

Our ref: 20260609.EWR.CON
Date: 09 June 2026
Contact: Nav Panesar/Jack Eagle
Email: NSIPs@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Lee Harris, Executive Director
Place and Sustainability
Environment, Planning and Economy

Sent via email to: consultation@eastwestrail.co.uk

Consents Team
PO Box 761
ALC2660
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE29 9QR

Dear East West Rail Company Limited,

**East West Rail - Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements Development
Consent Order Route-wide Consultation**

1. I am writing on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council (the Council) in response to the route-wide consultation led by East West Rail Company Limited (**EW**R) for the proposed East West Rail - Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements Development Consent Order (the **DCO**), which commenced on 14 April 2026 and closes on 09 June 2026.
2. Attached to this letter is a table containing the Council's views on the current proposals, as set out in the consultation materials published by EWR on 14 April 2026, across a number of technical specialisms. The Council welcomes the opportunity for continued engagement and dialogue with EWR after this consultation and reserves the right to comment further in the coming months as the proposals develop and more detail becomes available.
3. Whilst the Council is, in principle, supportive of the principle and objectives of the East West Rail scheme, there remain matters where we consider that further work and changes to the proposals are required:
 - A lack of detail - at this stage details of the DCO are still emerging and there is not enough technical information available for officers to make informed recommendations. On 18 March 2026 the Council requested sight of a number of documents, listed in paragraph 4 below, to enable the Council to continue to meaningfully input into the consenting process and evaluate the potential impacts of the DCO on our assets, communities, and various statutory functions. These documents have not yet been received. Please note, at the Council's [Highways and Transport Committee on 23rd July 2024](#), a holding objection to the scheme was established and will be maintained until sufficient information is shared with the Council.
 - Impact on residents - the Council needs to ensure that the DCO comes forward in a manner which ensures that benefits are maximised and negative impacts for residents are minimised. The Council's detailed representations on this point are

set out in the attached table. The Council requires sight of the documents referred to in paragraph 4 below to provide further input on this point and intends to make further representations in due course.

- Protection - the Council will require protective provisions in respect of its duties as Local Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority. It will also require protective provisions to protect its assets and to manage the interface between the DCO and the proposed Cambridge South East Transport and Cambourne to Cambridge Transport and Works Act Orders.

4. The Council requests sight of the following key documents as a minimum as soon as possible, to enable the Council to review, shape, and input into these:

- Draft Statement of Common Ground, which is understood to be progressing shortly between the respective teams as the issues log evolves.
- Draft Development Consent Order.
- Environmental Impact Assessment.
- General Arrangements / highway plans, Traffic Regulation Order proposals and Work Plans.
- Public Rights of Way Crossings statement and related plans.
- Level crossing closures and proposed diversions - noting that officers are in discussion regarding some of these.
- Detailed forward programme to support us in managing staff resources. We would also welcome this information being shared publicly to support meaningful community and wider stakeholder engagement with the scheme.
- The consenting route and timescale for Tempsford East Coast Mainline Station, which we understand will be delivered ahead of EWR.

The Council also welcomes the opportunity to engage with EWR on wider community benefits for Cambridgeshire residents and would like to make it clear that the Council expects a full package of community benefits from EWR in and across Cambridgeshire. This is discussed further in the attached table.

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

Yours sincerely

Lee Harris

Executive Director

East West Rail - Bedford to Cambridge and Western improvements: Comments on EWR's Consultation

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

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

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
1.0	Air Quality		The Council would expect EWR to consult Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on air quality impacts in relation to any infrastructure that falls within the respective District Councils' boundaries. The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future engagement, in particular as it relates to public health.
2.0	Communities, Skills, Employment, Socio-economics		Employment and Skills The Council requests sight of an Employment and Skills Strategy, detailing how EWR will prioritise sourcing their construction workforce and materials from the local Cambridgeshire area. The Council would expect EWR to consult with Cambridgeshire Skills regarding the forecast of need/training for employment on the project. As part of their Employment and Skills Strategy, the Council would also expect EWR to engage with local colleges and adult learning centres in relation to preparation for employment and opportunities such as

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			internships, apprenticeships, and work experience. The Council would welcome the use of Cambridgeshire businesses during the construction of the railway. Moreover, once the railway is operational the Council would encourage local recruitment for operational roles. Indeed, 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 operation of the railway. The Council would also recommend EWR link into local schools and colleges to interest young people in careers connected to this DCO and provide work experience and internship opportunities. This was undertaken on the National Highways' schemes for the A14 and A428, and lessons could be learnt from this approach. The Council would like EWR to confirm whether any discussions with organisations such as the Department for Work and Pensions, Work Well or the Probation Service have taken place to foster a route back to employment for people across the route. The Council also asks that EWR confirm whether they are working with the Changing Futures programme to improve outcomes for adults experiencing multiple disadvantages and employment.
2.1	Communities, Skills, Employment, Socio-economics		Community Benefit The council would like to see a community benefit or legacy fund to provide some mitigation for the disruption and loss of land for those local communities affected. The fund could support existing local groups and create opportunities for community-led action including new services and facilities. We would welcome further engagement with EWR to discuss the appropriate governance arrangements and how best to secure this for the communities including: the scope of the fund (type of projects that may be funded and their geographical location/catchment area)

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			• eligibility criteria for applicants • governance in terms of managing and administering the scheme to support the communities most affected by the DCO. 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 by the scheme continue to have focus on their local area and the legacy impacts of EWR following construction and into operation, to support a positive relationship with the scheme. The Council would like confirmation that additional funding will be made available for local communities affected by the DCO, this could include cycle training schemes with schools, and travel buddy schemes for older adults. Additionally, the Council would be interested in discussing whether station space at the proposed Cambourne Station, Cambridge Central Station and proposed Cambridge East Station could be used as community hubs. The Council would like confirmation on how EWR intend to measure social value impact, for example themes, outcomes and measures (TOMS).
3.0	Noise and Vibration		The Council expects EWR to consult Huntingdonshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council on these matters with regard to any infrastructure that falls within their boundary. Notwithstanding the above, the Council has concerns related to Noise and Vibration 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 and places where the proposals interface with highway infrastructure.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
4.0	Climate and Carbon		From the consultation documentation, it would appear that EWR has not responded to the Council's previous comments in relation to climate, carbon and climate resilience have. The Council would welcome clarity on these specific issues previously raised. The Council would request that the detail of the Whole Life Carbon Assessment and Carbon Management Plan, as detailed within the Consultation Brochure, Chapter 9, page 61, be completed as a priority to prevent any delays in reviewing the design at a later stage It remains disappointing that despite the Scheme's environmental strategy listing "Climate Risk" as a key pillar, there remains little to no detail specifically in relation to climate risk or development of a Climate Change Risk Assessment for this proposal. The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation, and notes that climate related matters are yet to be discussed in such forums.
5.0	Health		The council is aware that the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service are engaged in discussions with EWR around the proposed Cambridge East Station location in the Cherry Hinton area and especially any risks to public health by developing infrastructure on a site known to be on contaminated land. The Council would like EWR to confirm if the Integrated Neighbourhood teams (local, multi-disciplinary collaboratives that bring together health, social care, and voluntary sector professionals to provide joined-up, preventative care) have been consulted – it is important that they are consulted as new boundaries have just been set with the future focus being on local health hubs. In addition to Air Quality, Community, Equalities, noise and vibration, socioeconomics and traffic and transport, the Council's Public Health team are pleased to see that human

