

Appendix A

EWR Non-Statutory Consultation – Comments and key issues

Table 1: Summary of comments received by technical officers

This table sets out comments by South Cambridgeshire District Council (**the Council**) regarding EWR Co's Non-Statutory Consultation for the East West Rail (EWR) DCO proposal.

The below table sets out comments across a number of topic areas with reference to the published consultation material available on EWR Co's webpage: eastwestrail.co.uk/consultation2024

The Council reserves the right to comment further on the proposal through technical working groups and future consultation.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
AQ.1	Air Quality (SCDC)	Environmental Update Report Technical Report	The Environmental Update Report confirms EWR Co has undertaken their own background monitoring as well as studying data from local authorities. Air quality also appears to have been considered during the Options Appraisal process which is positive. However, there is little detailed information provided. It is therefore not possible for the Council to make detailed comments at this stage. The Council notes that there will be several areas that are due to have significant short-term traffic disruption (most notably the cut and fill tunnel under the A428 requiring temporary diversion of this road) and permanent road diversions are proposed around several villages within the South Cambridgeshire district.	All areas where road diversions (either temporary or permanent) are proposed should be considered to decide whether an air quality assessment will be required. Further discussion with the Council on how the criteria set out in the IAQM/EPUK planning guidance is to be applied to the proposals. The traffic modelling will need to be completed and agreed with the Council (and the highway authority) prior to any air quality modelling taking place. Dust management plans will also be required to control the release of particulate matter (PM2.5) into the atmosphere.
A.1	Archaeology	The Council is not the statutory consultee for this subject area. EWR are expected to consult Cambridgeshire County Council on this matter regarding the proposal (the site and any associated infrastructure that falls within Cambridgeshire County Council's administrative boundary. The Council would defer to Cambridgeshire County Council for a detailed response. However, the Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.		
B.1	Biodiversity	Fact Sheet - Our approach to Nature	There is very little information pertaining to biodiversity impacts within the submission other than the fact that ecological records have been acquired, ecological surveys are underway, and that the project is committed to a 10% net gain in Biodiversity. The Council welcomes the commitment to a 10% net gain. The mandatory requirement for 10% net gain for Nationally Important Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) is not likely to become law until late 2025. However, locally all infrastructure projects have been encouraged, and many are delivering 20% net gain. The Council would encourage EWR to do the same and leave a lasting positive impact to the biodiversity in the area.	EWR Co should increase the minimum biodiversity net gain target to 20% to match many of all recent infrastructure projects within the district.
B.2	Biodiversity	Fact Sheet - Our approach to Habitats Regulations Assessment	The Council welcomes EWR Co's commitment to undertaking a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). Considering the proximity of the proposed railway to Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) it is expected. The developer should be aware of the potential core habitat area of not only to female barbastelle bats that comprise the maternity roosts, but also the potential male territories that overlap. Other HRA studies have shown that the male barbastelle bat rest in solitary roosts in old growth and ancient woodland up to 10 km from the SAC and commute in and out of the core habitat area to mate and forage. The Greater Cambridge Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (2022) provides clear information on what natural features are considered important and should be included within analysis. It is also noted that many of the crossings (green bridges or underpasses) proposed by EWR Co between the A428 and Harlton are also located near construction areas and likely to be seriously compromised as a result.	EWR Co should incorporate the overlapping territories of male barbastelle bats within the analysis of the HRA, as they are a contributing factor to the conservation status of the SAC. EWR Co should also review the design, location and phasing of ecological crossings. Information is to be shared with the Council as part of ongoing engagement.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
B.3	Biodiversity	Environment Update Report	<u>Section 4.5.12</u> The submitted documents state that the project has undertaken approximately 4500 ecological surveys since 2020; although, it does not qualify if this is specific to this section of the route or all sections. The Council would expect the data presented within and supporting the EIA process to be up to date, relevant and complete. If there are ecological features that have been under surveyed (reduced number of bat surveys for example) the reasons why this has happened should be clearly explained, and sufficient adjustments made to the analysis to account for this. Incomplete survey data could be used as reason for objection/refusal if unqualified.	EWR Co should provide sufficient data and analysis of all ecological constraints to the Council as part of ongoing engagement. All data should be collected using the latest best practice guidance.
