

**Making Meaningful Connections: East West Rail  
Company consultation, March – June 2021  
Response of Cambridgeshire County Council  
22 June 2021**



1. Cambridgeshire County Council welcomes and supports the ongoing work to develop and deliver the East West Rail route, providing a strategic rail corridor between the East of England and central, southern and western England for both passengers and freight. The route should be transformational, shortening many rail journeys, providing new travel choices for many trips, taking pressure off rail lines into London, and reducing carbon emissions from the transport sector.
2. The Council endorses the response of England's Economic Heartland to the consultation, and the overarching requirements set out in that response, which are:
  - a) Continued support in principle for the development and delivery of the proposals required to restore the rail link between Oxford and Cambridge
  - b) The importance of high quality and environmentally sensitive design
  - c) A commitment by Government to deliver East West Rail section must include a commitment to fund the delivery of complementary improvements in local connectivity
  - d) The section between Bletchley and Cambridge should be designed to enable delivery of the full of the East West Main Line proposal
  - e) The section between Bletchley and Cambridge should be delivered as electrified infrastructure
  - f) The section between Bletchley and Cambridge should be delivered as a digitally enabled infrastructure corridor
  - g) The design of the Bletchley and Cambridge section must incorporate lessons learnt during the delivery of the Bicester to Bletchley section
  - h) The design of the Bletchley to Cambridge section must be capable of accommodating rail freight services
3. Expanding on the EEH requirements noted above, the Council would request the following principles / requirements are taken account of as further work is undertaken to develop the proposals Central Section between Bedford and Cambridge.

***A Strategic Railway***

- The East West Rail Central Section should be considered as part of the longer East of England to central, southern and western England route, and account for the need for services to continue to Ipswich and Norwich.
- Scheme design and service specification should allow for a flexible mix of fast inter-regional and local stopping passenger services, and for freight services.

***Growth***

- The East West Rail Central Section should support growth and enable sustainable transport patterns to be realised from that growth. The detailed alignment of the Central Section should be considered alongside the consideration of appropriate locations for growth in the Ox-Cam Arc, and the appropriate scale of that growth.
- The strategy for station provision on the Central Section must be informed by the consideration of appropriate locations for growth.

### **Carbon**

- East West Rail should be electrified between Bletchley and Cambridge and contribute to the decarbonisation of the transport sector from day one of operation, contributing to the achieving of net zero carbon emissions by 2050.
- 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.

### **Environmental / Social impacts**

- East West Rail should double nature to offset adverse construction impacts.
- Scheme design and alignments should minimise and mitigate adverse impacts on existing communities, and avoid or mitigate the severance of links between those communities.

### **Integration and connectivity**

- East West Rail stations should be designed to facilitate interchange with local public transport services and with the Cambourne To Cambridge Better Public Transport Project.
- High quality pedestrian and cycle links meeting the standards set out in LTN 1/20 should be provided between Central Section stations and existing settlements, or adequate funding for such provision made available to the Council.
- Station access should allow for the interception of trips on the Strategic Road Network, particularly for journeys to and from Cambridge.

4. The following paragraphs set out the council's detailed comments on the route options in Cambridgeshire.

### **The approach to Cambridge**

5. The Council notes the additional work undertaken on the option of entering Cambridge from the north, and the conclusions drawn by the East West Rail Company that it would result in higher costs and lower passenger benefits. The Council would ask that further detail be made available by EWR on the basis for its decision on the preferred route and in particular information regarding the following:~~The Council would ask that further details be made available by EWR to the public on the basis for its decision on the preferred access.~~

- location and quantum of future housing and economic growth
- impact on the environment
- residential impact of freight traffic
- the necessity of 4-tracking of the WAML with a northern approach.

### **Section B: Bletchley and the Marston Vale Line and Section C: Bedford**

6. The Council agrees that very significant investment is needed in the Marston Vale Line to ensure that overall EWR service provision is reliable and that journey times are minimised on the longer route. We support the commentary in the consultation response from England's Economic Heartland on the Marston Vale Line and on the section of the route through Bedford.

