natural environment.

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>In terms of these points, the Council's main concerns in relation to Public Health are around the need to encourage and not discourage active travel and ensure accessibility and connectivity for local communities is ideally improved and no additional barriers introduced. Any solution to existing level crossing for example should not result in community severance. We therefore welcome the commitment in Chapter 6 concerning the impact on Public Rights of Way (PROW)– <i>“seeking to maintain existing safe PROWs or provide suitable alternative”</i>.</p> <p>Sections of the route this response focuses on</p> <p>Chapter 13 To east of St Neots</p> <p>Although this section falls outside of the Cambridgeshire boundary the proposed station is close enough to become an attractive commuting station. Importantly, the new Tempsford station will allow Cambridgeshire residents to transfer to the East Coast Mainline. The area adjacent to the new station may also become an employment hub creating job opportunities for Cambridgeshire residents.</p> <p>Chapter 13 requests consultees feedback on the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logistics hub locations issues • Alignment options • New Station development • Other issues and opportunities that need to be considered as the proposals for this section are developed <p>Logistics hub</p> <p>In terms of the logistics hub, the Council's Public Health team do not have the knowledge of technical skills to make an educated judgement and consequently do not have a preferred option. We rely on the reports statement that Option B (near Little Barford parallel with the new A421 dual carriageway and the east coast mainline) is the only location compatible with both proposed alignments 1b & 1c.</p> <p>Alignment options</p> <p>We would have concerns with the potential impact of option 1b on those travellers with accessibility issues and the ageing population. Particularly, as the report states option 1b will be 22 metres</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>above ground level at Tempsford station. Twice the height of option 1c (9 metres above ground level). However, Option 1c appears to show an alignment closer to three communities in Wyboston, Chawston and Colesden and without the results of noise modelling it is not possible to establish the impact of 1c on these communities.</p> <p>New Station development</p> <p>As with all new station development we would wish to see measures to encourage active travel such as a significant provision of secure cycle parking. This is extremely important in this area of the UK with the high level of cycling which is increasing annually.</p> <p>Chapter 14 Croxton to Toft construction of a new railway and station</p> <p>As with all sections of the proposed line this section raises a number of Public Health concerns relating to the impact on health and wellbeing of the local residents living close to the proposed alignment as a result of due to disruption and noise during construction process. The impact on mental health of residents has the potential to be considerable for those living close by and the Council would welcome discussions with EWR regarding the planned measures to minimise the likelihood of residents experiencing such issues.</p> <p>Feedback required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues and opportunities around Cambourne station • Issues and opportunities that need to be considered as the proposals for the railway in this section including the A428 Bourn Airfield tunnel. <p>The report states that Cambourne station will have “bus facilities”. As this station could be a popular interchange and the Transport Update report shows that currently there are several buses per hour serving Cambourne more detail would be appreciated as to the extent of these facilities along with reference to the amount of secure on site cycle parking being allocated.</p> <p>As the station is to be located close to St Neots Road north of A428, we would welcome further details of access arrangements from Cambourne for safe and convenient cycling and walking to the station.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Chapter 15 Comberton to Shelford construction of a new railway and improvements to the existing railway.</p> <p>Feedback required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options for maintaining connectivity between Harston and Newton after closure of level crossing, including whether a footbridge should be built. • Whether a footbridge should be built to a road bridge to replace Hauxton Rd level crossing • Any other issues and opportunities that need to be considered. <p>Maintaining connectivity between Harston and Newton. Further consideration needs to be given to the potential impact on local residents in Newton, in terms of access services such as the GP surgery in Harston and the local village post office and local convenience store that serve both villages.</p> <p>Furthermore, adjacent to the crossing at Station Road, Harston is the location of a national building supplies business operating HGVs. The proposed new bridge should consider the needs of this and other local businesses and be designed with sufficient road space in mind, whilst allowing the business to safely operate during construction.</p> <p>Further detail of the inclusion of the new accessible foot bridge to the east of the existing Harston level crossing East West Rail are considering would be appreciated.</p> <p>Currently, cyclists travelling from Newton, south of the railway north through Harston and beyond have a direct route. The proposed bridge is 400 meters to the east and could be seen as a barrier to active travel.</p> <p>A footbridge should be built in addition to a road bridge to replace Hauxton Rd level crossing – we believe that a footbridge is essential because as the proposal in Option 4 also needs to ensure no loss of connectivity for cyclist/ walkers to destinations beyond Hauxton. In terms of cycling, recent residential developments north of Hauxton along with a segregated route that is already in place towards Trumpington and potentially Addenbrookes aims to encourage active travel.</p> <p>By the commencement of the construction of this section of East West Rail, the number of cyclists using the route could have significantly increased and as a consequence a bridge to replace the Hauxton crossing will be essential. (This route is shown on the Cambridge City Cycle Map towards Cambridge).</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Chapter 16 Route Section - Cambridge Improvements to the existing railway and stations.</p> <p>We support the aspiration of the railway to potentially enable the provision of wider employment opportunities within Cambridge and create employment clusters close to stations to west of the city. The estimated journey time of 35 mins to Bedford against up to 70 minutes by car and the proposed Cambridge South station will sustainably support growth.</p> <p>Proposals will include a new cycle / walking bridge at Coldham's Common that should contribute to continual growth in active travel in the city.</p> <p>We welcome the ongoing assessment is being carried out in respect of noise and vibration at sensitive locations such as the Microbiological Research Centre labs and the Anne McLaren building, focusing on the passing trains.</p> <p>Please contact the Health in all Policies team should you require clarification regarding any of the issues raised above.</p>
Biodiversity		<p>Cambridgeshire is one of the most nature depleted counties within England, with only small remnants of isolated habitats supporting habitats/species that are vulnerable to additional pressures, including development and climate change. The Council is concerned that habitat loss and impacts associated with the EWR scheme will further exacerbate fragmentation and result in losses to wildlife sites, habitat and species.</p> <p>The scheme, particularly the Cambourne tunnel, should be redesigned to avoid these losses, ensure mitigation measures are embedded within the design, and deliver landscape scale biodiversity enhancements. Proposed avoidance/mitigation measures should be agreed with the local authorities.</p> <p>Ecological Impact Assessment</p> <p>Survey work has yet to be completed/shared with the Council and as such the level of impact of the scheme on biodiversity is current unknown. All survey methodology should be agreed with the local authorities (and Natural England, where appropriate). The results of the surveys must be</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>shared with the local authorities as soon as possible to identify where further survey work is needed. These should form part of the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report.</p> <p>Direct and indirect impacts on ecological receptors from both the construction and operational phase must be considered. The zone of influence should include National Site Network sites within 10km (Portholme and Eversden & Wimpole Woods Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory sites within 2km (Sites of Special Scientific Interest / Local Nature Reserves), non-statutory sites within 500m (County Wildlife Sites, City Wildlife Sites and Local Geological Sites and a potential County Wildlife Site) and Protected Road Verges within 500m of the scheme. As well as irreplaceable habitats, priority habitats and protected / priority / notable species found in close proximity to the scheme.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact</p> <p>The EWR scheme must avoid adverse impact to ecological mitigation for other development schemes, as well as take into account ecological survey results, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A428 Black Cat – Caxton Gibbet road improvement scheme (see below) • Bourn airfield redevelopment (see Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC section below) • Cambridge to Cambourne Guided busway • Cambridge South Station, including compensation land for impacts to Hobson's Park • Cambridge South Station / Cambridge South East Transport Scheme (CSETS) farmland species mitigation, including Grey Partridge, Corn Bunting and Brown Hare • Cambridgeshire Guided Busway notable flora mitigation at Landscape & Ecological Mitigation areas N & O • Sawston Greenway, cumulative impact on habitat loss(including Long Road Plantation City Wildlife Site) and lighting (including DNA path). • Cambridge North Station mitigation for open mosaic habitat and reptiles, along with residential development of Cambridge North requiring mitigation for notable flora / invertebrates (please refer to invertebrate mitigation shows in Ecological Design Strategy for phase 2) • Chesterton Bridge landscape and water vole mitigation at Ditton Meadows • Chisholm Trail toad, reptile, water vole and grassland mitigation at Barnwell Pits and/or Coldham's Common. • Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation project <p>A428 Road Improvement Scheme – cumulative impact</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The EWR scheme will result in far wider and greater severance of the landscape between St Neots and Cambourne as a result of cumulative impacts with A428 road improvement works, including wildlife corridors linking Boys Wood / Sir Johns Wood (location of A428 bat tunnel), Pillar Plantation (including A428 early tree planting); along Hen, Wintringham, Fox, Gallow & West brooks (location of A428 underpasses) and A428 mammal crossing under Toseland Road Bridge.</p> <p>The Council notes that the EWR scheme will deliver habitat creation that will compliment A428 landscape scheme, particularly around Hen Brook, Wintringham Brook and Fox Brook. Opportunities to further expand habitat creation to strengthen all wildlife crossings across the A428/EWR corridor (e.g. Pillar Plantation and West Brook) should also be secured.</p> <p>However, the Council is concerned that the EWR scheme will adversely impact some of the ecological mitigation measures set out in the A428 Environmental Master Plan [REP9-037], including changes to approved habitat creation, delay/reinstatement of landscape planting and destruction of watercourse enhancements. These impacts should be avoided, particularly impacts to early guide planting/woodland planting for bat mitigation, and/or fully compensated.</p> <p>The EWR Environmental Update Report (9.2.23-9.2.27) also fails to recognise the presence of irreplaceable habitat, important habitats or species of district important (e.g. arable flora in fields A29 & A30, veteran elm and important hedgerow H39 & H58 shown within the A428 Terrestrial Habitats report [APP-190]) identified in the Environmental Statement for the A428 works, nor its arable flora mitigation strategy. These must be considered as part of the scheme design.</p> <p>Wildlife Sites</p> <p>Impacts to Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC barbastelle bat population are unacceptable and scheme should be redesigned (discussed below). The Council is also concerned about adverse impacts Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Local Nature Reserves (LNR), County Wildlife Sites (CWS), City Wildlife Sites (CiWS) and Protected Road Verges (PRV) and these must be avoided wherever possible. Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts of Chapel Hill tunnel (within SSSI Impact Risk Zone) and habitat works on Barrington Quarry SSSI • Indirect impacts on Denford Fen SSSI (within SSSI Impact Risk Zone) • Indirect impacts on Whittlesford - Thriplow Hummocky Fields SSSI, compounded by the section of Option 4C for Hauxton Junction (Technical Update Report 12.3.2.4)