B.4	Biodiversity	Environment Update Report	<u>Section 10.2.20 to 10.2.26 - Croxton to Toft</u> This section identifies barbastelle bats as a constraint and states that the scattered old growth and ancient woodland have been identified as potential roosting areas which is welcomed. The cut and fill tunnel under the A428, Bourne Airfield, and Highfields has the potential for a highly significant (temporary) negative impact to commuting and foraging barbastelle bats. Previous studies of this area have shown that the male barbastelle are crossing the A428 in this area (likely the St. Neots Road Bridge <i>pers. obs.</i>) and roosting in the old growth and ancient woodlands to the north. Disruption of this flightline by the construction of cut and fill tunnel and re-routed roads has the potential to be significant; and therefore, EWR must provide a detailed mitigation plan. Otherwise, the third derogation test of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) will not be met, and the impact to the SAC will be unacceptable. The Council would remind EWR Co of the Morge vs Hampshire County Council judgement (Morge (FC) (Appellant) v Hampshire County Council (Respondent), Judgment date: 19 Jan 2011, Neutral citation number: [2011] UKSC 2), which upheld the Appeal Court Judge's opinion that the term "significant" was inappropriate in such cases as it is impossible to significantly or insignificantly break the law. Therefore, any impact must be measured and mitigated to remove any residual risk that there will be an impact to the conservation status of the barbastelle, and all other bat species. The list of potential protected species impacted by this section of the route is based on the findings of the duelling of the A428, not those of the EWR ecology surveys. This has therefore not included species such as the water vole which is found in waterways in and around Cambourne and Bourne.	EWR Co should provide sufficient data and analysis of all ecological constraints to the Council as part of ongoing engagement. All data should be collected using the latest best practice guidance.
B.5	Biodiversity	Environment Update Report	<u>Section 11 - Comberton to Shelford</u> This section of the proposed railway will pass the Eversden and Wimpole SAC at its closest point; therefore, an impact to barbastelle and other species of bats is likely to be measured here. EWR must ensure that the data collected (in particular bats) is complete, with no missing data. If access issues have prevented data from being collected, then these must be highlighted and sufficient adjustments made to account for them within the analysis. Potential impacts from the proposed tunnel between Harlton and Haslingfield must be fully explored including all construction phase impacts. The route passes close to several statutory and non-statutory protected sites and must account for any and impact to these areas within the EIA analysis.	EWR Co should provide sufficient data and analysis of all ecological constraints to the Council as part of ongoing engagement. All data should be collected using the latest best practice guidance.
B.6	Biodiversity	Environment Update Report	<u>Section 13.5 - Combined impacts and effects</u> The Council welcome EWR Co's commitment to undertake and HRA and understand the ecological impacts of the project on the wider ecological environment. All assessments must follow best practice guidance, and if a deviation is unavoidable, then a clear explanation of why methods have deviated, and explanation of how they are accounted for within the analysis. EWR Co's commitment to follow yet to be published guidance on BNG and NSIP developments welcomed, all on and offsite BNG habitat creation and enhancement should be secured through a S106 with the relevant authority. The Council would also point the developer to the Greater Cambridge Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document which looks for larger developments, such as EWR, to aim for 20% net gain.	EWR Co should provide sufficient data and analysis of all ecological constraints to the Council as part of ongoing engagement. All data should be collected using the latest best practice guidance.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
CC.1	Climate and carbon	Fact Sheet - Our approach to powering the trains	The preference for the use of discontinuous electrification subject to further work, with full electrification being the baseline position assumed in these proposals, is welcomed. It is noted that in the interim some services will temporarily use diesel passenger trains until overhead electrification has been installed, with the Environmental Update Report noting that this may be until all construction through to Cambridge has been completed. The Council considers it important that a fixed end date for the use of diesel trains, both passenger and freight, is committed to, in order to ensure that EWR is consistent with the requirements of the Climate Change Act and Department for Transport's own commitments to end diesel only trains on the rail network.	EWR Co should include a fixed end date for the use of diesel passenger and freight trains on the route. Further clarification on the means of powering the trains should be fed back to the Council via climate and carbon focussed engagement channels.