Formatted: Highlight

## **Section D: Clapham Green to The Eversdens**

7. The Council considers that there is insufficient information available with regard to the location and quantum of future housing and economic growth for it to fully endorse a single Route Alignment for the Central Section between Clapham Green and the Eversdens at this time. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is undertaking work to consider further development over and above that included in current and emerging Local Plans in the Ox-Cam Arc. The final choice of route alignment and station locations in the St Neots / Tempsford area and in the Cambourne area must be informed by and inform the consideration of the location and quantum of any future growth by MHCLG.
8. Based on our initial assessment of the consultation material and of environmental and heritage constraints, Route Alignments 1 and 9 are likely to have fewer negative implications for ecology, green infrastructure and heritage assets than Route Alignments 2, 6 and 8.
9. We would draw attention to the following areas where we need more information or have identified issues that will need to be addressed as the scheme is taken forward.

### St Neots South / Tempsford area

10. The location and quantum of growth in this area is fundamental to the choice of route option between Bedford and the East Coast Main Line, and to the location of the proposed interchange station. It is not certain at this point in time that a station on the East Coast Main Line would be located optimally to serve new development to the south / south east of St Neots or in the Tempsford area, and consideration of options for an additional station should be kept open should the growth context support this.
11. Route Alignments 1, 2 and 9 are routed between the old A428 and the proposed alignment of the new A428 to the east of St Neots and pass close to the Wintringham Park development, which is delivering around 2,800 homes. A station on the East Coast Main Line to the south is relatively poorly located for access from this site, and the opportunity to provide as station in this area should be considered if these Route Alignments are taken forward.

### Cambourne area

12. The County Council notes the initial view from South Cambridgeshire District Council that growth immediately to the south of a Cambourne South station would be likely to be less favourable than growth to the north of Cambourne, due to the nature of the landscape and the location relative to existing villages. However, as they note, more information is needed on the scale and nature of development to confirm this assessment.
13. A station at Cambourne South (Route Alignments 2, 6 and 8) would have good accessibility from the existing settlement of Cambourne. However, a station at Cambourne North (Route Alignments 1 and 9) would be separated from the existing settlement and from the consented Bourn Airfield settlement by the A428. Significant investment will be needed to allow for access from Cambourne to a Cambourne North station by pedestrians and cyclists. In a similar context, a station at Cambourne must be linked to surrounding villages.

14. Alignments 1 and 9 via a station at Cambourne North are shown cutting across the north east corner of the Bourn Airfield site, and through Highfields Caldecote on a viaduct and embankment. The Bourn Airfield site has resolution for planning consent (subject to completion of a S.106 agreement) for a settlement of 3,500 dwellings. At Highfields Caldecote, the alignment crosses a consented residential development site. Detail of how Route Alignments 1 and 9 would impact on the development of Bourn Airfield and Highfields Caldecote is needed.
15. If route alignments 1 or 9 are ultimately selected, consideration should be given to either tunnelling or putting the route in cutting under the A428 and across the Bourn Airfield site and under Highfields Caldecote. Consideration should also be given to a station serving Bourn Airfield directly, which might add value to the development rather than just add costs and take land.

#### **Section E: Harlton to Hauxton**

16. Cambridgeshire County Council supports the emerging preferred option for the Hauxton junction, as it would minimise the impacts on properties and woodland, move the existing railway further from Harston and reduce noise impacts, and would minimise disruption of existing rail services during construction. The Council appreciates that a grade separated solution is highly desirable in operational terms, but wishes to highlight the need for detailed consideration of noise and visual impacts of such provision in the development of more detailed options.
17. The new rail junction at Hauxton would sever the Station Road / Newton Road between Harston and Newton. Pedestrian and cycle access between the villages must be maintained on the current alignment as a minimum. Options for maintaining vehicular access should be discussed with the County Council.
18. Paragraph 10.3.8 of the Consultation Technical Report notes as a key advantage in relation to the use of the Shepreth Branch, that *"This option should not require widening of the existing two track corridor beyond the junction resulting in a smaller footprint and acquisition of fewer properties."*
19. The County Council welcomes this assessment, as it will limit the impact of the EWR route through Great Shelford. However, we are aware that the Shepreth Branch currently caters for six trains an hour in each direction, and that timetabling of these different services into Cambridge can be challenging. There are no opportunities for faster trains to pass stopping services on the Shepreth Branch, and this constraint impacts on the timetabling of services on the East Coast Main Line and the West Anglia Main Line. While we note and agree with the advantages detailed in paragraph 10.3.8, it must be ensured that the addition of East West Rail services onto this busy section of railway does not lead to increased journey times or timetabling problems for existing services on the Shepreth Branch.