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			health has now been included and listed within Table 9 of the Assessment Factor 14 judgements within the Cambridge East Train Care Centre document and that some assessment has taken place as to the impacts and opportunities relating to local and regional environment and socio-economic conditions. It's pleasing to see that human health and wellbeing also factors in the other consultation documents, for example EWR Consultation Brochure 2026. Importantly, this document discusses green infrastructure and its role in providing community wellbeing and alternative routes for walking and cycling. It also discusses how the proposal and potential impacts (for example noise, air quality, visual impacts, socioeconomics etc) could have an effect on settlements and health of the local communities. The health and safety of railway workers is also considered which is supported. It will be important to maintain connectivity for active travel through to delivery of the scheme and that the proposed station is accessible for all users including cyclists and pedestrians. The impact on human health and wellbeing (particularly for residents in the communities affected) should be considered at all stages and phases including the impacts of construction, emissions, noise and vibration.
6.0	Biodiversity	Brochure	The proposed changes to the scheme, such as the realignment of the scheme to reduce impact on County Wildlife Sites and use of a mined tunnel at A428 Bourn Airfield, have lessened some impacts to biodiversity. However, the Council is disappointed that the scheme, still has the potential to result in significant negative impacts to biodiversity in Cambridgeshire, as set out in our previous consultation response on 24 January 2025. The scheme should be refined further to align with the species, habitats and site-specific actions set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), which was published by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority on 23 December 2025. These include actions to create strategic wildlife

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			crossings over major infrastructure (Section U3A), wildlife corridors / pollinator routes along railway corridors (U4A), restore and enhance habitats within and around County Wildlife Sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (Section M1C), and bespoke actions for LNRS species including Crested Cow-wheat (found within EWR route). The Council reiterates its position that biodiversity net gain must be delivered within Cambridgeshire, which is proportionate to the scale of impact in our county. Given the scheme is of national importance, delivery of BNG should be of a similar strategic scale and help substantially contribute to the delivery of the LNRS. Given the ongoing issues with substantial failures of tree / scrub / hedgerow planting along the A14 Huntingdon to Cambridge improvement scheme, the Council seeks robust design that will ensure effective delivery of the landscape scheme; as well as robust measures within the DCO to ensure any remedial works will be completed in a timely manner, to ensure the delivery of all ecological compensation / mitigation and biodiversity net gain commitments. The Council remains concerned that the design has not adequately considered the cumulative impact of this scheme and other schemes (e.g. new A428) or future projects (e.g. Cambourne North). Cambridgeshire's intensive agriculture and growth / development have resulted in a very fragmented landscape with very few effective wildlife corridors running north / south. Any further degradation of these fragile corridors could have a significant impact on the ability of the county's species to move, impacting both their territories and ability to adapt to climate change. It will be important that effective wildlife corridors are incorporated into the design, including substantial green bridges / other structures at targeted locations, and ensure they effectively link into the wider landscape. At this stage, the Council is not aware of the location of key foraging / commuting routes for barbastelle bats of Eversden and Wimple Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			identified as part of the DCO because we have not seen any bat survey results. It should be recognised that barbastelle will often use the wider landscape to return to their roost sites. We therefore recommend that it be assumed for barbastelle bats to be present across the entire Impact Risk Zone and use all wildlife corridors identified across the proposed development. It will be important for all structures to be designed to accommodate bats – they should meet Natural England’s standards for bat crossings; help deliver Greater Cambridge Shared Planning’s Cambourne North Spatial Framework (currently being updated); All green bridges should also meet the standard set out in Natural England’s bat protocol for Wimpole and Eversden Woods SAC, which requires 50-60m wide wildlife corridors (currently, a maximum of 30m wide habitat is being proposed). The design of ecological mitigation should be discussed further with the Council and Natural England.
6.1	Biodiversity	Brochure	Chapter 16. Roxton to east of St Neots (Route Section 5) It is still unclear how the scheme will interact with and impact the ecological mitigation / compensation provided for the A428. It will be important that cumulative effects are adequately considered and avoided wherever possible, particularly adverse impacts to key wildlife corridors across the landscape and the bat mitigation ‘tunnel’ linking to St John’s Wood. <u>River Great Ouse</u> It is unclear how the design of the viaduct has been designed to minimise impact on the River Great Ouse, particularly given the section within Cambridgeshire (downstream of the viaduct) is designated a County Wildlife Site.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
6.2	Biodiversity	Brochure	Chapter 17. Croxton to Toft (Route Section 6) It is still unclear how the scheme will interact with and impact the ecological mitigation / compensation provided for the A428. It will be important that cumulative effects are adequately considered and avoided wherever possible, particularly adverse impacts to key wildlife corridors across the landscape, including Hen Brook and Winteringham Brook. The scheme should be modified to help deliver the Cambourne North Spatial Framework (currently being updated by Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service). An important aspect will be to secure strategic wildlife crossing points around Cambourne. <u>Hen Brook</u> We welcome the commitment to enhance Hen Brook and request that further discussions are held with the Council and District Council's, as to how this will be delivered and its integration with the new A428 scheme. <u>West Brook</u> The Council is concerned that the latest proposal to lower the railway by 6m over the West Brook would effectively sever the wildlife corridor along West Brook. This is particularly disappointing given that the West Brook was identified as one of only a few crossing points across the new A428. Adequate assessment must be completed to consider the cumulative impact of the A428 and EWR scheme on this wildlife corridor and whether it is possible to retain an effective wildlife corridor across the landscape. If the new bridge is to be a key wildlife corridor across the landscape, then it should be substantial and meet Natural England's specifications for wildlife corridors for barbastelle bat protocol for Eversden and Wimpole Woods which requires a wildlife corridor of 50-60m (unless it has been disproved this is route is not utilised by barbastelles). The scheme should be

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			expanded to ensure this wildlife corridor adequately links into the wider landscape and Eversden and Wimpole Woods. <u>Knapwell Wood Road bridge</u> The Council welcomes the inclusion of a bridge designed for wildlife as part of Knapwell Wood Road realignment. However, for the green bridge to be effective, a safe crossing point is also required over the A428 and we suggest this is delivered as part of the EWR scheme. This would also help deliver the LNRS action U4A for a strategic wildlife corridor over the A428 (see LNRS Local Habitat Map). All bridges to be created for barbastelle bats should follow the design specification of Natural England's bat protocol for Eversden and Wimple Woods, which requires wildlife corridors of 50-60m. The Protected Road Verge/County Wildlife Site located on the existing Knapwell Wood Road supports LNRS species – Crested Cow-wheat. This population is under threat because of suboptimal management and encroachment of scrub. If this road is to be stopped up, the Council, as local highway authority, will no longer be able to manage the verge, which is likely to result in further decline and loss of this species and the CWS. It is important that future management is secured as part of the DCO. In the first instance, this needs to be discussed in detail with the Council (including whether additional funds are required). <u>Cambourne Station</u> The proposed location of Cambourne station is concerning and there appears to have been little consideration of how this will influence on the design of future development (Cambourne North) and the subsequent consequence on long-term impact on barbastelle