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete destruction of Frogs Hall Drift CWS as a result of utility works is unacceptable and must be avoided. • Habitat loss within County Wildlife Sites (e.g. Coldham's Common and Cambridge – Bedford Disused Railway (Harlton)) and City Wildlife Sites (e.g. Barnwell Pit, Ditton Meadows, Hobson's Park, Long Road Plantation, Triangle North of Long Road and Noman Cement Pits) must be avoided. Any temporary losses must be reinstated to achieve the target habitat condition/for target species. Impacts to landscape/ecological mitigation schemes for these wildlife sites as a result of other development (as discussed above) must be addressed. • Habitat loss, shading and pollution of River Cam CWS (including Bourn Brook) and River Rhee CWS must be avoided. Opportunities for enhancement of river corridors and improvement of existing crossing structures (e.g. River Cam CWS at Shelford) for biodiversity should be secured. • Impact to Knapwell Road RSV CWS/PRV S23 is unknown. The railway alignment must avoid this CWS. However, it must also be noted that the verges outside of the CWS also support notable flora (contact CPERC/BSBI vice county recorder for more information) and therefore, further surveys are required to identify most appropriate alignment • Habitat loss to potential Westfield Farm County Wildlife Site (to be discussed at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Sites Panel in 2025, please contact Wildlife Trust BCN for more information). • Recreational pressure on Bramblefields LNR and Hobson's Park CiWS due to increased visitor usage of Cambridge North and Cambridge South stations (respectively) • Indirect impacts, e.g. air/water pollution or hydrological connections, on non-statutory sites must be considered and addressed (e.g. Lords Bridge Observatory and Knapwell RSV CWS and CU Officer Training Corps Pit, Cherry Hinton Brook, Hobson's Conduit / Vicar's Brook, Hobson's Brook Mid, Hobson's Brook South and Norman Cement Pits CiWS) • Destruction of PRV S08 (Brockley Road), compounded by utility works associated with A428 road improvement scheme. However, opportunities to restore for of eastern verge (previously part of the PRV prior to degradation) and incorporate verge flora into grassland creation area. <p>A mitigation strategy for impacted wildlife sites should be developed and agreed with local authorities and Wildlife Trust/Natural England. It should provide enhancements and long-term management of wildlife sites adversely impacted by the scheme. Furthermore, the draft CoCP must incorporate adequate measures (e.g. air, noise, light and water pollution and monitoring of recreational pressures) to protection wildlife sites during construction phase.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Site Specific Information:</p> <p>Eversden and Wimpole Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>The Council is concerned that adverse impacts to the barbastelle bat population of Wimpole and Eversden Woods Special Area of Conservation cannot be fully mitigated as part of the current design and could result in catastrophic impacts on the barbastelle population.</p> <p>EWCo have selected a route through functionally linked land for the barbastelle bat population of Wimpole and Eversden Woods SAC. Barbastelle bats use commuting routes that follow woodlands, hedgerow and treelines. These features are limited in Cambridgeshire and therefore, any vegetation removal or severance by the electrified railway route could have a significant impact on the ability of barbastelle bats to commute between foraging habitat and roost sites. This is further compounded by the cumulative impact of other development schemes, as well as the long construction period for EWR scheme (up to 7 years), which would significantly delay re-establishment of bat flight paths (vegetation would take 10-15 years to establish). Severance of the bat population could result in population decline and in the worst-case scenario, loss of the maternity roost. The Council considers it unlikely that these impacts can be adequately compensated and consider any impact on the SAC (significant or not) unacceptable.</p> <p>As previously discussed, the combination of EWR and A428 road improvement schemes will result in severance of the landscape for bats between St Neots – Cambourne. This is further compounded by the lack of bespoke bat crossing points within Cambridgeshire section of the A428 scheme, with mitigation relying on usage of pedestrian underpasses providing sub-standard bat crossing points and tree planting along the A428.</p> <p>The A428 bat tunnel (Bedfordshire) will provide connectivity to Boys Wood/Sir Johns Wood. However, the EWR scheme will adversely affect this route as the result of creation of construction compounds immediately next to the wildlife corridor and delay in 'early guide planting'. This would be further compounded by EWR route alignment option 1C (from Tempsford 1b station option), if it is selected.</p> <p>At Chapel Hill, a mined tunnel is proposed by EWR, which will help to conserve existing bat flight lines in this area, along with some bat crossing point, which will help to mitigate impacts. Although further survey work is required to confirm if these bat crossing points are sufficient.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>At the A428 Bourn Airfield Crossing, Option 2 (cut and cover tunnel) has been selected. This will result in significant excavations and associated compounds within areas known to be utilised by barbastelle bats and likely to result in severance of barbastelle bat commuting routes over the A428 and links to ancient woodland that support roosting males. Therefore, the design of the scheme must be reconsidered to retain key barbastelle bat habitat, such as using a mined tunnel. The Council notes that a mined option (e.g. Option 3) was considered and it was identified as delivering 'major improvement' for environmental impacts and opportunities and consistency with local plans (when compared with other options), however it is unclear why this design was discounted given it's ability to help reduce impacts to barbastelle bats.</p> <p>Given the potential impact to the SAC, the Council requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • redesign of route and use of construction techniques (e.g. mining) that avoid severance of any barbastelle bat commuting routes • extensive consultation/collaboration with local authorities, NE and other nature conservation organisations through the entire design process • bat survey methodologies be agreed with local authorities and Natural England • bat survey results to be completed prior to early design 'freeze' and reviewed by local authorities and Natural England • reliance on replacement tree planting for mitigation will not be acceptable for mitigation (given issues across Cambridgeshire, including A14 Cambridge – Huntingdon improvement works, of high failure rates of tree planting), unless early planting and establishment can be secured prior to construction works • assessment of cumulative impact is essential, including A428 improvement scheme (particularly taking into account its poor design for bats), other transport schemes and housing development such as Bourn airfield • opportunities to enhance bat flightlines, extend woodland with known barbastelle roosts and improve foraging habitat close to the known roost sites should be secured <p>Hobson's Park City Wildlife Site (CiWS)</p> <p>Hobson's Park CiWS habitat losses and recreational pressure are unacceptable. This wildlife site is already severely impacted by Cambridge South Station, with an area of compensatory land being provided to the south of Addenbrookes Road for grassland, ponds and Hobson's Brook water vole improvements will be created. Usage of this compensatory land for EWR compound is</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>unacceptable given the delays to the delivery of habitat and water vole compensation for the approved South Cambridge Station.</p> <p>Hobson's Park also contains landscape and ecological mitigation Landscape and Ecological Mitigation areas (LEM) O for Cambridge Guided Busway and is managed as a receptor site for translocated notable flora. LEM O is also being utilised for planting wild liquorice as part of a project to expand population of Liquorice Piercer moth. Destruction of LEM O without any proposed reinstatement is unacceptable. This area should be restored, and long-term management secured for target flora and fauna.</p> <p>Opportunities should also be sought to help deliver the Hobsons Conduit Trust's proposal to divert the main Addenbrookes Drain to flow through the attenuation pond reedbed by Long Road before entering into Hobson's Brook.</p> <p>Triangle North of Long Road County Wildlife Site</p> <p>The Triangle North of Long Road CWS is designated for its notable flora. The CWS contains landscape and ecological mitigation area LEM N for Cambridgeshire Guided Busway receptor for notable flora, with the northern and eastern section managed as grassland to support the translocated plants. The site was previously managed by Cambridgeshire County Council as part of planning conditions/obligations for the Cambridge Guided Busway. However, the landscape management period has expired, and the site is no longer leased to the County Council.</p> <p>The proposed destruction and creation of scrub within this site is considered unacceptable. This area should be restored to grassland/open mosaic habitat and long-term management secured for target plants, including removal of scrub and buddleia. Buddleia eradication along the adjacent section of railway track is likely to be required to enable effective control of buddleia.</p> <p>Habitats</p> <p>Habitat losses must be adequately compensated, particularly for losses of priority habitat (including traditional orchard, rivers, calcareous grassland and hedgerows), with impacts to irreplaceable habitat (including veteran trees, ancient woodland and lowland fen) avoided. Scheme design should clearly show the extent of habitat loss including the type of watercourse 'crossings'.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Opportunities to complement or expand existing habitat improvement projects (e.g. Bourn Brook) and strengthen wildlife corridors across the landscape (particularly for barbastelle bats) should be explored. The habitat should also reflect the priorities within Cambridgeshire. The draft Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) is due for publication in early 2025, however, in the interim, Huntingdonshire Nature Recovery Networks and Cambridge Nature Network should be utilised to guide planting, as well as Natural Cambridgeshire's Priority Landscapes.</p> <p>The Draft Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) must demonstrate how large-scale tree planting can be achieved and sustained, given the extent of planting failures in Cambridgeshire associated with other developments, particularly the A14 improvement scheme. The LEMP should secure long-term management of habitats for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Species</p> <p>As discussed above, a full suite of species surveys must be completed and assessment consider impacts on protected/priority and notable species, including bats, badger, otter, water vole, otter, harvest mice, breeding and wintering birds, common reptiles, great crested newts, common toad, terrestrial & aquatic invertebrates, flora, fishes, potentially white-clawed crayfish and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Additional Species of Interest. Presence of invasive species (including aquatic and terrestrial species) should also be identified.</p> <p>Particular attention should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • severance of wildlife corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cumulative impact from other developments, including double handing of translocated species and potential contribution to extinction of local populations of vulnerable species. • terrestrial invertebrate surveys to include Chesterton Sidings • botanical surveys to include assessment for arable flora, priority / irreplaceable habitat, watercourses and survey of Chesterton sidings • water vole mitigation to include long-term mink control • impact on commuting routes, foraging habitat & roost all bats for the entire scheme, including demolition / construction of rail bridge at Long Road, Cambridge and impact of night working • Identifying opportunity for incorporating wildlife sensitive design to old and new road / rail infrastructure (e.g. lighting and culvert design)

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</p> <p>The Council expects the Cambridgeshire section of the scheme to deliver a minimum of 20% BNG, to help deliver Natural Cambridgeshire 'doubling nature'. As well as helping to meeting the 20% BNG goal of the Environmental Principles regionally agreed for the Oxford to Cambridge (OxCam) Arc development vision, which is also highlighted in the Greater Cambridge Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document; and the requirement for 20% BNG within the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and potential for emerging Local Plans in Greater Cambridge/Huntingdonshire to include 20% BNG. The methodology for the assessment of BNG should be shared with the Council and all relevant stakeholders so that it can be agreed at the earliest opportunity. The Council expects this to be based on the government's statutory biodiversity metric and guidance as set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Planning Policy Guidance (unless superseded by specific guidance for NSIPs).</p>
<p>Archaeology and Historic Environment</p>	<p>Whole project</p>	<p>The construction of East West Rail will involve major ground disturbance on a wide transect through landscapes of considerable archaeological potential. The route traverses the Cambridgeshire claylands, where dense Iron Age and Roman settlement remains have been discovered to the south east of St Neots (such as at Wintringham Park and Loves Farm), and passes through areas of complex archaeological cropmarks, notably to the north of Cambourne. The Comberton to Shelford section will involve ground impact adjacent to several scheduled monuments (mainly later prehistoric and Roman settlement), the boundaries of which were decided on incomplete information nearly half a century ago. Significant remains were found and excavated along the line of the ongoing A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements, which East West Rail shares much of its route with. The Council believes the likelihood of encountering regionally and nationally significant archaeological remains along this route is high.</p> <p>The Council notes that geophysical surveys have and continue to be carried out on all areas of potential ground impact, and that intrusive (trial trenched) evaluation will shortly commence. Archaeological monitoring of GI works will also take place. Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team (CHET) is supportive of this approach, so long as evaluative works cover all areas of likely significant ground impact, and as long as all results are available to support the DCO application and inform the ES chapter to enable the finalisation of a plan for mitigation.</p> <p>EWR and their archaeological agents have been consulting CHET on the scope and nature of the required archaeological evaluations, and The Council would expect them to continue to do so, and</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		to follow the advice given, as per relevant national guidance. The Environmental Report (para. 4.5.20) does confirm that this will be the case.