#### **Section F: The Shelfords to Cambridge station**

20. The consultation states that the existing Hauxton Road level crossing on the line between Little Shelford and Hauxton may need to be closed and that this will be assessed in detail at the next stage of design. If the crossing was not closed it would be likely to see significantly more barrier down time than is the case today, as the number of trains on the route would increase from six to eleven an hour in each direction with East West Rail. The

Council considers that it is highly likely that a replacement bridge or bridges over the railway for vehicular traffic and pedestrians and cyclists will be needed.

21. East West Rail will necessitate the railway between the Shepreth Branch junction and Cambridge Station being widened to four tracks. Cambridge South Station will widen the route at the station. The four tracking will require the bridge taking Long Road over the railway to be lengthened to accommodate the new tracks. Long Road is part of the Cambridge Ring Road, and the East West Rail Company will need to ensure that the works to replace the bridge are managed to minimise disruption on the local transport network.
22. Two additional through platforms will be required at Cambridge Station, and it is possible that a third additional platform will be needed. These platforms are likely to be on the east side of the station. The opportunity should be taken to provide an eastern access to the station as part of the works to provide the new platforms. It must be ensured that sufficient space for passenger circulation and platform access is provided, and a second station footbridge is likely to be needed.

#### **Vertical alignments**

23. In several areas [in Cambridgeshire](#), but particularly [to the east of St Neots and](#) between Cambourne and Harston, the Route Alignments are shown with very significant lengths of high embankment and viaduct. In some cases, this is to cross water courses and in others it appears to be to pass over roads.
24. The Council appreciates the engineering challenges associated with a railway and the shallow gradients required compared to a road. However, the visual impacts of the embankments and structures is likely to be considerable and there are likely to be greater noise impacts compared to alignments that are at-grade or in cuttings. As proposals are refined, opportunities to reduce these impacts should be considered in detail and discussed with the County Council where it affects our infrastructure.

#### **Interaction with infrastructure being developed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership.**

25. Comments from the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) are appended to this response, focussing on the interaction of the East West Rail Central Section with their programme, particularly with the Cambourne to Cambridge and Cambridge South East Transport projects. Cambridgeshire County Council supports these comments and would emphasise the need for effective co-ordination between the East West Rail Company and the GCP to ensure that the interfaces between the projects in their design and delivery phases are managed effectively.
26. We would also emphasise the opportunity for a multi-modal interchange at the Cambourne station allowing passengers on East West Rail direct, fast access to parts of west Cambridge and the city centre that are not directly served by rail.

#### **Interaction with Local Roads and Public Rights of Way (PROW)**

27. It is vital for rail scheme promoters to consult with the County Council's Highways Service early and extensively to agree workable solutions and help minimise objections. For the

EWR central section the number of roads and PROW affected is large and will require a great deal of work to assess the impact and potential solutions.

28. The EWR Company is therefore strongly advised to consult the County Council as early as possible in the next stages of work to develop the scheme to discuss the impacts of the Route Alignments in detail, and what mitigation or form of compensation is needed as the scheme is developed further, and certainly prior to the formalisation of any proposals. The EWR Company will need to agree with the County Council a plan for approval of changes to the highway network, including the handover of all relevant asset information in order to enable the Council to update its legal records and undertake ongoing maintenance. Commuted sums for the future maintenance of new highway infrastructure will be sought by the Council.

#### Local Roads

29. Early discussion of the proposed changes to the local transport network with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as Transport Authority will be needed.
30. Any changes proposed to the road network as a result of the central section of East West Rail will need to consider the potential future use of the network in the affected areas, as well as immediate short term impacts. The County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy and Highway Operational Standards can be viewed at <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/highway-policies-and-capital-maintenance-programme/>.