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			bats and ancient woodlands. Greater consideration must be given to preserving barbastelle foraging / commuting routes, with the station relocated to a less sensitive location to enable dark corridors to be delivered (e.g. moved further west to enable development to focus on areas that will already be affected by development / are less suitable for wildlife). The Council seeks further discussions on this matter and requests that the findings of detailed bat survey work are published and provided to the Council for consideration. As mentioned above, it will be important that the station, railway track, passing loops and other infrastructure considers the work on the North Cambourne Spatial Framework work (which is being developed by Greater Cambridge Shared Planning), which is seeking to conserve key barbastelle foraging / commuting routes and ancient woodlands within this area. <u>A428 Bourn Airfield Tunnel</u> The Council welcomes the decision to mine the proposed tunnel under Bourn Airfield (rather than using the cut-and-cover method) and changes to the east and west entrances, which will help reduce some biodiversity impacts highlighted in our previous consultation responses. <u>Hardwick and Toft</u> It will be important that the proposed structures to mitigate impacts on biodiversity are designed to provide an effective wildlife corridor, including Harcamlow Way / Wimpole Way diversion bridge, green bridge at Bourn Brook and Hardwick Road road bridge. These structures must meet Natural England's standards for bat crossings, and help deliver their bat protocol for Wimpole and Eversden Woods SAC (requiring 50-60m wide wildlife corridors).

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			<u>Frogs Hall Drift County Wildlife Site (CWS)</u> The Council welcomes the changes to the scheme, which will ensure the majority of the Frogs Hall Drift CWS falls outside of the proposed scheme boundary. However, we are concerned there will be partial loss to the CWS as a result of temporary EWR service road and that reinstatement to high quality chalk grassland may not be achievable. <u>Westfield Farm County Wildlife Site</u> The Council welcomes the changes to the scheme, which will ensure the majority of the Westfield Farm CWS falls outside of the proposed scheme boundary. However, we are concerned there will be partial loss to the south-west section of CWS as a result of the proposed route alignment and severance of this section of the field (making future management difficult). We request that the DCO Order limits are adjusted to avoid any impact to this CWS. If this is not possible, adequate compensation for loss of notable arable flora habitat should be secured within close proximity to the loss. We recommend Plantlife is consulted as to how arable flora reserves can be created and local expert knowledge is utilised to identify a suitable site. For example, Lower Valley Farm (BNG habitat bank owned by Cambridgeshire County Council) is known to support arable flora of county-national importance. Currently, the BNG site is focused on delivering chalk grassland and areas of hedgerow / scrub. This may provide an opportunity to establish an arable plant reserve within the phase 2 of the scheme, which has yet to be designed.
6.3	Biodiversity	Brochure	Chapter 18. Comberton to Shelford (Route Section 7) We welcome the inclusion of landscaping as part of the bridge over the B1046, however, this should be widened to ensure a 50-60m wide wildlife corridor is being delivered (to help support the National England bat protocol for Wimpole and Eversden Woods SAC). We note that the bridge will include a shared user path. It will be important that no lighting is

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			provided. If EWR is considering the use of solar studs, this should be discussed with the Councils and Natural England to ensure adequate bat mitigation is being proposed (e.g. using bat hats to reduce uplighting). <u>Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory</u> Please note that the Lords Bridge Observatory County Wildlife Site was resurveyed by the Wildlife Trust in 2025 and as a result, the boundary has changed. It will be important for this information to be captured in the ecological impact assessment. <u>Shelford Junction</u> It will be important that the design links up well with Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) / the Council's improvements to active travel and/or road network in this area, including the improved connection of 'Jenny's Path to the DNA cycleway and Cambridge South Station'. Impact of lighting on barbastelles is a key consideration in this area and should be avoided – with cumulative impacts of lighting of the DNA pathway and guided busway being factored in. The Council notes the opportunity to link to open spaces, including Ninewells Local Nature Reserve (LNR) (via new footbridge). Many of the nature reserves in Cambridgeshire already experience adverse impacts from significant visitor pressure, which will be exacerbated by further growth (e.g. biomedical campus) and housing development within this area. It will be important to discuss the implications of attracting more visitors to Ninewells LNR with the City Council, as well as completing a recreational pressure assessment, as part of the ecological impact assessment. This may require mitigation measures, such as provision of alternative greenspace and/or support better management of Ninewells LNR.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			<u>Barrington Quarry</u> It will be important to ascertain the impact of the proposed usage of Barrington Quarry during the construction phase (conveyor system for removal of soil and waste) on the Site of Special Scientific Interest, as well as the species-rich habitats that have established as a result of the restoration of the quarry site.
6.4	Biodiversity	Brochure	Chapter 19. Cambridge (Route Section 8) <u>Newmarket Line east of Cambridge</u> The Council is concerned about the adverse impact of the proposed scheme on Coldham's Common Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site and (recently designated) Local Geological Site and the species it supports (e.g. water vole). Additional consideration must also be given to the impact on foraging / commuting routes for bats (including barbastelles) and the historic toad migration route to / from Barnwell Pit City Wildlife Site during construction works. <u>North of Cambridge Station</u> Please note, that new Local Site(s) have recently been selected in the local area. The proposed scheme will need to consider cumulative impact on any notable species / ecological mitigation associate with Cambridge North station. The impact of increased usage of Cambridge North station on nearby Local Nature Reserves / Local Sites will need to be considered (particularly during the construction phase).