Landscape and Visual		<p>The Council would expect East West Rail to consult Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on this matter regarding the site and any associated infrastructure that falls within the respective District Council's boundary.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Council has concerns related to the landscape and visual impacts from the proposal and therefore reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation, in particular where it relates to users of public rights of way.</p> <p>The Council is disappointed that limited information has been provided in the consultation materials in the form of cross-sections to demonstrate the impact of this key aspect of the proposals.</p>
Land Use, Quality, Soils and Agriculture		The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.
Minerals and Waste		<p>The Council, in its role as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) wishes to make comments on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minerals and Waste Resource Requirements • Safeguarded Minerals and Waste Sites • Minerals Safeguarding Areas <p>The MWPA recognises that the project is at an early stage and is hopeful that many, if not all, of these comments can be addressed prior to submission of any application to the Secretary of State for determination. Please do contact the MWPA should you wish to discuss any part of this response.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan can be found on the County Council website:</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p data-bbox="770 196 1827 256"> https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/planning-and-development/planning-policy/adopted-minerals-and-waste-plan </p> <p data-bbox="770 292 1384 323"> Minerals and Waste Resource Requirements </p> <p data-bbox="770 359 2022 560"> It is understood that the details of the project are still being formed. The MWPA would ask that details of the minerals and waste resource requirements are made available for consultation at an early stage, particularly in respect of aggregate and landfill requirements. There are a number of large-scale nationally significant infrastructure projects and other large developments in and around the Cambridgeshire area, (for example the Fens Reservoir Project), that are likely to place additional demand onto existing and planned waste and mineral resources. </p> <p data-bbox="770 595 1966 691"> When preparing the Environmental Statement, consideration of the demand of other projects and the potential sources of aggregate and landfill should be documented, assessed and mitigated where possible. </p> <p data-bbox="770 726 2022 821"> If borrow pits are being proposed, we would encourage early discussions with the MWPA so that restoration requirements are considered and can be fully set out in any application, with methods to secure ongoing involvement of the MWPA in monitoring and aftercare. </p> <p data-bbox="770 857 1301 888"> Safeguarded Minerals and Waste Sites </p> <p data-bbox="770 924 2007 1058"> The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) (MWLP) is the Minerals and Waste Local Plan for those authorities, and forms part of the development plan used in the determination of planning applications. When preparing the Planning Statement and Environment Statement, East West Rail should have regard to the MWLP. </p> <p data-bbox="770 1093 2022 1294"> Whilst there will be several policies of the MWLP that are relevant, Policy 16 is of note at this time because it seeks to safeguard minerals and waste management facilities. It states that development within a Consultation Area (CA) will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the development will not prejudice the existing or future use of the area for which the CA has been designated. This sits alongside paragraph 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out the 'agent of change' principle. </p> <p data-bbox="770 1329 1980 1425"> The proposed Draft Consent Order Boundary lies within the Consultation Areas for the Cambridge Northern Fringe Aggregates Railhead, the Cowley Road Waste Management Site, and the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Works; all of which are located in the Cambridge </p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>North East Fringe area. The Boundary also lies within the Consultation Area for a site known as 'South west of Addenbrooke's Hospital, between Robinson Way and Addenbrookes Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire'.</p> <p>As part of any Environmental Assessment, the effect of the proposed development on these safeguarded facilities should be considered. The Planning Statement will also wish to address whether the proposed development complies with Policy 16.</p> <p>Please note that Anglian Water are seeking to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Works and full consideration of the impact of this and the stage at which the DCO is should be set out in the application.</p> <p>Mineral Safeguarding Areas</p> <p>As noted above, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) (MWLP) forms part of the development used in the determination of planning applications and when preparing the Planning Statement and Environment Statement, East West Rail will wish to have regard to the relevant mineral policies in the MWLP.</p> <p>Whilst several policies will be relevant Policy 5: Mineral Safeguarding Areas, which seeks to prevent mineral resources of local and/or national importance being needlessly sterilised is of key importance.</p> <p>In various places the proposed route is within areas identified on the MWLP Policies Maps as Sand and Gravel Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Chalk Mineral Safeguarding Areas. Given that the extent of the project cannot avoid the Mineral Safeguarding Areas, the project should, in accordance with Policy 5, seek to either extract the mineral prior to development or failing that make best use of any mineral extracted. An assessment of the volume and extent of mineral lost should be documented in the Environmental Statement. Compliance with Policy 5 should be addressed within the Planning Statement. Methods to make best use of any material incidentally extracted as part of the development should be included in the Construction Environment Management Plan.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
Water Resources and Flooding	Surface Water and Flood Risk (LLFA)	<p>As the project is still in the early stages the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) cannot comment on drainage details at this stage. A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy will be required. The proposed routing passes through numerous areas of localised flood risk, this includes the likes of Haslingfield and Comberton which have previously experienced localised flooding. In areas of high flood risk floodplain compensation may be required.</p> <p>One point to which attention should be drawn is to the location of construction compounds. Several villages are concerned with localised flooding which may be exacerbated by these compounds, it is recommended that temporary surface water drainage be included within the compounds. It is also recommended to consult the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024. An emphasis on including sustainable drainage systems is encouraged and it is noted that a large number of attenuation ponds and wetland areas are proposed which the LLFA are supportive of. As no flood risk assessment has yet been provided, we would usually ask for the following in such a report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing and proposed impermeable areas - Flood Risk Assessment - Greenfield/ brownfield runoff rates - Drainage general arrangement plans outlining location/ diameters of all pipes/ infrastructure along with discharge points - Use of SuDS where possible. - Maintenance plans
Traffic and Transport		<p>Insufficient information at present. Comments will be made when the Transport Assessment and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is available.</p> <p>The Council cannot comment on the validity of the modelling submitted thus far. It is expected that any model would be accompanied by a 'Local Model Validation Report' (LMVR) and a 'Forecasting Report' which would set out details of how the model is constructed, how it was validated and calibrated and the assumptions made for future year scenarios. From the information submitted, it would appear that key developments and highways schemes, which will impact the future scenarios, have been omitted from the model.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>On this basis, the Council would have to view any conclusions in the submission as to the potential impacts on the highway network with caution until further modelling has been submitted at the next stage of the process</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with EWR with regards to the modelling work required for inclusion in the Transport Assessment. This will include both construction and operational scenarios. The Council will also continue to engage with EWR where needed on design and access solutions for new stations and along the route of the railway. The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.</p>
Transport Strategy		<p><u>General comments</u></p> <p>This response focuses on the sections of route in Cambridgeshire and proposals close to the county boundary.</p> <p>There is a lot of information to review and limited time to do so, with the Christmas holidays falling in the middle of the consultation period. The Council may therefore have further comments to make at or before the Statutory Consultation that are not covered in this response.</p> <p>It is essential that EWR delivers tangible benefits for Cambridgeshire residents particularly in terms of door-to-door connectivity to the new railway given the limited number of stations along the route. The current door-to-door strategy is very high level, and the Council expects to see further detail and be fully involved in the development of proposals to ensure that door-to-door connectivity is given high priority as the project moves forward. New and existing railway stations along the route should have high quality connections by active travel and sustainable transport modes to local populations and be delivered as part of the DCO to ensure the scheme brings benefits for Cambridgeshire residents.</p> <p>The Council would like further information regarding the impact of level crossing closures, changes to junctions and road diversions on local bus services.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council remains concerned about impacts of the proposed EWR route on health and well-being both during construction phase and when the railway is opened and operating, in terms of noise, vibration and community severance.</p> <p>The Council would like to see the full Business Case for East West Rail to better understand the full range of impacts of the scheme. Having access to the full Business Case would help the Council see the wider strategic context of the scheme and would help to provide evidence regarding the decisions taken when one option has been selected over another.</p> <p>Where the new railway goes through Cambridgeshire there are areas where the proposals will bring significant disruption to residents with limited benefits created for them if they are not served by an accessible station. Therefore the points made above regarding high quality active travel routes are key and there is also a need to highlight the benefits the railway will bring to those affected by it.</p> <p><u>Overarching Transport Policy and objectives</u></p> <p>The County Council is broadly supportive of the positions set out by England’s Economic Heartland (EEH), Transport East, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), and the other Cambridgeshire Host Authorities.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) supports the principle of EWR. The Council’s local transport policies also support the principle of EWR and the opportunities for improved travel by rail, with particular reference to the Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy (2023) and the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (2014).</p> <p>England’s Economic Heartland supports the delivery of EWR as a fully electrified route</p> <p>The Council supports the strategic objectives of the EWR project:</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve east-west public transport connectivity by providing rail links between key urban areas across the Oxford to Cambridge region. • Stimulate economic growth, housing and employment through the provision of new, reliable and attractive inter-urban passenger train services in the Oxford to Cambridge region. • Contribute to improved journey times and inter-regional passenger connectivity by connecting with north-south routes and routes beyond Oxford and Cambridge. • Provide a sustainable and value for money transport solution to support economic growth in the area. • Meet initial forecast passenger demand and consider and plan for future passenger demand, making provision where it is affordable. • Maintain current capacity for rail freight and make appropriate provision for anticipated future growth. <p>The Council strongly supports the ambition of a net zero railway.</p> <p><u>EWR Eastern Section</u></p> <p>The Council supports the delivery of the EWR eastern section to extend EWR services to Ipswich and Norwich, for which Transport East are leading the business case development work. We welcome that the consultation documents state that the options to extend services further east of Cambridge and west of Oxford have been assessed to ensure that the current project does not create obstacles to potential future extensions. This also highlights the need for other vital rail projects to come forward to enable the full benefits of EWR to be released, including the Ely Area Capacity Improvements and Haughley Junction improvements.