#### Public Rights of Way

31. The five Route Alignments Central Section intersect with numerous routes of the Public Rights of Way (PROW) network. As the Highway Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council is the statutory body with responsibility for maintaining these PROW and the legal records related to them, in the form of the Definitive Map and Statement. The proposed works will severely impact upon the PROW network in the specified development corridor.
32. In accordance with the County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) (see <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/local-transport-plan/>) and the Cambridgeshire Health & Well-Being Strategy (see <https://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/jsna/health-and-wellbeing-strategy/>), the Council's approach is that:
  - It will seek to ensure that countryside access provision is not damaged by new development, and that, where possible, it is enhanced for the physical and mental well-being of communities.
  - In principle, public rights of way should remain open on their existing alignment, and diversion or extinguishment will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that there is no alternative.
  - Any routes that are proposed for diversion or extinguishment will require appropriate mitigation proposals (including consideration of convenience of users and enjoyment).
  - In addition, enhancements to the PROW network should be provided where possible both to help mitigate any losses, and to make use of the development as an opportunity to bring benefit to local communities, e.g. through upgrading the status of a right of way

to bridleway for more inclusive access by equestrians and cyclists.

33. Guiding Principle 3 from the ROWIP states that:
34. *“New development should not damage countryside provision, either directly or indirectly. New settlements should be integrated into the rights of way network, and improved provision made for the increased population. Where appropriate, development should contribute to the provision of new links and/or improvement of the existing rights of way network.”*

### **Climate Change**

35. The County Council agrees with the following commentary on climate change made by South Cambridgeshire District Council and considers that the Central Section should be delivered with electrification from the outset.

#### Climate Change Targets

36. Whilst the consultation material makes a number of high-level commitments to reducing the climate impacts of the scheme, on the whole it is considered that the proposals are currently lacking in clear and measurable targets related to climate change and carbon reduction, and there are a number of inconsistencies throughout the consultation materials.
37. The Government has just accepted the Committee on Climate Change’s recommendations for the Sixth Carbon budget, which sets an extremely ambitious carbon reduction target for a 78% reduction in emissions by 2035 in order for the UK to be on target to achieve net zero carbon by 2050. This new target will become enshrined in law by the end of June 2021. It will be vital that the proposals that come forward for East West Rail are in line with this carbon budget, including the assessment of the significance of effects as part of the EIA process.

#### Electrification of the Rail Network

38. The consultation documents make a number of high-level commitments including that the scheme will aim to deliver a net zero carbon railway, in line with existing and developing net zero carbon policy, legislation and commitments at a global, national and local level. Paragraph 3.9.2 of the technical document goes on to state that ‘the use of diesel-powered trains is not a project objective’. This is incompatible with the Programme Wide Output Specification (PWOS) contained within the appendices to the technical document, which states (at Section 5.1.9.1) that ‘the railway shall not at this point in time be electrified’.
39. In making their recommendations to Government on the Sixth Carbon Budget, the Committee on Climate Change included recommendations that continued electrification of the rail network, together with hydrogen, battery-electric and hybrid trains, will play a significant role in meeting the sixth carbon budget. To meet the ambition set out in the Committee’s carbon reduction scenarios, rail will need to be decarbonised further, with gradual electrification up to 55-60% of the network by 2050. Their recommendation was that ‘Government should set out a clear vision to deliver Net Zero in rail and support Network Rail in delivering the target to remove all diesel trains by 2040. This is expected to cover a mix of zero emission technologies (e.g. battery-electric, hydrogen and track

electrification). The strategy should be published by 2021 as recommended by the National Infrastructure Commission'. The Council considers it imperative that the proposals for East West Rail are compatible with this recommendation.

40. The sixth carbon budget cannot be met unless all new railway infrastructure is electrified at the point of construction. The statement in Section 5.9.13 of the PWOS that 'all new or renewed infrastructure shall be made compatible with positive passive provision of future electrification' is not considered to go far enough to meet this commitment.
41. We are also disappointed that the scheme does not make a clear target to rule out diesel powered EWR services or freight services and recommend that the PWOS be updated to commit to electrification from the outset. To fail to do so would not be compatible with the UK's legally binding carbon reduction commitments and could open up the project to legal challenge on climate change grounds.
42. While it is outside the scope of the current Central Section scheme, for electric traction freight services to use East West Rail there is a need for the earliest possible electrification of the route between Cambridge, Ipswich and Felixstowe / Harwich.