CC.2	Climate and carbon	Cambourne Station	The Council would recommend an approach to the new station at Cambourne (and indeed other stations along the route) that follows a similar approach to delivering high quality design and sustainable design and construction to that being implemented for the new Cambridge South Station. This should also take into account active travel requirements, as noted within other sections of this table.	EWR Co should provide further design detail to the Council as part of ongoing engagement to better understand climate and carbon impacts.
CC.3	Climate and carbon	Environmental Update Report	The general approach to considering the impacts on climate change, notably related to carbon emissions as part of the Environmental Statement is noted. However, given the high-level nature of the information provided as part of the non-statutory consultation, the Council would request early sight of detailed assessment of carbon and the mitigation measures proposed to reduce the impacts associated with construction of the railway and associated structures. The Council would support the use of materials with low embodied carbon wherever possible and would recommend that where new or replacement habitats are proposed, consideration be given to how the carbon sequestration potential of these habitats could be maximised. In addition to the consideration of carbon, it will be important to understand how the wider climate impacts will be considered as part of the Environmental Statement, noting that flood risk is already considered. This should include the consideration of wider climate impacts and resilience measures, for example the impacts of heat during the construction phase and also on the operation of the railway, so it will be important for us to understand how this will be considered as part of the Environmental Statement. Water scarcity is also a considerable issue facing the region, so as part of the consideration of the impacts of the proposed development on water resources, it will be important to consider whether construction and operational impacts on potable water supplies in terms of creating additional demands on water resources and to develop mitigation measures to minimise any requirements.	EWR Co should: - consider water resource demand generated by both the construction and operational phases of EWR as part of the Environmental Statement and identify appropriate mitigation measures - provide further information on how climate resilience and climate impacts beyond just flood risk is being factored into the Environmental Statement - provide further detail on the assessment of carbon as part of the construction and operational phases of the proposed development - engage and discuss potential mitigation measures with the Council
CC.4	Climate and Carbon	Technical Report	<u>Section 14.1 – Proposal for powering the trains</u> It is noted that the development of the EWR project will require works to make grid connections to bring power supply to the railway as well as realigning and diverting existing utilities supplies. This includes substation upgrades north of Cambridge. Work is currently underway to develop a Local Area Energy Plan (LAEP) for Cambridgeshire. As part of this work, it will be important to ensure that the electricity infrastructure requirements of EWR are factored into the growth scenarios that the LAEP will look to support.	EWR Co to engage in the development of the LAEP and share relevant data with the Council to ensure that the power requirements of the project are considered as part of the wider transition of energy infrastructure across Cambridgeshire to support net zero carbon.