</p> <p>The Council would therefore highlight the need to actively address opportunities for achieving or safeguarding options for enhanced connections and service frequencies to the east of Cambridge as part of the development and delivery of the Bedford to Cambridge section of the EWR route.</p> <p><u>Active Travel</u></p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council very much welcomes the work currently being undertaken on the feasibility of end-to-end active travel provision in line with the railway corridor. This is a once in a generation opportunity to provide a high-quality active travel route that will connect villages and towns in the region and provide an important link between St Neots and Cambridge. Research on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway has highlighted that having a segregated active travel route nearby incentivises more people to walk and cycle more often and, with e-bikes becoming more popular, people can travel much longer distances.</p> <p>Cycle parking at all new railway stations should be located close to entrances, covered and include at least 20% Sheffield stands. There should be provision for non-standard cycles which should be located closest to the station entrance (as these are used by those carrying children, bulky items or by those who have a disability) and should be signed/marked on the ground as such and have ground anchors or similar so that standard cycles are not parked in these spaces. All cycle parking should be covered by CCTV and be well lit. Cycle theft is often high at stations and a secure compound has been retrofitted at Cambridge North to provide improved security for regular users, and similar work is planned for the cycle park at Cambridge station. A proportion of the cycle parking at the new stations should be provided in a secure compound. A management plan will be needed for the cycle parking, including the removal of abandoned bikes and access to the secure compound (which should be made as easy as possible for users).</p> <p>Space should be provided for e-bike and scooter hire with appropriate signage. Where schemes do not yet exist space should be safeguarded at a suitable location. Station designs should comply with Cycle Rail toolkit 3 guidance from the Cycle Rail Working Group.</p> <p>Any lifts at stations should be big enough to accommodate cycles and steps should include wheeling ramps.</p> <p>All references to “footbridges”, should be changed to active travel bridges unless there is no demand for future use as part of an expanded cycle network. These must be</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>designed to allow cycling without dismounting and minimise interaction between pedestrians and cyclists. Where appropriate (for example, where restoring an existing equestrian right of way), the design should also provide for equestrians. Underpasses should also be future proofed for active travel in terms of width and height and should be designed to be as open and inviting as possible for users.</p> <p>All new road bridges should include a shared use path to futureproof an expanded active travel network</p> <p>Any re-aligned roads should include active travel provision and any proposed junction improvements should consider active travel users, and infrastructure generally must be designed to LTN 1/20.</p> <p>As above, when considering cyclable distances for Door to Door Connectivity, e-bikes must be given significant weight in design considerations. Given that the project is 10 years away from delivery and that sales of e-bikes in many European countries already exceeds that of conventional bikes, it must be anticipated that e-bike ownership in the UK will be considerable by the mid-2030s. Even on e-bikes with current technology, 15 miles (approximately triple the distance that is normally considered cyclable) is achievable without significant effort in around an hour (which, given that the journey can be truly door-to-door without additional time to find and pay for parking and then to walk to the final destination, will for many people be similar to the door-to-door time taken for the same trip by car). Future e-bike technology is likely to increase this cyclable range.</p> <p><u>Train services</u></p> <p>The Council understands that EWR are proposing 4 trains per hour to stations in Cambridgeshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 x Oxford to Cambridge • 2 x Stewartby to Cambridge (1 x Bletchley to Cambridge and 1 x Stewartby to Cambridge – consolidated stations on the Marston Vale Line)

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council understands that these services will all stop at Tempsford, Cambourne, Cambridge South and Cambridge. The opportunity for turn-back capacity on the Cambridge to Ipswich line has also been proposed and this consultation response supports the provision of a new station to serve the east of Cambridge and development of the Cambridge Airport site, which is discussed in more detail below.</p> <p>The Council would like to understand in detail how the proposals will facilitate additional services (either EWR or existing) to stop at Cambridge North, and at the new Cambridge South station as well as a new station at Cambridge East, in the context of how platform capacity and turnback capacity will be managed in the Cambridge area with EWR. The Council also notes that there may be linked opportunities for current services to Cambridge from the south to be extended to Ely.</p> <p>Timings of services</p> <p>We note the intent to spread out EWR services equally through the hour, but that this will be dependent on other services on shared track sections, particularly the busy approaches to Cambridge and Oxford. Passengers should be able to rely on a consistent and frequent train service. The benefits of a regular clockface timetable are well understood and would be the Council's strong preference.</p> <p>It is anticipated that EWR trains would run a passenger service between the hours of 06:00 and 00:00 (midnight) from Monday to Thursday, 06:00 and 01:00 on Friday and Saturday and 07:00 to 23:00 on Sunday, with fewer train movements outside of these hours for essential empty train stock moves, limited freight and maintenance, in line with the rest of the national rail network.</p> <p>Extending EWR services east of Cambridge or west of Oxford is not currently in the remit of EWR. The Council supports the proposals for EWR eastern section and extension of services to Norwich/Ipswich. Additionally, the Council supports connections west of Oxford.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Interchange with other rail services at stations along the route should be timely, efficient and stress-free. Particularly, there should be well-timed interchange between EWR services at Tempsford and East Coast Main Line services. The Council would like to understand in more detail how the interchange with the ECML at Tempsford will operate.</p> <p>The Council would not want to see any reduction of Thameslink Great Northern stops at other stations on the East Coast Main Line including St Neots and Huntingdon to accommodate stops at Tempsford. Similarly, we would not wish to see any reduction in East Coast services stopping at Peterborough and Stevenage if stops at Tempsford were proposed for these services. The Council would welcome further discussion of timetabling if any such proposals are to be considered.</p> <p>Cost</p> <p>To ensure that EWR is well used it is vital that the services are affordable to local residents and also that services are reliable, convenient and efficient. Transport Focus's work provides useful insights into what rail passengers want from rail services and top issues are, price of train tickets offering value for money, reliability and punctuality, and sufficiently frequent trains¹.</p> <p>Future demand</p> <p>The Council would like to understand in more detail how EWR have considered future rail demand in the development of the project overall. If demand increases above the current four trains per hour will the infrastructure proposed suffice or will more works be needed? Given the level of investment and the construction disruption the project is likely to bring, it is vital that EWR is fit for purpose for several generations. This one reason that the potential for connections further east of Cambridge and west of Oxford require consideration at this time.</p> <p>Journey times</p>

¹ <https://www.transportfocus.org.uk/news/back-to-basics-what-passengers-want-from-rail-services/>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>In terms of journey times between key destinations when comparing road and rail it is unclear if the compared journeys have the same origins and destinations – for example are these station-to-station or door-to door journeys. Whilst door-to-door comparisons may make car travel appear relatively more attractive in terms of journey time than rail they also amplify the need for attractive door-to-station and station-to-door connections to support the aims of the EWR scheme. This shows the importance of high-quality access to stations by active travel. The Council also notes that reliability of journey time is typically as or more important than fastest journey time for many trips.</p> <p><u>Powering of trains</u></p> <p>The Council has previously raised concerns about the environmental impacts of a diesel traction railway and therefore welcomes the principle of discontinuous electrification – part overhead line equipment / hybrid battery-electric powered trains. However, the Council's preference remains a fully electrified railway, with the key ambition for net zero passenger services.</p> <p>The Council would like further detail on hybrid battery trains as they are a relatively new technology, and particularly which sections of the route would require Overhead Line Equipment. The Council also requires further information on how discontinuous power would work for freight trains. The council understand that full electrification would bring greater benefits to freight services as locomotives powered by electricity have greater acceleration and therefore would have less impact on capacity on the rail network.</p> <p>With achievement of a net zero railway being reliant on the electrification of numerous aspects of the operation, such as heating through to electric vehicles. The Council would like to understand further how EWR have engaged with industry partners to ensure there is the electrical power capacity available for the railway and ancillary works and operations. The Council is pleased to see that conversations have been started in this area.</p> <p><u>Stabling of trains/ train maintenance depots/ infrastructure maintenance depots</u></p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Currently there is not enough detailed information to assess the impacts or the proposed train maintenance and infrastructure maintenance depot and stabling of trains. Given the potential impacts of these the Council would wish to work closely with EWR as proposals are further developed.</p> <p><u>Freight</u></p> <p>The East West Rail Central Section should have active provision for electrically powered freight services, including track capacity to enable freight operation without adversely impacting on passenger timetables.</p> <p><u>Traffic and transport impacts</u></p> <p>Work is taking place between the Council and EWR to model and understand the impact of the railway on the local transport network.</p> <p>Digital</p> <p>The Council requests that EWR take advantage of the opportunity to increase digital connectivity along the proposed route. This should include provision of ducts and a fibre optic spine along the length of the route with connections to local networks at appropriate points.</p> <p>Construction impacts</p> <p>The Council would like ensure that lessons have been learnt from the construction experience in Buckinghamshire². EWR need to ensure that residents and Council assets are not adversely affected by the construction of EWR.</p> <p>The Council would like to understand more about how the construction traffic routes would be strictly controlled. Potentially HGV traffic could be tracked by GPS with KPIs in place for EWR contractors to ensure routes that are agreed are kept to and with compensation to local areas if vehicles did not keep to the routes.</p>