#### **Ecology and Green Infrastructure**

43. In the 2019 consultation the county council provided the following commentary on Ecology and Green Infrastructure:

*"It is essential that proposals protect and enhance sites, habitats and species of biodiversity value, including those of local importance (e.g. priority species / habitats, County Wildlife Sites and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Additional Species of Interest). Best practice mitigation hierarchy should be followed, with the route avoiding the greatest impacts on biodiversity selected, with any residual impacts minimised and adequately mitigated.*

*This scheme, along with other infrastructure and housing development within Cambridgeshire, will cause significant fragmentation of the landscape and result in isolation of biodiversity assets. It is critical, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, that the scheme seeks to establish coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to such pressure – including protect and buffer existing wildlife sites, extending existing networks of natural habitats and enhancements for species / habitats of local interest.*

*It is essential, in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, that the scheme seeks to deliver biodiversity net gain which contributes to county-wide strategies / projects, including:*

- *Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy; (<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/2557/green-infrastructure-strategy.pdf>)*
- *Wildlife Trust's Living Landscape Project (e), including West Cambridgeshire Hundreds and Cambridgeshire Chalk (<https://www.wildlifebcn.org/living-landscapes>); and*
- *Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Habitat Opportunities map (<http://www.cpbiodiversity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Cambridgeshire-habitat-mapping-final-report-FINAL.pdf>)"*



44. We would further note that Cambridgeshire is one of the most biodiversity deprived counties in the country, with many of Cambridgeshire's wildlife sites, habitats, and species in decline as a result of pressure from development, intensive agriculture and climate change. Transport schemes can have significant impact on wildlife as a result of carving-up the landscape, leaving small isolated pockets of wildlife, which are vulnerable to change. It is therefore important to consider opportunities to best protect and enhance the fragments of wildlife that remains.
45. In this context, in Cambridgeshire, route Alignments 1 and 9 provide the best opportunity to protect the county's biodiversity assets, as they follow the route of existing infrastructure (e.g. alignment of the old / proposed new A428) so that only a single transport corridor is created across the landscape. Route Alignments 1 and 9 are also further away from the rare Barbastelle Bat maternity colony at the Wimpole and Eversden Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest, which is of international importance for its bat population.

### **Flood Risk Management**

46. The route options to the north via Cambourne and south via Bassingbourn pass through areas with significant flood risk. It is essential that the scheme considers the risk from all sources of flooding (i.e. including risk from surface water runoff, ordinary watercourses and groundwater as well as main rivers) and avoids or manages the risks appropriately.
47. Where possible, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the scheme should explore opportunities to provide a reduction in flood risk to existing communities as well as ensuring that the route itself is sustainability designed. This could include exploring the use of natural flood risk management solutions on a catchment scale, providing betterment along the corridor. This would also enable a more holistic approach to managing the corridor environment integrating green infrastructure, biodiversity and flood risk management measures. Taking this kind of approach might also enable external funding and contributions to be drawn in from partners to support the delivery of high quality infrastructure.
48. All of the proposed routes would require the crossing of a number of watercourses. These watercourses form an essential part of water level management across Cambridgeshire and the wider catchment. Therefore consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council should be undertaken to ensure any crossings are designed appropriately and sustainably. The consent of the Council is required before changes can be made to the watercourses.

### **Business case**

49. The Council wishes to see the Business Case for the Central Section and the options under consideration, including the northern approach into Cambridge, as part of the statutory consultation.

### **Ongoing consultation and engagement**

50. The council considers that there is a need for substantial engagement with officers to address the issues identified in this response and ensure that the local impacts are identified and addressed prior to the statutory consultation and the submission of the application for a Development Consent Order as far as is possible. This will include the

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Appendix text, Space After: 0 pt

opportunity for detailed local consideration of the evidence in support of the southern approach into Cambridge in comparison to the northern approach.