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
7.0	Archaeology and Historic Environment		The Council has engaged with EWR from an early stage with regards to the scope and nature of archaeological surveys needed to inform any DCO application, and we welcome that engagement. The surveys being undertaken now and in the future are broadly appropriate in scale, if carried out as proposed. There are, however, discrete areas within the draft Order limits where trenches are not proposed – we hope this will be rectified or explained in our ongoing discussions regarding the trial trenching scope. Equally, there are a number of areas of high archaeological significance that are currently proposed for Phase 2 trial trenching that in the Council's view should be evaluated as soon as possible, and brought into Phase 1, as information about them needs to be available as early as possible to inform the Environmental Statement chapter and potentially approaches to mitigation. We will provide details to the applicant in our ongoing engagement re. evaluation scope.
7.1	Archaeology and Historic Environment	Our Approach to the Historic Environment	The Council notes that EWR resolves to avoid or reduce impact on the historic environment, and are, where not practicable, “developing an approach to ensure the affected elements of the historical environments are appropriately recorded”. We would query what EWR means by ‘affected elements’. While we support the resolution to reduce impact whenever possible, any mitigation by record should be appropriate in scope and nature – for particularly significant monuments heavily impacted by the scheme it should focus on mitigating any loss of significance caused to that monument as a whole entity appropriately. This may in particular cases require mitigation by record outside specific areas of physical impact, when to do so is required to mitigate loss of significance to the monument. The Council welcomes the undertaking to share knowledge of the archaeological work with local communities.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
7.2	Archaeology and Historic Environment	Consultation brochure	On page 59 of the Consultation Brochure a 'large Romano-British settlement' near Cambourne is used as an example of archaeological remains avoided by the scheme. This is misleading. The document refers to a complex and significant Iron Age and/or Romano-British settlement that on current proposals the proposed development will heavily impact circa half of, with the remaining portion recently removed entirely from the draft order limits. This monument, a non-designated heritage asset which may currently be of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument (and if so subject to the policies for designated heritage assets as per National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 213(b) footnote 75), would survive in a much-diminished state under these proposals, while only part of it would be archaeologically recorded. The Council has considerable issues with this approach, which is among the worst possible outcomes for the asset.
7.3	Archaeology and Historic Environment	Plans and Profiles RS5 to RS8	Thank you for the updated details on scheme design. The Council notes that there are large areas within the draft Order limits where no work is currently proposed. It would be helpful for judging the appropriateness of archaeological evaluation and mitigation to know what works are proposed for these areas.
8.0	Landscape and Visual		The Council would expect EWR to consult Huntingdonshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council on this matter regarding any infrastructure that falls within their boundary. Notwithstanding the above, the Council has concerns relating 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 engagement, in particular where it relates to users of public rights of way.
9.0	Land Use, Quality, Soils and Agriculture		The Council would expect EWR to consult Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on this matter regarding any infrastructure that falls within the respective District Councils' boundaries.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future engagement.
10.0	Minerals and Waste		The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) is engaging with EWR through ongoing discussion. Topics of discussion include sterilisation of safeguarded minerals resources, impacts of the development on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, impact of development in terms of resource (minerals) requirements, and waste generation and management. EWR are reminded of the importance of due diligence being undertaken to ensure that minerals are being sourced from, and waste is being managed, at sites with the appropriate planning permissions, and to be aware that there may be specific restrictions on certain sites that will affect their availability.
11.0	Water Resources and Flooding		The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is engaging with EWR as part of the ongoing technical working groups and future consultation process. At this stage the detailed drainage design has not yet been produced, the LLFA would encourage this to be completed as a priority to prevent any delays in reviewing the design at a later stage. Additionally, the numbers and frequency of Ordinary Watercourse Consents applied for at any given time should be agreed with the LLFA to prevent a backlog. The Council will require protective provisions for the benefit of the LLFA to be included in the draft Development Consent Order. Protective provisions in favour of the Council as the LLFA are included in the recent East Park Energy DCO. Cambridgeshire is an area of water scarcity. Therefore, we expect that buildings are designed to minimise water use during their operation including water preservation and reuse. The use of water during construction also requires careful consideration. The Council refers EWR to the government statement on water scarcity in Greater Cambridge.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
12.0	Traffic and Transport		The Council is engaged with EWR to identify traffic and transport impacts of the proposals, during both the construction and operation phases, and to agree appropriate mitigation measures. Key priorities for the Council include the minimisation of any severance and active travel and public transport connectivity to Cambourne Station, Cambridge Station eastern access, and Cambridge East Station. The council suggests using a transport mode hierarchy to help inform station design and access arrangements. Please see Figure 9 Road User Hierarchy in the Council's Active Travel Strategy: Cambridgeshire's Active Travel Strategy Adopted March 2023. Productive dialogue is ongoing regarding permanent highway diversions needed to facilitate the new railway line, noting permanent highway designs are still evolving. The Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.
13.0	Public Rights of Way (PROW)	PROW temporary diversions	A number of the proposed Public Rights of Way (PROW) diversions are unsatisfactory to the Council, since several of the proposed temporary diversions have the following issues: • PROW closures with no alternative routes provided • PROW closures where the only alternative routes for non-motorised users to connect between communities are along 60mph roads with no footways. PROW users must not be put at additional risk as a result of PROW closures. • PROW diversions which are unrealistically long for non-motorised users. PROW diversions should be substantially as convenient to the public as the original route. • It is also not clear how long the 'temporary closure' for each location is likely to be. We need to understand the proposed scheduling of each closure in order to understand the potential cumulative impacts of multiple closures. These issues must be resolved. Specific location concerns have been provided separately. Phasing of closures should be planned so that PROWs within an area are closed and opened sequentially to mitigate the impacts of the closures.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
13.1	Public Rights of Way (PROW)	Permanent PROW alterations – Limits of deviation	The Council's experience with other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) has been that PROWs created or diverted under DCOs have sometimes been constructed on alignments different to those set out in the DCO's Public Rights of Way and Access Plans. This invalidates the legal extinguishment, creation, or diversion of those routes because the conditions required to effect the extinguishment, creation, or diversion are never met. To resolve this, new legal orders are then required, separate to the DCO process, which adds time and cost to the applicant with the risk of public objections, preventing the additional legal orders being successful. The Council requests that the DCO is drafted with a Limits of Deviation clause for PROW, and those limits are marked on the appropriate plans. This approach has been used on other DCOs which the Council would be happy to advise.
13.2	Public Rights of Way (PROW)	Permanent PROW alterations - Specifications	New PROW must be designed in accordance with the Council's PROW specifications regarding width, gradients, surfacing, and other items. PROW Specifications have been provided to EWR. If exceptions to the PROW specifications are proposed, then these need to be approved by the Local Highway Authority. The designs must consider users with visual, mobility or other impairments, avoiding steps and gradients steeper than 5%.
13.3	Public Rights of Way (PROW)	Permanent PROW alterations – Flood risk	Several of the proposed diverted PROWs are shown abutting or crossing proposed wetland areas. These paths must be elevated suitably to ensure that they are at no greater risk of flooding than at present. These paths are: • St Neots FP55 (Hen Brook) • St Neots FP52 (Wintringham Brook) • Hardwick Bridleway 5 Additionally, Hardwick Bridleway 3 is shown as not being diverted but is also shown passing through a proposed wetland area. This path also should be at no greater risk of flooding than at present.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
13.4	Public Rights of Way (PROW)	PROW enhancements	The addition of a lineside bridleway between Harston and Great Shelford is welcomed, however we seek the following additional improvements, to improve connectivity and mitigate for the effects of the DCO on PROW users: • A lineside route for non-motorised users between the Wintringham Park development and the proposed Tempsford station. Wintringham Park is creating several thousand homes within 5km of the new station. This is a missed opportunity given the extent of the EWR draft order limits in the area. • Jenny's path is currently used by a wider range of users than pedestrians. This route should be no less restrictive in status than at present. • A path alongside the carriageway from the Toseland Road bridge to Toseland FP7 (237/7) • A footpath link from Haslingfield FP15 (117/5) to Haslingfield FP9 (117/9) and/or a link to Barrington FP4 (18/4) enabling greater PROW connectivity in the area and providing users of a FP117/5 a safe off-carriageway route to Haslingfield.
14.0	Emergency Planning		Liaison regarding the DCO should be developed with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF). This will help to ensure that implications arising from the DCO, 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 DCO has impacts upon existing CPLRF Response Plans and how these might be resolved.
15.0	Transport Modelling	Page 67 consultation brochure	The modelling used in the assessment of the scheme has yet to be fully shared so it is not possible to confirm if the mitigation proposed is adequate, in addition mitigation only refers to highway mitigation. Reference is made to potential increase in congestion and delay around stations and there is also mention of station access facilities facilitating interchange to EWR from other