C.1	Communities	Consultation methodology	The consultation approach does not appear to follow the Council's advice in response to <i>East West Rail – Statement of Community Consultation</i> in March 2024. The Council advised of the need to tailor the engagement approach to specific groups. There is little indication that consultation methods have been tailored to access specific groups which seems inconsistent with the <i>Accessibility and Inclusion Factsheet</i> and EWR commitment to human-centred design. The Council's experience of consultation events to date (Shelford and Cambourne) is that whilst well attended, they have attracted a limited demographic in terms of age. Hearing only from a particular age group may skew the consultation findings and will not inform an effective package of mitigation	EWR Co should: - report on demographics of attendance at online and in person events and consultation responses - provide reports on any tailored consultation with specific groups - provide a EQIA for the statutory consultation - hold inclusive and accessible consultation events including at

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
			to meet the needs across the South Cambridgeshire communities. Specific groups such as parents, young people, people with disabilities, women and the elderly are less likely to utilise standard consultation models and more likely to have specific travel/ transports needs. For example, parents of young children are likely to travel in 'trip chains' such as taking children to school, then travelling onwards to employment. Young people are particularly reliant on public transport to access educational opportunities in Cambridge and are less likely to have access to cars - this group will experience the longest-term impact of EWR.	local primary and secondary schools/ villages colleges and sixth forms, at community events and at local supermarkets
C.2	Communities	Consultation methodology	As advised in the Council's response to <i>East West Rail – Statement of Community Consultation</i> in March 2024, more consultation locations are needed across the district as many residents within South Cambridgeshire are unable to travel far beyond their village. Similarly, the proposed routes have a significant impact on access to schools (Harston and Newton Primary and Comberton Village College). For future consultation events, where there is significant impact on access to schools (Harston/ Newton and Comberton) – specific consultation should be held with school community.	EWR Co to ensure an updated Statement of Community Consultation includes more village-based / accessible consultation events, including within local schools and colleges.
C.3	Communities	All consultation materials	Residents are required to access and digest a large amount of information across a wide range of documents to understand the impact of the building process and permanent changes resulting from EWR project. The impact of higher-level infrastructure such as bridges, cuttings and tunnels are also difficult to comprehend without visual aids.	The statutory consultation stage should include village/cluster information packs/ which include EWR route; diversions of roads and crossing closures and their impact (there are concerns about 'rat runs'); closures of existing PROW's/footpaths/cycle ways and replacements with estimated journey times; proposed door-to-door route options with estimated journey times, as well as artists impressions and/or 3D models/ modelling of railway cuttings, embankments, bridges and tunnels.
C.4	Communities	Transport Update Report	There is no information provided on the impact of EWR on Foxton level crossing (SBL and A10), which has long been a concern to Foxton and surrounding communities. Nor is information provided on relationship between EWR and the proposed GCP Foxton Travel Hub (currently paused). Previous proposals to address long and frequent waiting times at this level crossing have highlighted its impact on both A10 traffic (and breaks in traffic allow other villages to access the A10) and on journey times particularly of emergency vehicles.	EWR Co should ensure that the statutory consultation materials include reference to the impact of EWR on Foxton Level Crossing and A10- traffic flow and relationship with Foxton Travel Hub.
C.5	Communities	Technical Report	Concern raised that there is no reference within the consultation material that the draft Order Limits and safeguarded area impact Fulbourn ward, where there is due to be a telecommunication compound (with no indication regarding access to such compound).	EWR Co to ensure all affected wards are adequately referenced within consultation documents, and to ensure meaningful and transparent engagement within parish councils.
C.6	Communities (Strategic Sites)	Technical Report	<u>Section 13.3 – North of Cambridge station</u> The EWR proposals north of the Fen Road level crossing are very close to the major development area at North East Cambridge, which lies west of the Cambridge to Ely line and may even encroach on some areas development sites (e.g., the North East Cambridge proposals include a foot/cycle bridge over the railway line landing in the middle of the proposed EWR sub-station ('Milton Feeder station'). The impacts of the EWR proposals on the proposed NEC development and Fen Road level crossing need to be fully assessed and mitigated, and the Council would like to explore whether the proposals can be delivered together. See figures 10 and 30 of the Proposed Submission North East Cambridge Area Action Plan, Regulation 19 (November 2021).	Early discussions with the Council to establish the relationship of proposals to the development site, and opportunities for coordinated delivery of infrastructure is required.
C.7	Communities	Technical Report	<u>Section 13.3 – North of Cambridge station</u> Clarification needed on whether the proposed replacement for two train sidings from Cambridge Station will be re-provided at Chesterton Sidings at Cambridge North station, and whether this will increase the barrier downtime at Fen Road level crossing (note: the use of the level crossing is already a point	Early discussions with the Council to establish the relationship of proposals to the development site, and opportunities for coordinated delivery of infrastructure is required.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
			of concern, having a negative impact on the communities living and working in the area, as Fen Road is the only means of access). The works proposed at Cambridge North station lie partly within the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) area. This area is being replanned and include proposals to improve wider connectivity with a potential new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway from the Anglian Waste Water Treatment site to Chesterton Fen. It will need to be understood how the railway works in this area could impact on the deliverability of this bridge or could potentially help deliver this ambition.	