51. There is a need for continued engagement with communities and local Members whose divisions are impacted by the proposals, to develop the scheme in a way that addresses their concerns and minimises local impacts. We would again highlight the substantial impacts of the embankments and viaducts shown in the information presented in this consultation, and the need for the consideration of taking roads over the railway instead of the railway over the road in many areas.

Formatted: Appendix text, Space After: 0 pt

## **Annex 1: CCC Historic Environment Team commentary on route options**

The comments below relate to the Route Alignments as they impact on Cambridgeshire.

### **Map Review: Clapham Green to The Eversdens**

**Route 1** (dark blue) and **Route 9** (purple) follow the corridor of the new A428 road line, restricting further impacts to the historic environment resource and to Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire's rural landscape. This corridor has already been subject to archaeological evaluation so a broad understanding of the archaeological character of the area has begun to be established. These routes avoid most statutory historic environment designations, areas of Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas. Non-designated heritage assets are present according to the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER), for which mitigation solutions, including route realignments to avoid large known archaeological sites, might be possible. They avoid affecting the landscape between Kingston and Toft and avoids areas of extensive archaeological sites (mapped from cropmarks on aerial photographs) – particularly around the Bourn Brook. These route alignments have a relatively lighter impact on historic environment resources in Cambridgeshire and are preferred by the Historic Environment Team.

**Route 2** (red) heads to the Bourn valley (Bourn Brook) and would despoil a historic intersection of parishes at a sensitive area of the river valley. It would also affect Conservation Areas in the Kingston, Caldecote, Toft triangle. This is an area of considerable landscape value and natural environment around Bourn Brook, which should not be affected by a transport route. It is not supported by the Historic Environment Team.

**Route 6** (light blue) and **Route 8** (yellow) would in addition to the impacts noted for Route 2, pass by a high number of designated heritage assets (e.g. Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas). The Conservation Area of Abbotsley would be significantly affected. They are not supported by the Historic Environment Team.

**Route 9** (Purple); Route 9, as with Route 1, is preferred in historic environment terms in its Cambridgeshire section. It stays to the north of the A428, closely aligned with its route, importantly avoids affecting the landscape between Kingston and Toft and avoids areas of extensive archaeological sites (mapped from cropmarks on aerial photographs) – particularly around the Bourn Brook.

### **Map Review: Harlton to Hauxton section**

All routes will converge to the south of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory that was built on the former Oxford-Cambridge Varsity Railway Line and the site of a former WW2 airfield and ammunitions dump (CHER ref MCB15138). The EWR route will take a course immediately north of Harlton and will affect the setting of the scheduled monument and non-designated components at Fryer's Cottage alongside the Roman Road Arrington to Cambridge (CHER ref MCB28262), which would need appropriate mitigation commensurate with nationally important archaeological sites.

The intensity of non-designated historic environment assets on the CHER increases and expands around Harston and the alley of the River Cam or Rhee. Scheduled Monuments are numerous in the Hauxton to Great Shelford area where additional track beds will create impacts and affect their settings. Careful mitigation will be needed.

**Document Review:**

- **Our approach to the environment 2021 Update**
- **Technical Document**

We welcome and encourage the stated intention to protect the historic environment through preserving and enhancing heritage assets but there is still a long way to go before these have been fully identified and new archaeological sites discovered via appropriate evaluation works.

We consider that Routes 1 and 9 have demonstrated route planning that avoids most of the statutorily designated sites and monuments, but the documents lack detail as to how non-designated assets will be found, understood and used to make localised route changes, where necessary. In line with NPPF paragraph 189, we recommend that a robust programme of evaluation is required in advance of the submission of any application for a DCO in order to provide information that can be used in decision making for mitigation schemes and for promotion and display of the archaeology of the EWR route.

The additional works in support of the route (chapter 4 Technical document) include reference to impacts on the historic environment

**Section E: Harlton to Hauxton.** The consultation document shows options for an online or offline junction with the West Anglia Main Line. Care and attention is required with the planning of this section to prevent spoiling or damaging the settings of a series of heritage assets designated as Scheduled Monuments in this area (Settlement sites at Manor Farm NHLE 1006809). It is evident on the Historic Environment Record maps alone that there are very few opportunities for the routing and expansion works for the line junctions in this area that would fully avoid heritage assets.