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			modes, but there is nothing about providing access by Public Transport to the stations, just highway improvements. The Council requests more information on this.
16.0	Transport Strategy	Pages 20 and 21 consultation brochure Train Services	The Council welcomes the clarification provided in relation to train services. We need to understand further how growth in the area has been considered, such as Universal Studios, Tempsford New Town, Cambourne, the proposed Development Corporation plans in Greater Cambridgeshire, and associated growth. It would be useful to understand the maximum capacity the proposed infrastructure could deliver. Additionally, the Council would welcome information and discussion regarding how EWR intend to future-proof the line to support further growth in Cambridgeshire. Page 21 – The Council particularly welcome the potential for a service extended beyond the EWR route and would be very supportive of EWR services extending further north and east of Cambridge. The Council would like to see the benefits of EWR maximised so that extensions beyond the current EWR scheme can be realised as soon as possible.
16.1	Transport Strategy	Page 76 Consultation brochure Electrification of the railway Page 21 Consultation brochure freight services	The Council welcomes the announcement of discontinuous electrification as a step in the right direction; however, we reiterate that EWR should seek to undertake full electrification of the route as far as possible, and future proof the line and its infrastructure to provide provisions for full electrification of all trains. Whilst we welcome that the design has considered the potential for electrification at a future date it should be noted that this will create disruption to services in the future and is likely to cost a lot more than if electrification were provided at the same time as constructing the scheme in this location. The council has concerns that the tunnelled section of the route might prevent future full electrification and seeks reassurance that this has been considered, and require that passive provision for future electrification is included for all structures, including tunnels, that EWR constructs.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			EWB must ensure that any materials sourced for the batteries of hybrid and electric trains must not be sourced through forced labour or slavery. The Council have concerns regarding the powering of freight trains given the carbon implications alongside noise and air quality impacts. This is particularly relevant to the section of the line between Tempsford Station and Hauxton Junction. The Council requests more information regarding the powering of freight trains along the route. We believe that due to the discontinuous electrification, freight would have to be diesel powered. It would be useful to understand the potential timings of the two freight trains a day in each direction east of Bedford. It would also be useful to know what, if any, additional capacity there is for freight services.
16.2	Transport Strategy	Page 19 consultation brochure - Phased delivery	The Council welcomes the phased delivery of the scheme and request greater clarity on the programme. We agree with the approach to delivery as early as possible to realise the benefits of EWB. We would like to understand how the delivery programme integrates with the Greater Cambridge Local Plan delivery work to ensure that the EWB is fully operational before developments in locations such as Cambourne and Tempsford are occupied.
16.3	Transport Strategy	Page 36 Consultation brochure- Design approach document	The Council wishes to see the Design Approach Document as soon as possible. We are interested in how the DCO has been designed to take account of the long-term operation of the railway, ensuring that future demand is catered for, how climate risk and resilience is managed, and ensuring the best possible approach to station accessibility is brought forward.
16.4	Transport Strategy	Page 45 Consultation brochure door to door connectivity	The Council welcomes the approach of supporting access to stations by walking, wheeling, and cycling, as well as by bus and other forms of transport. We look forward to reviewing the detail as it comes forward. EWB must ensure that the best quality routes are put in place for active travel modes to access stations.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			Modern stations with easy interchange between modes and secure cycle parking is key and the Council is pleased to see this highlighted.
16.5	Transport Strategy	Construction impacts	The Council remains concerned about construction 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. To reduce the construction impacts, the Council would expect EWR to develop a hierarchy of construction traffic - for example rail, off-road HGV utilising the track alignment, HGV on the strategic route network, HGV on the local road network, avoiding congested roads and peak period. The Council wishes to see as much construction material as possible brought in by rail.
16.6	Transport Strategy	Community Benefit Fund	As mentioned above the Council would expect a Community Benefit Fund to be developed that benefits the communities that are impacted by construction and operation. National Highways, for example, have a payment per mile system for schemes. The Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with EWR.
16.7	Transport Strategy	Harston/Newton area	The Council remains concerned about the impact of level crossing closures on local and school bus service provision, local connectivity, community severance and access to local schools in the Harston, Newton and Hauxton area. The Council welcomes the proposal to reduce the height of the Shepreth Branch Line when it crosses the EWR route at Station Rd, Harston.
16.8	Transport Strategy	Roxton to east of St Neots	Connectivity to new Tempsford station - The Council notes the importance of active travel and public transport links to the planned new railway station at Tempsford and is keen to continue discussions with EWR regarding potential routes and services that would connect the new station with communities in Cambridgeshire.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
16.9	Transport Strategy	St Neots passive provision for EWR station	Consideration of the topology and signalling design should be carried out to ensure passive provision of an EWR St Neots station. This is to ensure a future station could be developed at lowest possible costs taking advantage of works that EWR will carry out. Should a station be brought forward in this location, it would serve an area of significant development.
16.10	Transport Strategy	Page 49 Consultation brochure.	The Council needs to understand the demand modelling work in more details so that we can correctly and accurately assess the impacts of EWR and new stations on the local transport network.
16.11	Transport Strategy	Page 65 consultation brochure Page 66	The Council are still working with EWR to confirm the modelling approach. We have had early discussions around construction routes, impacts, and repairs to roads following diversions putting greater pressure on the local road network. The Council would encourage as much movement of construction materials to take place by rail. We also note that Mill Road bridge is proposed as a Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) construction route, which would not be suitable due to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) restricting access. We have yet to see any detailed modelling of movements through stations. It is important that the Council can understand how station design is catering for the expected growth in Cambridgeshire.
16.12	Transport Strategy	Page 69 Works on operational railway	The Council would like evidence that works at weekends are less disruptive to those in the week. There is a large amount of leisure travel at the weekends and sometimes higher passenger numbers on weekends than quieter weekdays.
16.13	Transport Strategy	Code of construction	Drawing on lessons learnt from the delivery of earlier sections of East West Rail, the Council emphasises the need for significantly stronger and more specific requirements