² <https://www.newcivilengineer.com/latest/buckinghamshire-council-details-significant-damage-to-roads-from-east-west-rail-hgvs-02-02-2024/>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Without more detail, it is hard to know what the impact both during construction and operation will be. Potentially standard could be in place regarding diversions and levels of delay. For example, it a standard could be agreed between the Council and EWR saying that diversion of NMU routes will be limited to a set distance. There could also be a standard put in place to limit delays caused temporary traffic lights. The council would welcome suggestions from EWR for consideration.</p> <p>In terms of the operation of the railway we would want the impact on rail users to be as limited as possible. Something that is always mentioned is weekday vs weekend closures. We have yet to see this be fully explored by the rail industry and this is something we would like to see put in place. Replacement bus services should be seen as a last resort and should be managed much better than they currently are by providing the best quality of service with limited wait time whilst interchanging between road and rail. Rail passengers should be provided with lower fares when having to use replacement bus services given the added inconvenience and time to their journey. The needs of all are required to be considered noting that some may find it easier to travel by rail than coach/bus and may not even be able to board a coach/bus that has stairs. The impact of those taking longer journeys in the construction period needs to be considered and minimised.</p> <p><u>Operational impacts</u></p> <p>At the moment there is not enough information to fully consider the operational impacts but these will need to be fully assessed. Noise is a key impact both along the new railway and where EWR will lead to an increase in services running on the existing railways this needs to be fully understood. The visual impact of the new rail line is also key and how this impacts people’s visual amenity and wellbeing. Community severance and the impact of this needs to be fully assessed.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure sections</u></p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Roxton to east of St Neots.</p> <p>Starts page 238 of technical report</p> <p>This section of EWR runs between Roxton and east of St Neots, which is approximately 10km (6 miles) long, beginning at South Brook, north of Roxton and Tempsford, and running to the east of Little Barford and St Neots. It ends where the B1428 Cambridge Road joins the existing A428 at the roundabout east of St Neots.</p> <p>The Council supports the principle of a new railway station on the proposed EWR route at Tempsford.</p> <p>The Council notes that both Tempsford station options would sit at the northern edge of the proposed wider Tempsford development and therefore both would require comprehensive door-to-door connectivity to serve any new development and wider local community effectively.</p> <p>Local connectivity to/from the new station at Tempsford from St Neots and local area by active travel is a priority. The Council believes the EWR scheme should include provision for access to the new station by active travel and public transport from the surrounding villages and the town of St Neots to provide real benefits to the local population.</p> <p>The Council would like to see seamless interchange with ECML services at Tempsford for onward travel south to London and north to Peterborough and beyond.</p> <p>The Council would expect to see the following facilities at the new railway station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full accessibility • Active travel links • Secure cycle parking • Public Transport services/connections • Appropriate levels of car parking • Cycle hire

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel information • Travel/mobility hubs • Last mile connections • Ticket offices • Carbon positive building <p>Temporary Rail Logistics Hub - The Council supports the principle of transporting construction materials via rail and wishes to be consulted on impacts of this in terms of noise, dust and traffic impacts. The Council and local communities needs to be involved in the preparation of the Draft Code of Construction Practice.</p> <p>Wintringham (St Neots East) Station</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority has advocated for a new station east of St Neots (Wintringham) as part of the scheme in its response to this consultation. The County Council considers that there is a logic to this suggestion in local transport terms and that an additional station to the east of St Neots would be more accessible for passengers in St Neots wishing to make east-west trips than either a journey from the town to Tempsford on the A1 or the local transport network, or by a rail trip from St Neots on the East Coast Main Line. It can also be noted that while Tempsford is a location for growth, St Neots is the largest town in Cambridgeshire (only exceeded in size by the cities of Cambridge and Peterborough), is itself continuing to grow, and is part of Cambridge's commuter belt as well as London's. Cambridgeshire County Council therefore supports this proposal.</p> <p>Croxton to Toft</p> <p>Starts at page 275 of technical report</p> <p>This section of the route is approximately 19km (12 miles) long. It begins at the roundabout east of St Neots, running north of Cambourne and the new dual carriageway being constructed by National Highways (which will be renumbered A421 when opened),</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>before crossing the current A428 / future A421 at Highfields Caldecote and ending at the B1046 between Toft and Comberton.</p> <p>The new road/roundabout alignment at Cambridge Rd should include active travel provision, connecting to the existing network in Wintringham, Loves Farm and beyond as well as to the new A428 junction NMU provision.</p> <p>The two proposed PRow bridges to the west of Cambourne Station should link better to the station and to the proposed bridge over the A428 into Cambourne. This bridge links to an existing unsurfaced path which connects to Back Lane which should be upgraded to a sealed surface. The bridge and all infrastructure should be LTN 1/20 compliant and splayed sides (such as on Cambridge's Chesterton bridge) could be considered to extend useable width for cyclists. With the potential development of land north of Cambourne the bridge and links either side should cater for future use and so should be 5.5m wide with segregated provision for people walking and cycling. Upgraded active travel connections are needed to and in Cambourne for onward routes to the Business Park, Village College and the Cambourne to Cambridge busway Active Travel provision.</p> <p>As well as to the station the Knapwell footpath 5 overbridge should link (by means of an improved crossing of St Neots Rd) to the existing crossing of the A428 slip road and shared path network in Cambourne to facilitate onwards active travel into the western side of Cambourne.</p> <p>Civil parking enforcement in South Cambs will need to be taken into account when developing plans for car parking at the proposed Cambourne railway station.</p> <p>There will need to be an active travel interchange with the CtoC active travel path near Hardwick, where the two routes cross. This is an opportunity to provide an Active Travel route from Hardwick directly to Comberton Village College continuing the proposed maintenance access road running parallel to Hardwick Rd/Main St north to link to the proposed Greenways route and continuing the lineside maintenance track to the B1046.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Cambourne Station</p> <p>The Council welcomes and supports proposals within the EWR consultation for a new station at Cambourne. The Council also notes and welcomes information pertaining to ensuring any new station is designed and delivered to a specification which promotes and facilitates connectivity by all modes, particularly non-motorised modes, to surrounding communities, and not just those adjacent to the station itself and the design spec outlined in section '3.8.3.1 Stations'.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposed location of Cambourne station to the north of the current A428, with a NMU footbridge included to connect Cambourne to the station to cross over the A428 and St Neots Road. The Council would remind EWR of the requirements set out in the technical report to facilitate access by NMU and to consider travel needs of the local community. Therefore, any bridge or crossing should accommodate easy access for those 'wheeling' (wheelchairs, cycles, push chairs etc.) between Cambourne and the station, as well as those walking. This should be replicated at the station itself both in terms of access to the station building, the platforms or any crossing points. Good examples of this exist at Cambridge Station where lifts and cycle access/movement on the stairs are provided.</p> <p>The Council notes the EWR report stating an active travel hub and car park would be provided. This should be accompanied by sufficient space for bus and taxi access to encourage non-car modes and public transport interchange. Secure and convenient cycle parking should also be included. Segregation of car and non-car modes as they access the station should be achieved as far as possible. The station design should account for the potential for access from the north as well as the south.</p> <p>Furthermore, The Council would urge EWR to work alongside Local Authorities on the level of car parking provided at Cambourne Station. As stated above, the new station should benefit from facilities which promote use of active travel and public transport interchange in the first instance but also note that for some, car parking will be required. It is important that the new station does not promote significant increases in short car</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>journeys in the local area. It is likely that some form of civil parking enforcement will be required around the areas close to the new station to prevent unsociable parking issues and will need to be taken into account when developing plans for car parking at the proposed Cambourne railway station.</p> <p>Integrating EWR with Transport Network</p> <p>The Council notes that EWR proposals only include provision for one station between Cambourne and Cambridge, however would remind EWR that the proposed new route of the railway would pass between a number of villages between Cambourne and Cambridge. These villages are currently underserved by high quality public transport and although some active travel links exist or there are proposed new links through the GCP programme of works (such as Greenways and Cambourne to Cambridge busway), there is significant scope to increase active travel and public transport mode share further by connecting these villages to the new rail station at Cambourne with high quality infrastructure. It is also noted within the technical report that:</p> <p><i>“Door-to-door connectivity is an approach that considers the travel needs of people from the very start of their journey until they reach their destination. This applies not only to those journeys involving rail travel, but also to journeys within the communities that EWR would serve”</i></p> <p>It would therefore seem reasonable for EWR to strongly consider providing or working with the Council/GCP/CPCA to help provide significant upgrades in public transport and active travel links between the villages that would look towards a new station at Cambourne. Links to the existing and proposed transport network, in particular those in the GCP programme of works such as Cambourne to Cambridge and the Greenways, should also be a high priority.</p> <p>Link to Growth Proposals and Local Plan</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council strongly encourages EWR to continue to work closely with Local Authorities with regards to how EWR will benefit and interact with both existing and also the proposed new communities and developments in the Local Plans.</p> <p>Both the existing adopted Local Plan for South Cambridgeshire and the new Local Plan for Greater Cambridge that is in development include significant developments close to the proposed EWR route between Cambourne and Cambridge. None of these developments require EWR in order to be delivered, however all are likely to benefit from EWR. Predominant movements for employment and keys services from the Cambourne area are towards Cambridge. Cambridge itself is also set to see large scale growth in employment, housing and other key services over the Local Plan period and this is likely to drive demand for travel higher. The Council would urge EWR to work closely with local authorities to capture these benefits.</p> <p>The Council notes that where the new railway passes close to/through the new development at Bourn Airfield (included in the current adopted South Cambridgeshire DC Local Plan) and the A428 a new cut and cover tunnels is proposed to minimise impact. The Council welcomes proposals to minimise impacts on the environment and on communities, but would emphasise the concerns related to the use of construction techniques and severance of any barbastelle bat commuting (see page 14 of this response). The Council urges EWR to work closely with local authorities on these proposals to ensure they are adequately sensitive to ecologically significant sites and tie in with the design of the development. In particular with regards interacting with transport and access proposals and linking to the existing and planned transport networks.</p> <p>Comberton to Shelford</p> <p>Starts at page 301 of technical report</p> <p>New railway lines would be constructed between Comberton and Harston, a section of approximately 10.7km (6.7 miles). EWR would then use an existing section of railway</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>from the proposed grade separated junction near Harston (referred to as Hauxton Junction), where it would join the existing Shepreth Branch Royston line (SBR). From Harston it is around 3.6km (2.2 miles) to SBR's junction with the West Anglia Main Line (WAML). North of Great Shelford, the WAML would be reconfigured, with two new tracks to be installed alongside the existing two track WAML corridor into the currently under construction Cambridge South Station.</p> <p>The new railway would travel close to Comberton Village College. The Council is concerned about noise, vibration and air quality impacts for pupils at the school both during construction and operation of the railway.</p> <p>The Council is working on improving the Toft to Comberton shared path alongside the B1046, and provision for this should be accommodated by the new proposed overbridge.</p> <p>As with the Croxton to Toft section, the Council reminds EWR that there are several villages in this section of the proposed route that are impacted by EWR but do not benefit from a station, whilst also suffering from an existing lack of connectivity to key services by public transport. It would therefore seem reasonable for EWR to strongly consider providing or working with the Council/GCP/CPCA to help provide significant upgrades in public transport and active travel links between the villages that would look towards a new station at Cambourne and towards Cambridge. Links to the existing and proposed transport network, in particular those in the GCP programme of works such as Cambourne to Cambridge and the Greenways, should also be a high priority.