**Section F: The Shelfords to Cambridge.** We have been in discussions with Network Rail about this section and are working with them and Historic England to design the least harmful route reducing impacts to a large Scheduled Monument west of White Hill Farm (NHLE 1006891 – shown on a maplet on p.256 of the consultation document) with non-designated portions on the west side of the existing railway line. Constraints here include the existing railway line and the proposed route of the Cambridge South East Transport travel route in design by the Greater Cambridge Partnership as well as Nine Wells LNR, which is the source spring of Hobson's Conduit.

**Consultation Technical Report: Appendices**

This language may need greater explanation to Member and members of the public:

**Appendix B, Page 26, para 5.30.9.** states "*Historic environment. EWR Co shall protect the historic environment through preserving and enhancing heritage assets.*" It would be better for EWR Co. to indicate that their intention is to find and excavate archaeological remains that can't be avoided by construction and other impacts connected with the railway, and seek to analyse and publish the results of ensuing excavations in a variety of formats, to conduct public engagement for archaeology during the construction programme and to display and interpret the evidence in galleries, museums, railway stations and websites as part of the mitigation strategy.

**Appendix E. Project Section D Assessment Factor Tables: Environmental Considerations.**

Designated heritage assets are solely used to quantify impacts. This is 'very high level' (see above) assessment data and does not include reference to far higher levels of non-designated assets –

some denoting extensive settlement sites or funerary remains. Some may class as being of equivalent status just have not been put forward for scheduling.

**Appendix E, Factor ID 3 Capital Costs.** Once the archaeological evaluation exercises produce physical evidence, the cost risk and programme risk can be more securely calculated. Underestimation of the costs of an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy risks jeopardising the scheme and can lead to unwanted corner-cutting and budget rearrangement (including with Govt departments, DfT). The Council will be happy to work with the EWR Company to minimise such risks.

**Appendix E, Factor ID 14 Environment and Society.** Environmental impacts and opportunities. The scores given for Route 9 do not tally if the historic environment is included in this row. If historic environment is not included in this row, how is it accounted for in this table?

### **Conclusion**

An appraisal of the Route Alignments 1, 2, 6, 8 and 9 has taken place. We consider the Cambridgeshire sections of Route 1 and Route 9 to be least harmful in historic environment terms.

## **Annex 2: Greater Cambridge Partnership response**

(also submitted under separate cover)

### **East West Rail “Making Meaningful Connections” Public Consultation – comments on interaction with Greater Cambridge Partnership schemes**

The GCP’s partners – including Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge University – will be submitting comprehensive responses to the consultation. This document provides comments on the interface between the consultation proposals and several of the GCP’s transport schemes.

#### **General comments**

The GCP has several schemes which interface with East West Rail both as the line approaches Cambridge from the west, and in terms of providing onward connectivity to the east. As proposals develop, it is important that the dialogue to ensure schemes are complementary and aligned continues.

As set out above, the GCP partners will submit comprehensive responses to the consultation. The GCP echoes the position set out in our partners’ responses that East West Rail should be electrified from the start in order meet the area’s ambitions for a sustainable transport network and to support the achievement of local and national goals with regards to carbon emissions and air quality.

#### **Cambridge South East Transport (CSET)**

There is an interface between the CSET and East West Rail (EWR) projects within the area identified in the consultation materials as Section F: The Shelfords to Cambridge station. Improvements to the existing railway and Cambridge station are proposed by EWR within this area. This section of our response focuses on Section F and the interface between the projects within this area.

The GCP welcomes the recognition within the consultation documents (Technical Report, para 11.7.8) that the CSET scheme is planning to build a section of a new off-road public transport and active travel route in the same area, with a part of that route proposed to run close to the existing West Anglia Main Line. We appreciate that coordination meetings have been taking place and the commitment made in the consultation documents that these will continue going forward so that integration risks can be minimised, and opportunities maximised.

#### **Shepreth Branch Junction**

Two options are proposed for Shepreth Branch Junction, both of which require removal of the existing junction and building two new tracks next to the existing tracks. We note (Technical Report, para 11.6.7) that further design is required to understand the design of the grade-separating structure that would be needed for one of these options, identify the relevant land boundaries, and confirm the most appropriate solution.