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			within the Development Consent Order to protect local communities and infrastructure. Previous experience has demonstrated that insufficiently defined arrangements for construction traffic, highway condition, and communications can result in unacceptable impacts on local roads and communities, with costs and risks transferred to local authorities. The Council therefore expects full pre-, mid- and post-construction condition surveys, binding commitments to fund all necessary highway repairs, clearly defined and enforceable construction traffic routing strategies, and robust monitoring and reporting mechanisms to ensure compliance throughout the construction period.
16.14	Transport Strategy	Tempsford Station Page 209 consultation brochure	The proposed new town at Tempsford is mentioned here however we do not believe that the demand the new town is likely to create for rail services has been modelled. Tempsford Station needs to have the highest quality Active Travel links to St Neots including the Wintringham Park development. The highest quality active travel links are also required to existing settlements in Cambridgeshire located to the south and east of Tempsford including Gamlingay. If these settlements were connected to Tempsford station active travel would be an active option for access to these stations and would reduce car use. We welcome the acceleration of the East Coast Main Line (ECML) station at Tempsford and would welcome a clearer understanding of the proposed consenting for this facility. Access between the East Coast Main Line and East West Rail station needs to be smooth - there is potential for long walking distances between platforms and consideration is needed for those with reduced mobility. Consideration is also needed between the timetables to ensure there are not long wait times between EWR trains and the ECML.
16.15	Transport Strategy	Page 213	East of St Neots and East Coast Main Line construction logistics hub -The Council is very supportive of the use of rail to transport construction materials. The use of rail to transport construction materials needs to be maximised as above. This will reduce impacts on

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			residents and will have environmental benefits. However, the impacts of the construction and logistics hub on nearby residents will need to be fully and carefully assessed.
16.16	Transport Strategy	Cambridge area – Long Road bridge	Long Road bridge rebuild - The Council notes the proposed closure of the bridge for 6 to 13 weeks for construction of the new bridge and is keen to understand and discuss proposals for the short-term diversions referred to in the consultation document. As stated in the previous consultation response, Long Road forms part of the Cambridge ring road and is a key route for blue light services, employees, patients and visitors accessing the hospitals and wider Cambridge Biomedical Campus as well as providing access to numerous local education establishments. It is therefore important that disruption is limited as far as possible and for a short a time as possible in this location. Disruption during the Long Road bridge closure needs to be kept to the absolute minimum possible given the importance of this route. This includes traffic over Long Road Bridge and the Guided Busway including those using the maintenance track as a key active travel route. The Council requires further information and detail to assess the impacts of the works on the busway and the maintenance track. 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 form part of the Sawston Greenway. It is important that any new overbridge provides at least 4m segregated space for walking and cycling on each side of the road along this section. It is also important that the overbridge does not adversely affect the walking and cycling path that runs along the Busway.
16.17	Transport Strategy	Cambourne station	The Council supports the principle of the provision of a new railway station at Cambourne and notes the change in location, 700 metres west of the previously proposed location. The Council encourages EWR to work closely with the local planning authority regarding the proposed development at Cambourne North to ensure the station is fully integrated into the local area. In addition, discussions regarding the planned station opening date would

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			be welcome with regards to potential phasing for the planned development. The design of the station should also allow for access from the north. The Council notes that an active travel hub 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. It is important that the new station does not promote significant increases in short car journeys in the local area. Civil parking enforcement in South Cambridgeshire will need to be considered to deter bad parking practices from people wishing to avoid paying for parking at the station's car park. Experience, wayfinding, and information for travellers needs to be of the highest quality available to allow people to make simple, easy, and well-informed journeys. The Council 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 public transport and although some active travel links exist or there are proposed new links through the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) programme of works (such as the Greenways projects 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. There is a significant opportunity for EWR to facilitate public transport and active travel network improvements for all of the settlements in the vicinity of the line between the new stations at Cambourne and Cambridge South.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
16.18	Transport Strategy	Cambridge Station Eastern Access Clifton Rd	The Council is pleased to see the inclusion of a new eastern access at Cambridge station in the updated proposals and is keen to continue discussions regarding the details of the new access. Active Travel and Movement Strategy - Active travel will be critical to accessing the area and new station entrance, which should function as a major Active Travel Hub. This must include: - High-quality, secure cycle parking (including provision for cargo and adapted cycles), of a scale proportionate to the increased level of passenger usage forecast at Cambridge Station and informed by levels of utilisation of the existing cycle park. - Space for shared mobility schemes (e.g. bike and e-scooter hire) - Other facilities, such as changing places, should also be included - The new station footbridge proposed could provide for general movement over the railway as well as providing for platform access. The Council would welcome EWR consideration of whether a bridge design with appropriate segregation of rail-side and public access could be achieved. - The new eastern entrance must accommodate: - High-quality active travel access - Taxi provision - Efficient drop-off / pick-up facilities - Public transport provision at the Clifton Road entrance needs careful consideration. Currently, the nearest bus route is on Cherry Hinton Road, so achieving a service that is logical and viable would likely require bus franchising or engagement with bus operators and this would be facilitated via the wider development of the Clifton Road area. The new station entrance needs to ensure that it does not preclude any future integration with bus.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			- EWR proposals for drop-off provision must be: - Convenient and efficient - Designed to prevent informal or ad hoc drop-off activity on surrounding streets - Inclusive of a high-quality taxi drop off and collection zone. Parking and Traffic Management - The DCO submission should include commitments to fund monitoring of rail commuter parking on streets around the Eastern Access to Cambridge Station (extent to be agreed with City / County Councils) and for the funding of the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone or other parking restrictions as appropriate should the need for them be identified through the monitoring. Safeguarded Routes - Previous work by the Great Cambridge Partnership in relation to the Chisholm Trail (GCP) identified opportunities for improved station access. - In particular: - The safeguarded “green route” (via the Rustat Road / Davy Road corridor) provides an existing active travel link between Rustat Road and Clifton Road - This route should be recognised and integrated into future proposals Wayfinding information and infrastructure should also be present to promote active travel. The Council suggests using a transport mode hierarchy to help inform station design and access arrangements. Please see Figure 9 Road User Hierarchy in the Council’s Active Travel Strategy: Cambridgeshire's Active Travel Strategy Adopted March 2023.
16.19	Transport Strategy	Cambridge East station	The Council is pleased to see the inclusion of a new railway station at the planned Cambridge East development. It will be essential to ensure the new station is fully

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			integrated with the new development with high quality active travel links, cycle parking, public transport connections and interchange. Cambridge East Station should be seen as the first step towards delivery of the full Eastern Section of East West Rail. More information on this topic is provided below in the “Wider connectivity east and north of Cambridge” section of this document. As Cambridge East is proposed as a terminus for some EWR services it is essential that this is an enabler rather than a preventor to two trains per hour running from Cambridge to Ipswich. The Council would like reassurance that the proposed two platform station has the track capacity for the terminating EWR services, the two trains per hour Cambridge to Ipswich - with potential extension further west of Cambridge once infrastructure is in place, and the proposed terminating services to and from London Liverpool Street. The Council suggests using a transport mode hierarchy to help inform station design and access arrangements. Please see figure 9 Road user hierarchy in the Council’s Active Travel Strategy: Cambridgeshire's Active Travel Strategy Adopted March 2023 Due to the proposed location of Cambridge East Station, Active Travel routes through the underpass on Coldhams Lane need to be careful considered, ensuring the highest possible quality active travel route is available to the Cambridge East Station. The potential of increasing the underpass width for improving active travel routes including links with the Chisholm trail should be considered. This is also relevant for the Coldhams Lane Road which goes under the railway bridge on Coldhams Lane, which will need improving for Active Travel access to the new station.
16.20	Transport Strategy	Cambridge East train care centre	The Council would like to understand if these proposals have been designed to accommodate ambitions for two or more trains per hour from Cambridge to Newmarket, Bury St Edmunds and Ipswich. Trackwork to access the train care centre could represent a