</p> <p>Linking and extending some of the proposed access roads, between Comberton and Harlton Road would enable active travel routes between the villages of Eversden, Haslingfield and Comberton Village College with additional connections to Harlton via Washpit Lane if an off-road link between the re-aligned Comberton Rd and Washpit Lane were provided.</p> <p>Crossing of A603 and realignment of connecting roads</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The notes the proposal for Comberton Road and Washpit Lane to be slightly diverted and a new junction with the A603 created for each. With regards to Comberton Road, CCC notes that the current junction between Comberton Road and the A603 provides poor visibility for those travelling south on Comberton Road and wishing to turn on to the westbound carriageway, due to the angle of the junction where fast moving traffic on the westbound carriageway of A603 approaches from over the shoulder of driver. CCC would urge EWR ensure any junction designs for the diverted Comberton Road offer improved visibility for drivers.</p> <p>The Council welcomes proposals for the part of the new railway line to travel through a tunnel at Chapel Hill, Haslingfield to reduce visual and landscape impacts, but wishes to continue to engage on construction impacts in this area.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposal for the realignment of the A10 coming into Harston from Foxton on a bridge over the new railway line. The Council is concerned about visual impacts of the new bridge.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposed level crossing closure at Station Road, Harston and remains concerned about local connectivity, access to Harston and Newton Community Primary school which serves both villages, and other community severance issues between Harston and Newton. The Council therefore strongly supports the implementation of a new pedestrian/cycle bridge close to Harston level crossing. From an active travel standpoint, option 4 is much more preferable to option 1 as it would provide a safe active travel link between the two villages. To encourage active travel we would question the need for the vehicular link across to Station Rd or whether a bus only link could be considered.</p> <p>The existing track bed of the redundant section of the Shepreth Branch Line could be used for non-railway purposes. Options include a footpath or to provide road connectivity. The Council would like to engage further on this issue to maximise benefits for active travel and connectivity in the area.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council notes proposals for a grade separated rail junction south of Harston, to be known as Hauxton junction. The Council wishes to continue discussions regarding the visual impacts of this proposal.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the proposal for the realignment of London Road. The Council has concerns about the visual impacts of the proposed overbridge.</p> <p>There is a very obvious demand for active travel along London Rd with a well worn track along the verge and high quality provision should be incorporated into the design. To avoid a long detour for pedestrians, consideration should be given to providing a transition (steps) between London Road and Shelford Road.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposed Hauxton Road, Little Shelford level crossing closure and the proposal to divert traffic via a new road bridge over the railway east of the current Hauxton Road level crossing. The Council strongly supports the inclusion of a foot/cycle bridge over railway close to the existing Hauxton level crossing to maintain local connectivity by active travel and reduce community severance in the Little Shelford area.</p> <p>The Council is concerned about impacts on local and/or school bus service provision due to the proposed level crossing closures in the area. Further information on potential impacts is required.</p> <p>The Council would like to understand any impacts on waiting times for traffic at Foxton level crossing due to EWR.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the proposal for the Shepreth branch junction with West Anglia Main Line to remain at grade rather than being a grade separated junction as proposed in the 2021 consultation.</p> <p>The Council would like further information on any impact of track works on the DNA cycle path between the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the Shelford's parallel to the</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>WAML and the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambridge South East Transport scheme (CSETS).</p> <p>Cambridge</p> <p>Starts at page 375 of technical report</p> <p><u>Four tracking</u></p> <p>The route into Cambridge would involve four tracks between Cambridge South station and Cambridge Station. Cambridge South station is being constructed with four tracks and platforms.</p> <p>As part of this four tracking the Long Road bridge would need to be rebuilt to accommodate the extra tracks. Long Road is part of the Cambridge Ring Road and is a key route into the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, including the Addenbrooke's, Papworth and Rosie Hospitals. EWR will need to ensure that the works to rebuild the bridge are managed to minimise disruption on the local transport network and on blue light routes. It should be noted that the options for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the railway if transit over Long Road bridge were not possible are the Busway Bridge 550 metres to the south or the Hills Road Bridge around 1.25km to the north.</p> <p>The Council requires detailed information on how works to replace Long Road bridge would be undertaken, including how provision for traffic, public transport and active travel users will be maintained on Long Road during the works; and how access will be maintained for properties, businesses, Long Road Sixth Form College and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</p> <p>Steps should be provided from the guided busway path to Long Road to avoid Long Road students having to scramble up the bank.</p> <p>On the approach to Cambridge Station, The Busway alignment converges with the railway. The Council needs further information regarding any possible disruption to</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>busway services and the parallel pedestrian and cycle route during the construction phase, and notes that the Busway operation has the benefit of a Transport and Works Act Order, not standard highway protocols.</p> <p><u>Cambridge Station</u></p> <p>Significant overcrowding is experienced at Cambridge station due to the high number of users, particularly in the main station building and the overbridge to access platforms 7 and 8. The Council wishes to continue to engage in discussions regarding overcrowding issues and the Heritage Impact Assessment of Cambridge Station.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposals for the western gate line to be expanded, provision of an additional platform and extensions to platforms 7 and 8 to provide capacity for EWR services. Cambridge Station is a listed building, and this will need to be taken into consideration as proposals are developed.</p> <p>Regarding the upgrades to accommodate EWR in Cambridge station we would want these to be the most future proofed they can be and to provide the most operational flexibility. For this reason, the council believe that option G+ is the best. However, we would like to understand more around this and the decision regarding upgrading the Newmarket Branch vs Cambridge station or Cambridge North, or even an upgrade further north for example at Ely.</p> <p>The council needs to fully understand the decision-making process around this and with the material currently provided this is not possible. It should be noted that opportunities such as provided by EWR to massively improve all aspects of the operation of stations like Cambridge are rare, and it is vital that these opportunities are maximised and are future proofed. There is a need to consider future rail operations so that costly and disruptive works are not required for a significant amount of time after the EWR central section has been constructed.</p> <p>Cambridge Station - Eastern Access</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council notes that there are currently no proposals within the non-statutory consultation to create an eastern access to Cambridge station. Currently the sole access to Cambridge station is via the main station building on the western side of the tracks and whilst increasing the size or further improving the efficiency of the existing space used is beneficial, the Council would strongly support additional access and ticket purchasing facilities to the east of the current tracks. However consideration of an eastern access does need to be made alongside consideration of proposals for a station in the east of Cambridge which is discussed further below.</p> <p>The railway itself creates a significant severance barrier to those wishing to access Cambridge station and those users coming from east of the railway line have a reasonably lengthy process of crossing the railway using either the main road bridges on Hills Road or Mill Road, or by using the Carter Bridge (pedestrians and cyclists only). As an illustration, the Council notes that from Davy Road on the east of the railway it is a little over 160m by foot to the railway boundary, but it is around a 770m walk to access the station building on the west of the railway.</p> <p>As stated, the station suffers from peak time overcrowding on platforms and in the ticket hall, and although improved since the development of the station square, traffic/vehicle congestion can still be an issue in the taxi / drop off facility outside the station.</p> <p>Proposals within the EWR consultation may provide additional capacity, however, there would be benefits from opening up the eastern side of the railways tracks to access and ticketing to further enhance capacity by spreading the load of passengers more evenly. Convenient access and connectivity for all users is very important in attracting people to rail, something which would certainly improve with a new eastern access and is supported by local transport policy, including the Combined Authority Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (2023) and Cambridge Local Plan (2018).</p> <p>Furthermore, as part of the Chisholm Trail works undertaken by the GCP in the last few years, discussions were held about creating an eastern access point to the station, via the 'green route' that was safeguarded during the planning process for the Rustat</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Road/Avenue development (in the early 2000s). This land currently provides an active travel link between Rustat Road at the Davy Road junction and Clifton Road.</p> <p>The Council would urge EWR to look again at this possibility and work together to deliver this sustainably, with consideration for local residents and businesses who suffer existing parking issues related to Cambridge station.</p> <p>The Council believes that a new eastern access could address overcrowding issues and to encourage and facilitate improved access to the station by active travel from the east of the city. A new bridge (fire escape) across all platforms is contained in the proposals – could this be extended/used to a new eastern access?</p> <p>We would also ask that a direct connection to the cycle park from the existing station footbridge be considered if works to an eastern access are taken forward.</p> <p>Double tracking to the east of Cambridge Station (Newmarket line), and potential for a new station in the east of Cambridge</p> <p>The scheme proposes to double track the railway line towards Cherry Hinton for a train turnback area. It will not impact on the level crossing at Cherry Hinton.</p> <p>The Council believes that double tracking may help the case for enhanced rail services between Ipswich, Bury St Edmunds, Newmarket and Cambridge. It is key that anything changes made on this line do not prejudice future provision of increased service levels on this line.</p> <p>The existing underbridge on Coldhams Common (where the Chisholm Trail goes under the railway) should be improved to increase headroom and width.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The reconstruction of the foot/cycle bridge on the Tins path needs to tie-in with the Greater Cambridge Partnership Fulbourn Greenways proposals.</p> <p>There would be major benefits of extending the double tracking to Six Mile Bottom. This would have the benefits of allowing for two or more trains per hour in each direction east of Cambridge (and to Ipswich subject to the upgrade at Haughley) and also permit freight trains sooner rather than later. It would make sense to undertake work on this line at the EWR for numerous reasons, not least of which is maximising the benefits achieved from the disruption during the construction phase for the EWR proposals.</p> <p><u>New Station east of Cambridge.</u></p> <p>While EWR proposes the use of the Newmarket Line for turnback of trains, the Council considers that there would be very significant benefits delivered by provision of a new station on the Newmarket Line to the south of Cambridge Airport in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustainable transport capacity for new and existing trips in the east of the city • mitigating against increases in passenger numbers increasing congestion and crowding in Cambridge Station • increased rail passenger numbers and associated income to the rail industry. <p>The Council further considers that this station should be included in the EWR scheme DCO application, and would support, with local partners, the investigation of options for local contributions from development in the area that would directly benefit from such provision in mitigating their transport impact.</p> <p>We would request that if such provision is not included in the EWR proposals, that no works are undertaken that would prejudice such provision in future.</p> <p><u>North of Cambridge Station</u></p> <p>The Council considers it vital that continued discussions are held regarding the impact of EWR on Fen Road level crossing and strongly supports the development of a solution to</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>improve safety at this busy level crossing. The Council would like to see the number of trains using Fen Road crossing increase given increasing travel demand from growth on the rail corridor to the north of Cambridge and therefore a solution is required to address the impact that this will have on Fen Road level crossing.</p> <p>Cambridge North</p> <p>At Cambridge North station, EWR are planning to modify the track layout to allow for some existing train services from the north to terminate there during our construction works at Cambridge station. However, the consultation document states that EWR services would not serve Cambridge North. Not serving Cambridge North is potentially a missed opportunity of EWR. The Council would like to understand in more detail the options for services, whether from EWR or existing rail operators, to utilise platform / turnback capacity at Cambridge North.</p>