In advance of this design being progressed by EWR, CSET has sought to mitigate the integration risk in this location by developing an assumption regarding the land required to construct a grade separated junction at Shepreth Junction and developing the current design for the CSET scheme to avoid this land. However, there is now an opportunity for EWR to act to further mitigate this risk

by identifying the land boundaries required for the construction and permanent operation each option in advance of the CSET route alignment being fixed under a Transport and Works Act Order. GCP ask that EWR act to realise this opportunity in programming and expediting the further design work required for Shepreth Junction.

#### *The existing railway from Shepreth Junction to Addenbrooke's Road bridge*

It is proposed to increase this area of railway to four tracks, with Addenbrooke's Road bridge being the point where the two new EWR tracks will join the new four tracks that the Cambridge South station project will have already built.

We note (Technical Report, para 11.7.4) that further design is required in the next stage to determine the location of the two new tracks and how they tie in with the Cambridge South four tracking, with this design to be developed closely with Network Rail.

GCP ask EWR to take full account of the following matters at the next stage of design:

- Potential impacts on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and Hobson's Brook including cumulative impacts of the CSET, Cambridge South Station and EWR schemes.
- The current design for the CSET off-road public transport and active travel route within the same area, particularly the part of that route proposed to run close to the existing West Anglia Main Line and crossing Hobson's Brook.
- Actively contributing to planning an integrated solution to maintain the Addenbrooke's to Great Shelford "DNA Path" cycleway link during and following construction of Cambridge South Station, CSET and EWR, with the aim of avoiding multiple realignments of this link involving abortive works and minimising disruption.

GCP would be unlikely to support any proposal by EWR that would require the CSET public transport route to be moved to run closer to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve.

In advance of the design for the two new tracks between Shepreth Junction and Addenbrooke's Road bridge being progressed by EWR, CSET has sought to mitigate the integration risk in this area by developing an assumption regarding the land required to construct the new tracks and developing the current design for the CSET scheme to avoid this land. However, there is now an opportunity for EWR to act to further mitigate this risk by identifying the land boundaries required for the construction and permanent operation of the new tracks in advance of the CSET route alignment being fixed under a Transport and Works Act Order. GCP ask that EWR act to realise this opportunity in programming and expediting the further design work required for the existing railway from Shepreth Junction to Addenbrooke's Road bridge.

With the construction of the two new tracks between Shepreth Junction and Addenbrooke's Road bridge likely to follow the opening of the CSET scheme, there is a risk of disruption to the operation of services using the CSET public transport route. This risk should be fully considered during design and construction planning, with all possible measures taken to avoid or minimise this.

#### **Cambourne to Cambridge (C2C)**

The Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and East West Rail have been recognised as complementary to one another, with C2C serving intermediate developments, including the West Cambridge site, which the strategic railway is unable to serve. A new station at Cambourne could

be used to create a multimodal interchange location which could support an increase in use of public transport. The C2C scheme is likely to be completed before EWR, enabling growth in the current South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

Two options are proposed for the station location at Cambourne, either of which could be served by C2C. The GCP is committed to the development of a travel hub at the Cambourne station linking together the two schemes to help people to access rail and bus services, including by active travel modes.

The GCP asks that appropriate coordination meetings continue as the proposals for EWR and C2C progress. As part of this, the GCP asks that EWR works with local partners to provide certainty on project timescales, routing and station locations at the earliest opportunity so that these can be taken into account in scheme design and delivery.

The C2C scheme will provide the high quality public transport link required to enable the development of 3,500 homes at Bourn Airfield. The response from South Cambridgeshire District Council seeks further information on what assessment has been made of the implications of route alignments 1 and 9 on the Bourn Airfield development, with particular regard to site access and delivery.

### **Cambridge Eastern Access (CEA)**

The consultation reiterates EWR's ambition to provide improved onward connectivity east from Cambridge towards Ipswich. The CEA project is looking at access to and from the city from the east to enable people to get around more easily by public transport, cycle or on foot. The dualling of the Cambridge to Newmarket Line, alongside the provision of at least one interim station, would support the achievement of the project's objectives.