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			positive opportunity for wider rail benefits which might also take pressure off the A14 and the local road network in the east of Cambridge. The Council would like to understand the impacts of train movements to and from the train care centre on the local transport network at the Cherry Hinton High Street, Yarrow Road and Teversham Road level crossings. The proposed train care centre should not preclude a future Fulbourn Train Station. This includes consideration of the topology and signalling design. This is to ensure a future station could be developed at lowest possible costs taking advantage of works that EWR will carry out. Given the recent introduction of the Fulbourn Train Care Centre to the scheme, the Council requests further and more detailed engagement with affected local communities to discuss their concerns.
16.21	Transport Strategy	Wider connectivity east and north of Cambridge	The proposals to complete Cambridge East Station early are welcome and along with the train care centre should consider how these proposals support the delivery of two trains per hour between Cambridge and Ipswich, as well as the potential for through EWR services later when EWR is operating. There is high demand to link Cambridge to Ipswich along with places west of Bury including Newmarket to Cambridge for employment, education, and leisure. Consideration must be given to how Cambridge East Station and the train care centre could impact on existing rail journey travel time. The Council is of the view that there is a massive opportunity for greater benefits from EWR to be released by construction of the infrastructure required to support two or more trains per hour between Cambridge and Ipswich being undertaken at the same time as EWR. The main benefits include cost efficiencies and reduction of construction disruption.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			The reference to one train per hour running beyond the core to Oxford to Cambridge is very welcome along with the acknowledgement of the wider potential of EWR and the Eastern Section in particular. There is a need to ensure that EWR works allow for future increases in services on other lines. These include two trains per hour from Norwich to Cambridge/Stansted and the Eastern section of EWR to Norwich / Ipswich. There is also the aspiration for more services on the Fen Line and between Peterborough and Cambridge. EWR should facilitate future growth in rail patronage and not constrain it. The Council would welcome more detail on the capacity constraints in the Cambridge North station area. A report produced by prepared on behalf of Transport East East West Rail – East: The Case for Investment in the Eastern Section of the East West Railway, July 2025 https://www.transporteast.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/EWR_Eastern_Section_July25.pdf presents the case for investment in infrastructure that unlocks the great potential of the East of England.
16.22	Transport Strategy	Train services and capacity	More information is requested on train capacity. The Council notes that 5-car trains are mentioned but would like to understand what the capacity is in terms of passenger numbers, and whether longer trains could be accommodated, such as 10-car trains. New stations / platforms and associated signalling and other infrastructure should make passive provision for longer trains in future as a minimum requirement. The Council would strongly support 250-metre platforms from the outset to ensure adequate future capacity.
16.23	Transport Strategy	Coldhams Lane Junction	The Council would like to like to understand the plans for this junction, in particular whether it will have capacity for the EWR eastern section to provide two trains per hour to Ipswich.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			We currently understand that the junction is limited to a line speed of 15mph and that the Laundry Lane level crossing is a constraint on service frequency improvements.
16.24	Transport Strategy	Shepreth Junction	This junction will become an even busier intersection on the rail network and it needs to be ensured that it does not become a constraint to future growth on three key routes, EWR, West Anglia Main Line (WAML) and Kings Lynn- Cambridge- Kings Cross.
16.25	Transport Strategy	Construction Impacts	There construction impacts on local residents and the local transport network are inadequately explained and further information is needed to fully understand these. There is very little focus on the construction impacts to current rail users. Information is required on this. It is vital that the construction impacts on existing rail users are minimised. The Council would welcome innovative thinking regarding how these negative impacts can be reduced.
16.26	Transport Strategy	Construction compounds	Before the impacts of the proposed construction compounds can be fully understood more information is required relating to the hours and length of operation, vehicle movements, and what the compounds are being used for.
16.27	Transport Strategy	Level crossings east of Cambridge. Page 275	The Council would like to be updated on work to assess impacts of the proposals on the level crossings east of Cambridge including the following: • Cherry Hinton High Street level crossing, • Cherry Hinton bypass level crossing, • Teversham automatic level crossing, and • Cox's Drive private pedestrian access.
16.28	Transport Strategy	Level boarding	EWR need to ensure that station design from street to platform to train is fully accessible for all. Empirical research carried out by England's Economic Heartland shows that users with impaired mobility are less likely to use stations that do not have level-boarding

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			between platform and train when compared with stations that provide both ramp provision and level boarding. It is essential that all stations to be served by EWR have level boarding and that a manual ramp is not required.
16.29	Transport Strategy	Wider Economic Benefits	The DCO is much more than a transport/engineering project. It is important that the wider benefits of the connectivity provided by EWR are realised. Further investigation into the wider benefits that EWR could bring should be carried out to ensure that these are maximised. The Council recommends that the following recent report published by the Department for Transport is reviewed to ensure that the greatest number of people can be attracted to rail travel "Understanding the factors that influence people's decision to travel by train - GOV.UK"
16.30	Transport Strategy	Digital connectivity	There is no mention in this consultation document regarding the provision of high capacity fibre alongside the route. This could be used for third party telecommunications such as providing 5G mobile signal for passenger use. This can greatly improve the quality and productivity of rail journeys for passengers. This section of EWR should be specified as being digitally enabled from the outset. The cost of providing this enhanced digital connectivity as a percentage of the scheme's costs is marginal. If it is not included from the outset, it will be difficult to secure future provision. The East West Main Line Partnership state that experience with the Bicester to Bletchley section suggests that enhanced digital connectivity can be delivered at 10% of the cost of retrofitting once the railway is operational. The Council also expects that any new infrastructure such as bridges or similar will include ducts for utilities services including digital connectivity. The advantage of including this from the outset is that it results in much lower costs and less future disruption.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
17.0	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Bourn Airfield page 232	The Council is pleased to see the decision to propose a bored tunnel beneath Bourn Airfield. This would potentially minimise any conflict with the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge busway. The Council would expect the detailed design of the tunnel including any ventilation shafts to be designed to avoid any such conflict, and would welcome discussions on protective provisions for this matter so that engineering proposals can be agreed.
17.1	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) proposals	The Council is aware that the red line boundary required to enable a potential UKPN utility diversion and associated compound to the south of Addenbrooke's Road would overlap with the line of the proposed busway. Previous discussions with EWR and UKPN have been constructive and it is anticipated that agreement between the parties can be achieved which ensures that the CSET scheme is not impeded. At this time, however, no such agreement is in place and failure to achieve such an agreement would be a significant concern. The Council requests discussions on protective provisions for this matter, and encourages EWR to engage with the Council and GCP on an agreement to govern this interface.
17.2	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Fulbourn Greenway – Tins path bridge proposals	The consultation materials show that there will be a new footbridge at Tins Path Bridge. The Council requires this to be an active travel bridge and this should be made clear in the next iteration of the drawings. GCP intends to replace the existing bridge. As this is a key route to Cambridge East Station EWR will need to cover the substantial costs of this work. This work will be carried out as part of the Fulbourn Greenway project in the next three years.
17.3	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Construction routes	A number of proposed construction routes through the city utilise routes the GCP are upgrading including Mill Road (Fulbourn Greenway), Newmarket Road and the A1134. Condition assessments should be carried out by EWR before construction traffic uses those routes as the GCP will have upgraded them. Following construction, EWR should remedy any damage caused by HGV construction traffic. Depending on the timing of