CL.1	Contaminated land	Environment Update Report Technical Report	There is limited detail that has been provided in the initial high-level reports. Further details have been promised in the forthcoming Preliminary Environmental Information Report and, eventually, in the Environmental Statement. This early recognition and commitment to the gradual increase in the level of detail is welcomed.	The Council expects the submission of further details on contamination as part of ongoing engagement.
D.1	Design	All consultation material	<u>General design comments</u> More details in relation to the proposed buildings and the route structures should be provided at the statutory consultation stage to better understand the development context. EWR will have significant short and long-term impact on the existing and emerging infrastructure projects with the area (Cambourne to Cambridge Busway and CSET). Therefore, temporary and permanent realignment for main routes and during construction work should be considered in the context of how they are currently used by local communities.	EWR Co and the Council to work together to develop appropriate design objectives for all structures. EWR Co to share the assessment of impacts with the Council at the earliest opportunity.
D.2	Design	All consultation material	<u>Cambourne Station</u> The Council notes that the design of the station at Cambourne is still to be considered in more detail and is the subject of ongoing engagement with officers. However, future station users should be encouraged to use sustainable modes of travel; therefore, routes layout and facilities should be designed to facilitate this by creating comfortable routes/spaces. Pedestrian and cyclists' access to the station is important for access to the local amenities, and surrounding villages. The number of general car parking spaces should be considered in the context of forecast demand and expected use of the site and should be the subject of site-specific analysis. The design should include spaces for taxi and private vehicle drop-off/pick-up, with flexibility for future reassignment as transport needs evolve. Where significant numbers of people are likely to be waiting for services, an appropriately sized space should be provided to allow waiting in comfort and enhance the station environment.	EWR Co should ensure that more detailed design work to the station building, and facilities is explored with the Council prior to statutory consultation.
D.3	Design	All consultation material	<u>Impact on Bourn Airfield</u> The new train route will pass through the newly approved village at Bourn Airfield, potentially affecting approved routes, buildings, and the proposed busway. Clarity is needed on how the route aligns with approved plans and measures to ensure the train project does not disrupt other projects' timelines. Some existing routes benefiting the village and Bourn Quarter may be affected, leading to longer travel times. Alternative routes and mitigation measures during construction need to be identified. Development at Bourn Airfield may commence before the train project starts, with properties occupied and strategic routes in use. It is important to understand how these factors have been integrated into the train project plans and what steps will ensure minimal disruption for future residents.	EWR Co should provide more details on the how any impact on the emerging Bourn development is to be mitigated. Establishing ongoing dialogue with the Council, transport authority, and key stakeholders is required.
D.4	Design (route alignment)	Maps and plans	<u>Route Section 7</u> Concern raised regarding potential impact on Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory. As per local plan Policy TI/7 (Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope), consideration is to be given to the risk of interference from proposed development within the restricted area.	EWR Co to ensure there is no risk of interference to the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge. Consultation with University of Cambridge required.
DD.1	Door to door connectivity	Technical Report	<u>Section 3.7 – Approach to door-to-door connectivity in design development</u> It is noted that EWR Co are developing route-wide door-to-door connectivity proposals. The Council would expect	EWR Co to engage with the Council and transport authority to develop a comprehensive network sustainable travel routes and design specification.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
			provision of a comprehensive network of sustainable travel routes to surrounding communities to be developed and appropriately funded. These routes should be designed to a high quality standard reflecting LTN1/20 .	