Highways Development Management		<p>All roads, junctions and footways must be designed and laid-out in accordance with The Council's General Principles for Development (here) and the suite of documents contained with the DMRB for complex infrastructure and constructed in accordance with The Council's Housing Estate Road Construction Specification (here).</p> <p>For construction works not covered within the aforementioned documents then the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and the Specification for Highway Works (SHW) as contained within the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works (MCHW) shall be used.</p> <p>All materials used within the extent of the proposed highway shall be in accordance with the Housing estate road construction specification, <i>and any non-standard materials would be subject to the express approval of the Highway Authority and will be subject to a commuted sum, as detailed under our Commuted sum policy (adopted County Policy).</i></p> <p>New embankments to structures shall not be designated as highway under S278/S38 process. When required for the structural integrity of the adoptable highway, the land title</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>shall be transferred to Cambridgeshire County Council, with highway designation only being applied to the carriageway, footway or cycleway, with an appropriate width of maintenance strip provided behind any kerbing or edgings.</p> <p>All Traffic Signs and Carriageway Markings within the extent of the public highway, and any roads that are to become adopted public highway, shall be in accordance with The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.</p> <p>The information currently available does not provide enough information or detailed design/construction information to enable detailed commentary. General data has been provided for potential new road link locations but more detail is required as to the design, construction and status of these in order to determine how this impacts the Local Highway Authority network. There is also limited design detail regarding how each bridge/underpass/tunnel etc will affect the existing extent of the highway maintainable at public expense.</p> <p>The verified physical extent of any public highway should be acquired from Cambridgeshire County Council's Highway Records Team in the form of a 'detailed' Search to inform the assessment and designs/ siting of accesses/ achievement of mitigation measures etc: note that not all features form part of the public highway (i.e. ditches/ drains do not usually form part of the public highway but are in riparian ownership).</p> <p>A link to more information is available here: https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/highway-searches or contact the Highway Records team via Searches@cambridgeshire.gov.uk. Please note the provision of highway extent information is a chargeable service.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority welcomes early and ongoing engagement throughout the consultation and DCO application process, and requests early agreement key information including design standards. The Council notes that it will be seeking appropriate protection for it's assets through Protective Provisions, commitments in the Development Consent Order, and legal agreements. This is expected to cover existing highway assets, Rights of</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Way, damage to roads, and current and future projects including the Busway and proposals being brought forwards by the Council, and the Greater Cambridge Partnership</p> <p><u>There are several design guides that can be shared with EWR that are either published or in development, which cover active travel and Rights of Way. The Council would be happy to discuss this further.</u></p>
Public Rights of Way (PROW)		<p>General Comments</p> <p>All locations where PROW's pass under the new railway, or beneath any other new structure, must be assessed for the risk of flooding. No PROW should be subject to an increased risk of flooding as a result of the development. All underpasses must also ensure a welcoming environment for PROW users by achieving or exceeding minimum height and width requirements. If a PROW is to be diverted through an underpass adjacent to a watercourse, as at Hen Brook, West Brook and other locations, any design must also incorporate safety measures appropriate to the type of lawful user of the affected PROW.</p> <p>Clarity is requested regarding the provision of non-motorised user (NMU) facilities alongside new/diverted local roads. Does the applicant intend to provide NMU facilities on all new/diverted local roads? If so, which user types will be accommodated by the design? The Council requests all roadside NMU provision to be suitable and accessible to all NMU types, unless there is demonstrable reason not to do so.</p> <p>Where part of a PROW diversion route involves non-motorised users (NMUs) being discharged onto a road for any distance, a roadside NMU path should be provided to ensure vulnerable users are safe and are not forced to walk/cycle/ride in the carriageway.</p> <p>Terminology used on drawings needs to be consistent and must reflect the correct legal status of the relevant PROW. For example, Route Section 6 Sheet 4 shows a 'proposed Knapwell Footpath 5 overbridge'. This bridge also appears to be the only possible diversion route for the nearby Elsworth Bridleway 4, and therefore the bridge should be identified as a bridleway and the structure should be designed to accommodate bridleway traffic. Issues such as this across the scheme to be reviewed and corrected where required.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>The Council expects any new or diverted PROW that are included in Development Consent Order (DCO) documents to be delivered on the precise alignment shown in the appropriate drawings. However, it is requested that the drafting of the DCO and associated drawings should include limits of deviation for the construction of new PROW. The Council has obtained Counsel advice on this matter: where PROW are not constructed on the same alignment as what is specified in a DCO, the legal event for bringing them into being is considered nullified. Furthermore, this also serves to nullify the associated stopping up of any PROW which are required to be closed for the construction of the railway. The outcome is that a second legal event is required to bring new PROW into existence and to extinguish PROW severed as a result of construction. The addition of limits of deviation for PROW to the DCO will help to prevent additional legal and administrative work from being required should on-site restrictions necessitate construction of PROW on different alignments.</p> <p>CCC requires clarification of proposed temporary PROW diversion routes to be used while construction is underway. Any diversion route should be as direct as possible and maintained by the undertaker. Construction traffic and NMUs should only share space where it is demonstrably safe to do so. Temporary diversions onto the road network should be minimised – any egress of PROW diversions onto roads must be safe. The Council requests engagement with regard to measures for PROW diversions and temporary closures that will be incorporated in the emerging Construction Traffic Management Plan. Impacts of construction on PROW must also be minimised and offset: pre-commencement surveys and measures to restore paths to original condition are required.</p> <p>The Council requires an understanding of the landscape and visual impact of the railway on visual receptors who use the local PROW network. The Council requests involvement in the selection of representative viewpoints for any visual impact assessment. The railway will present a permanent change to the landscape and this has the potential to negatively impact upon users' enjoyment of local PROW. Where negative impacts are demonstrated, The Council will seek appropriate mitigation measures to be implemented by the undertaker.</p>
Public Rights of Way (PROW)	Route Section Plans	The Route Section Plans available at eastwestrail.co.uk/consultation2024/route-section-plans have been reviewed to determine the possible effects of the development on PROW

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
	eastwestrail.co.uk/consultation2024/route-section-plans	<p>based on the information available. We have the following initial comments on these plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5 Sheet 3 Option 1C. Hen Brook underpass. Existing flooding issues should be mitigated as far as possible. The Council cannot accept any design that would result in flooding of the PROW becoming worse or more frequent. • Section 5 Sheet 3 Option 1C. Proposed Abbotsley FP 17 overbridge. This bridge is in very close proximity to the new bridge that is to be delivered over the new A421. Height differential between the two bridges should be minimised to ensure that PROW users do not have to ascend and descend two bridges in close succession. • Section 6 Sheet 1. Any design for the realignment of the local roads must ensure that NMU connectivity between Cambridge Road, St Neots, and the new A421/Cambridge Road junction is retained. • Section 6 Sheets 4 and 5. Connectivity should be provided between Knapwell FP 8 and Knapwell Byway 7 and the proposed Cambourne Station site, to facilitate easiest possible access from these PROW to the new station. • The access bridge from Cambourne to Cambourne Station site should be inclusive of all NMUs – including equestrians. This allows a connection to be made between the circular bridleways at Cambourne and the nearby Knapwell Byway 7 and other proximate bridleways. • Section 6 Sheet 6. The Council have received an application for a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) to be made to upgrade Toft FP 4 to a bridleway. If this DMMO is made (after investigation and determination), bridleway rights will exist over the route of this PROW. • Section 7 Sheet 3 Option 1. Haslingfield FP13 is crossed by the proposed railway but is not labelled on the appropriate plans. Please ensure labelling for this route is added so that members of the public can fully perceive the impact of the railway on this PROW. Please can confirmation be provided regarding whether this route will require diversion in this location. • Section 7. The proposed Newton Road pedestrian overbridge should accommodate all NMU types to ensure equality of access options between Newton and Harston.

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 7. All options requiring the closure of Newton Road should consider whether it is desirable to stop up the 'dead end' section of the road to motorised traffic. • Section 7. PROW users wishing to reach Harston FP 5 (off of Shelford Road) in order to access the Wale Obelisk local point of interest will be required to follow a more circuitous route if approaching from Harston. Options should be considered for reducing the length of this journey. • Section 7 Sheet 5. Consider accessibility measures to ensure that Great Shelford FP1 overbridge is accessible to as many users as possible. • Section 8 Sheet 2a. Proposed Coldham's Common and Teversham footbridges should be as accessible as possible to NMUs. Teversham footbridge forms part of a well-used informal cycling route – provision of ramps should be explored.
Public Rights of Way (PROW)	Route Section Plans eastwestrail.co.uk/consultation2024/route-section-plans	<p>Opportunities</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 105 states that “Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails”. The Council’s Rights of Way Improvement Plan also states that “development should contribute to the provision of new links and/or improvement of the existing rights of way network”.</p> <p>The proposed scheme presents a number of opportunities to deliver PROW and NMU access enhancements. The potential acquisition of land near to rural communities and a construction alignment which passes a number of settlements means that the development offers a chance to deliver active travel connections and leisure routes that may not be otherwise come to fruition. Cambridgeshire County Council urges the applicant to engage widely with communities, stakeholders, rights of way user groups and local authorities to ensure that possibilities offered by the scheme to deliver valuable new local infrastructure are not missed.</p> <p>A sample of potential PROW and NMU enhancement opportunities includes (but is not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5 Sheet 3. Use of maintenance access track to provide PROW connection between Abbotsley Road and Hen Brook.