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
			construction, the GCP and EWR will need to collaborate on programme to minimise disruption on the network.
17.4	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Construction routes	Construction routes outside the city could potentially be shared with the Council construction routes for the CSETs and/or Cambourne to Cambridge Transport and Works Act Orders. The Council would encourage EWR to liaise with the Council and the GCP on this point.
17.5	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Chisholm Trail 2 / Cambridge station eastern entrance	The Council asks EWR to commit to working with us to tie together Chisholm Trail Phase 2 to the Eastern Entrance of Cambridge Station. Depending on what is required, funding from EWR should be provided to ensure the tie in works.
17.6	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Harston and Great Shelford Link	The Council welcomes the active travel link between Harston and Great. This should be built to the same standards as the GCP Greenways as it will be a key link between the Melbourn and Sawston Greenways.
17.8	Complex Infrastructure Comments	Long Road compound	The end of the Sawston Greenway links from Robinson Way onto Long Road. A main compound for EWR is planned alongside the rebuilding of Long Road bridge. The infrastructure the GCP will have delivered as part of the Sawston Greenway should be protected with condition surveys carried out before and after construction. EWR should then rectify any issues which were caused as a result of their work.
18.0	Active Travel		The Council would like to reiterate the point raised in previous consultations with EWR that a lineside active travel route would be the preferred option to complement the EWR route. The use of the Busway maintenance track as an active travel route is evidence that there is a strong appetite and benefit for such infrastructure across the county. This is the best possible time to include this element of the project.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
18.1	Active Travel	What East West Rail would provide page 47	Page 47 states “ <i>We want to make walking, wheeling and cycling attractive, obvious choices for accessing stations by providing safe and direct routes that connect stations with nearby communities, both those which exist now and new ones in the future</i> ”. The Council welcomes this statement, but consideration should also be given to ensuring legible, conflict-free active travel routes on the approaches to new EWR stations and on the forecourts themselves. Lessons should be learnt from the issues associated with Cambridge station forecourt (including the inaccessibility of the bus stops). See comments above on Cambridge Station Eastern Access Clifton Rd.
18.2	Active Travel	Managing the impact of the railway page 48	Page 48 states “ <i>In addition to improving access to stations, active travel plays an important role in managing the impacts of the railway on local connectivity.</i> ” The commitment stated here is underwhelming when compared to those made in the “Traffic & Transport – Our approach to traffic and transport” factsheet on mode shift: “ <i>The project aims to encourage the use of more sustainable transport options for both long and short distance trips</i> ”.
18.3	Active Travel	Great Shelford Footpath 1	The replacement of the stepped bridge where Great Shelford Footpath 1 crosses the railway line with a ramped bridge is appropriate and is welcomed as it will improve accessibility to the DNA path and Sawston Greenway on the eastern side of the railway. EWR is requested to work closely with the GCP on the design and integration of the EWR works with the Sawston Greenway design and construction. This is to enable EWR to complement the Sawston Greenway and to ensure that minimal abortive works are undertaken by the GCP. This should include any works on the art strategy for the DNA path.
18.4	Active Travel	Harston to Great Shelford	The proposals include the creation of a lineside active travel route between Harston and the Great Shelford Footpath 1 ramped bridge. This route will increase accessibility along the route and is appropriate.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
18.5	Active Travel	Harston, Newton and Hauxton	The network of new active travel routes between Harston, Newton and Hauxton with a new bridge over the railway, and lineside routes with enhanced routes will improve connectivity between the villages in this area. However, the footpath between Little Shelford and Hauxton should also be upgraded to a shared use path, thereby providing a missing link in the cycling network.
18.6	Active Travel	Harlton to Haslingfield	The proposed walking, wheeling and cycling along Harlton Road between Harlton and Church Street in Haslingfield will improve connectivity between these two villages over the railway and is welcomed.
18.7	Active Travel	Hardwick to Harlton line side route	The Council will continue to work with EWR to create a line side route (on the east side) between Hardwick BW4 / Comberton Greenway and Harlton – the maintenance access roads south of Comberton should be linked by sections of shared use paths, and Footpath 26 should be upgraded to a shared use path to mitigate the increased severance the DCO will create for residents of Great and Little Eversden.
18.8	Active Travel	Cambourne station walking & cycling links page 230	In the Cambourne area the active travel routes being created by EWR will integrate with active travel routes being created by National Highways as part of the A428 improvement works, and as well as those being provided by developers on St Neots Road. The access improvements proposed for Cambourne Station will create a network of integrated routes to link with Cambourne and a potential future extension of Cambourne north of the railway. It is key that Cambourne Station has high quality walking and cycling routes to it, as well as the ability to integrate into a future bus network. The Council is concerned that the proposed shared use bridge over the A428 (located roughly 400 to 500m to the east of the new station) will not encourage active travel trips by residents and employees coming from Cambourne West. Walking and cycling infrastructure at the A428 Cambourne dumbbell roundabouts and A428 slip roads should therefore be upgraded. The Council will continue to work with EWR on these routes which are detailed in the consultation.

Reference	Specialism	Consultation Document referred to (if applicable)	Comments
18.9	Active Travel	Tempsford Station page 211	In the Tempsford Station area, it has been agreed that the station will be connected to St Neots via active travel routes. It is therefore worrying that the routes already identified along the River Great Ouse and Little Barford Road are only referred to as “potential” routes on page 211. Similarly Figure 69 on page 211 clearly depicts the station access road and two multi-storey car parks but the “active travel connectivity” lacks a similar level of detail. We know from experience that if details of active travel infrastructure are not clearly set out, and committed to, at the earliest stage in a project’s life, they are often sacrificed when space for the motor car is deemed insufficient and is prioritised over space for active travel. There is also a need to connect to settlements in Cambridge to the south and east of Tempsford station- including Gamlingay. Without provision of high-quality active travel routes from these settlements active travel to these stations will not be attractive and there will be a missed opportunity.