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6 Sheets 4 and 5. All-inclusive roadside NMU facility on St Neots Road to provide enhanced connections between the proposed Cambourne Station and a number of PROW that terminate on this road. • Section 6 Sheet 4. Use of maintenance access track to provide PROW connection between Brockley Road and Elsworth Bridleway 4. • Section 6 Sheet 2. Extension of roadside NMU facility to connect to Toseland FP 7, providing an off-carriageway route to link this PROW to Toseland FP9 and Croxton FP1. • Section 6 Sheet 6. Potential provision of roadside NMU facilities between Hardwick and Toft. • Section 7 Sheet 1. Use of maintenance access track to provide PROW connection between B1046 and Toft FP16. • Section 7 Sheet 2. Potential walking routes on Chapel Hill could be considered to take advantage of wide-ranging (and rare) local viewpoint on top of the Hill. • Section 7 – Harston/Newton/Little Shelford. Roadside NMU options to be explored on London Road and Shelford Road to offer optimal off-carriageway connections between communities and the PROW which terminate on these roads. • Section 7 – Harston/Newton - All Options. PROW connections to be explored between proposed Newton Road overbridge and Harston FP4, and also eastwards to provide a walking route to London Road.
Emergency Planning	Community Risk and Response Planning	<p>Liaison regarding the project should be developed with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF). This will help to ensure that implications arising from the project, which may impact upon risks currently contained on the CPLRF Community Risk Register, are effectively addressed. It will also be necessary to establish if the project has impacts upon existing CPLRF Response Plans and how these might be resolved.</p>
The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP)		<p>Newmarket Line Turnback</p> <p>The proposed turnback on the Newmarket Line will require a replacement Tins Path Bridge. As discussed previously with EWR, this bridge is being utilised for the proposed Fulbourn Greenway, a key route for active travel into Cambridge. The scheme is due to come forward in approximately 2027, with the new structure to be built at that time. As the scheme will now need to allow for provision for the turnback a larger structure will be required. Therefore GCP requests that EWR work with us to provide or as a minimum identify the additional funding required for the structure.</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Sawston Greenway</p> <p>Shepreth Junction</p> <p>As indicated in the EWR consultation document, the Genome path runs adjacent to the WAML on the east side of Shepreth Junction to the Addenbrookes Road Bridge. It provides a critical walking and cycling link between residential areas and key employment sites, such as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The Greater Cambridge Partnership will be investing significantly to widen the Genome Path from Chaston Road to the Addenbrookes Road Bridge. This route will be formalised as a bridleway to make provision for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian users. Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) project will also provide big investment to the north section of the Genome Path and will provide much wider walking and cycling routes from the Nine Wells Bridge through Francis Crick Avenue. Such improvements will see the replacement of the Nine Wells Bridge. The underbridge proposal for Nine Wells Bridge should be discussed further with the GCP CSET and Greenway Team. The underbridge should be widened to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian users.</p> <p>The proposal to widen the Addenbrookes Road Bridge should seek to improve the width of the Genome Path that exists under the Addenbrookes Bridge and leads to Francis Crick Avenue. This should be considered in the event that further investment in the CSET Phase 2 scheme is not achieved. Again, these proposals should be discussed with the GCP CSET Team.</p> <p>Proposals to replace the footbridge at Shepreth Footbridge 1, should be reconsidered to provide a bridge for cyclists too (without the need to dismount). Investigations should also be made to work with Cambridgeshire County Council's Public Rights of Way Team to convert Footpath 1 into a walking and cycling path.</p> <p>The proposals for the balancing pond (adjacent to the Genome path and next to Granham's Road) and the diversion route will need to be carefully considered. This is particularly important where construction is concerned, especially as the proposal is for the route to pass through the construction compound on private land. To comply with the rest of the route, the diverted pathway will be required to be 6m wide and consist of a 4m tarmacked path and 2m wide grass strip. Any proposals to plant hedgerow either side of the diverted path will require wider widths. Artwork depicting the DNA code should also be replaced on this section, as well as space for the 'double helix structure' if it is required to be relocated.</p> <p>The tie in of the Genome Path with Granhams Road should also be carefully considered. Granhams Road is narrow with little protection for cyclists and pedestrians accessing the Genome</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>Path between the north and south sections. Land should be used to provide a wider access path to the northern section from Granhams Road.</p> <p>Cambridge – Long Road</p> <p>Long Road provides a shared use path facility for walking and cycling and feeds into improvements that will be made to Long Road and Robinson Way, both of which forms part of the Sawston Greenway. It is important that any new overbridge provides at least 4m segregated space for walking and cycling along this section.</p> <p>It is also important that the overbridge does not adversely affect the walking and cycling path that runs along the Busway.</p> <p>Sawston Greenway</p> <p>As mentioned in the response to Shepreth Junction, Network Rail should work with the Cambridge County Council Public Rights of Way Team to provide a walking and cycling bridge at Shepreth Footbridge 1 and a link through to The Hectare, which would provide a safer alternative to crossing the Level Crossing at Granhams Road.</p> <p>Cambridge Station</p> <p>Better provision should be made at Cambridge station for cyclists to take their bikes between platforms. Improvements to bridges, should have wider channels for bike wheels so that cyclists can take their bikes over the bridges.</p> <p>Melbourn Greenway</p> <p>Comberton to Shelford (Harston – Hauxton)</p> <p>Harston/Newton Road/Hauxton Road</p> <p>Investment in the Melbourn Greenway will enhance the existing shared use path for walking and cycling that runs along the A10. The route provides a vital link between villages (including Harston and Hauxton) on the outskirts of Cambridge with businesses and key facilities between Melbourn and the City Centre.</p> <p>EWR proposals to realign the A10 near to Harston must ensure that the existing walking and cycling route is not affected. As stated, the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) will be investing</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>in widening the existing shared use path alongside the A10. The inclusion of a 4m-wide shared use path should therefore be provided in any realignment proposals, however the desire would be for a 6m-wide segregated walking and cycling path.</p> <p>Such EWR highway improvements to the A10 between Church Road and Station Road must also include the provision of a toucan or signalised parallel crossing over Royston Road. Improvements to the footway on the southern section of Royston Road are also required to provide a safe walking and cycling connection to Station Road.</p> <p>In Options 1 and 4, route realignments, overbridges and pedestrian bridges are proposed over the railway between Station Road and Newton Road, and at Hauxton. These routes need to be accessible for walking, cycling (without the need to dismount) and equestrian use. Proposals for road realignment from Newton Road and London Road should also make segregated provision for active travel and should have improvements to connect active travel routes to the A10. There is an opportunity to improve the approach to the proposed bridges on Hauxton Road and at Newton to better accommodate active travel - this can be in the form of traffic calming. Network Rail should work with the local community and parish councils to develop a solution.</p> <p>Improvements needed to the railway and stations</p> <p>Although currently outside of scope, it would be remiss of the GCP not to request that Network Rail invest in improving some sections of the railway in conjunction with the EWR works. In particular, at Foxton Level Crossing where there has long been a campaign by local residents and councillors for a safer unhindered passage over the level crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Opportunities</p> <p>EWR offers a significant amount of opportunities for the both the City of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to enhance connectivity. GCP asks that EWR work alongside local partners to help maximise opportunities including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Interchanges between EWR Station at Cambourne and the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge busway (both from a public transport and active travel position) -Potential active travel links alongside the EWR route that could provide links to both proposed Greenways and existing active travel links

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>-The potential for an Eastern Access into Cambridge Station</p> <p>-Opportunities when enhancing infrastructure such as Long Road bridge in Cambridge, to provide better active travel links</p> <p>-The potential to utilise the turn back on the Newmarket Line to provide future provision for a Station.</p> <p>Cambourne Area</p> <p>The EWR proposals include a Safeguarding Directive for a wide expanse of land which includes significant CtoC activity. The interaction of the two schemes has been discussed for some time but CCC/GCP will require an Assurance, potentially through the format of a Statement of Common Ground, which confirms that the Safeguarding Directive will not impede delivery or operation of CtoC. EWR have issued a holding objection to CtoC pending completion of such an agreement. As such GCP would recommend that CCC similarly register an equivalent holding objection to EWR on the basis that the EWR holding objection would, until withdrawn, not only delay CtoC but also the development of Bourn Airfield thereby undermining delivery of the Local Plan and consequent 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>At the point where the schemes cross it is intended that EWR will be in a cut and cover tunnel and GCP has provided EWR with design details to help EWR ensure that there is no conflict. The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) will need to confirm that that is the case. EWR has asked GCP to consider passive provision at this location for the tunnel roof. GCP has indicated that it is minded to do so, but that given the state of development of the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) submission it was too late to amend the scheme drawings. As such GCP will be willing to confirm in SoCG that this would be addressed at Detailed Design within the remit of what is permissible or that GCP would be willing to provide this if any required supplementary consent were to be required. The marginal cost of passive provision including any additional consenting would be the responsibility of EWR.</p> <p>EWR have indicated that they would be agreeable to a SoCG which would be replicated for EWR.</p> <p>The proposal for a station at Cambourne has no direct implications for CtoC but there is considerable opportunity for co-operation between CtoC and EWR to maximise and realise</p>

Specialism	Proposal aspect referred to	Comments
		<p>benefits. This will cover issues such as bus terminus and interchange arrangements which need to consider the wider growth of Cambourne.</p> <p>This is a significant opportunity for EWR, CCC and GCP to work together with the LPAs.</p> <p>Cambridge East turnback</p> <p>GCP welcomes the proposal to extend EWR to a turnback adjacent to Cambridge East and the improvements that will accompany this. In the longer term GCP is concerned that the turnback may impede expansion of services on the Cambridge to Newmarket line and that, if not carefully planned, the turnback itself may prevent provision of a local station at some point in the future.</p> <p>GCP would welcome the opportunity to continue to work with EWR to ensure that any proposals for the DCO provide an interim stage towards a longer term goal of an upgrade to services on this line.</p> <p>GCP notes that the rail overbridge on Coldhams Lane is particularly constrained. Any possessions planned to enable restoration of twin-tracking may create a window of opportunity to replace the bridge with one which facilitates growth.</p> <p>Relationship between CSETS Phase 2 and EWR</p> <p>Option 3 is the least disruptive to CSETS Phase 2 However the safeguarded area potentially impacts the red line of the scheme, therefore we reserve the right to work with EWR on a Statement of Common Ground</p>