DD.3	Door to door connectivity	Factsheets: Accessibility and Equalities Consultation process in general	<u>Train capacity</u> Consideration to be given to the capacity to carry bicycles onboard the trains – many people undertake onward commuting journeys – Cambridge has very high proportion of cyclists, as does Oxford – it is therefore reasonable to expect people to bring their bikes with them. Additional cycle storage capacity should be provided at stations to account for additional users.	EWR Co to share detailed plans and information regarding required capacity for the development of new cycling storage and facilities at all proposed/existing stations within Cambridge city and South Cambridgeshire.
DD.2	Door to door connectivity	All consultation material	The Council would welcome consideration of a programme of upgrades and improvements to accessibility at existing stations in South Cambridgeshire which will form the connections to East West Rail.	EWR Co to consider accessibility improvements to existing rural feed-in stations that link with EWR. Further information and subsequent design detail to be explored with the Council via established means of engagement.
DD.3	Door to door connectivity	All consultation material	Residents are aware of the challenges of funding rural public transport schemes and have expressed concerns both about EWR users causing increased traffic and parking and their own challenges accessing EWR via public transport. Residents have also raised questions about how EWR will interact/ impact on other planned travel and transport infrastructure such as GCP greenways, park and ride provision and existing bus routes. As there are limited choices of walking and cycling routes in rural areas, it is particularly important that the project provides 'footpath/ cycle route net-gain'.	EWR Co to demonstrate how EWR stations and rail link integrates with existing rail networks, bus routes, park and ride interchanges, walking and cycling infrastructure and indicate how integration between the project and this existing/new infrastructure can be delivered. Further information and subsequent design detail to be explored with the Council via established means of engagement.
DD.4	Door to door connectivity	All consultation material	The proposed location of the new Cambourne station and associated pedestrian / cycle bridge access into Cambourne is noted. However, given the extent of existing and already planned development at Cambourne, Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield which extends over a considerable distance, the Council would expect greater NMU connectivity to the station across the A428 and St Neots Road (more than one crossing), to a high standard (width and design). Consideration also needs to be given to how the station will integrate with existing and future bus networks to serve these developments, including the Cambourne to Cambridge busway.	EWR Co to review the existing proposals for connectivity between EWR Station at Cambourne and existing and planned Development at Cambourne and Bourn. Information to also be provided on how accessibility to existing and planned development is being factored into proposals to deliver improvements to connectivity to all the existing and planned developments south of the A428.
DD.5	Door to door connectivity	All consultation material	Transport modelling for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan demonstrates that a station at Cambourne attracts additional car trips to access it from the North. The Council would expect the full transport impacts of the station to be assessed and appropriately mitigated, encouraging and facilitating as many trips as possible by sustainable modes; this should take into consideration a potential catchment area from nearby villages and Northstowe New Town. The Council is concerned that cars attracted to the new station are appropriately managed and accommodated.	EWR Co to work with collaboratively with the Council and Cambridgeshire County Council to provide comprehensive transport modelling evidence to identify transport impacts and appropriate mitigation. Further detail is also required in relation to mode share for commuters from Cambourne to Cambridge.
DD.6	Door-to-door connectivity	All consultation material	<u>Active travel</u> Design approach to new stations should take into consideration high quality and accessible links between active travel networks. This requires an understanding of any inadequacies and fragmentation within existing cycle/pedestrian networks within and to/from proposed infrastructure (e.g., Cambourne). This includes but is not limited to safe walking and cycling infrastructure, with sufficient levels of cycle parking, as well as integration with other transport modes (e.g., connection with bus routes [alignment with timetables], unified ticketing system etc.).	Further information is required in relation to design quality and integration of active travel measures. EWR Co should engage collaboratively with the Council and the transport authorities on these matters.
HW.1	Health and Wellbeing	Technical Report	<u>Chapter 11.2.1</u> Any temporary closure to Ermine Street South, Papworth Everard will cause significant delays to people commuting to the A421 from the St Ives, Huntingdon, Godmanchester and the A14. The impact on residents living in the villages of Elsworth and Knapwell, which offer alternative access routes to the A421, needs to be considered. Including nuisance, noise, vibration, pedestrian safety, and mental health impacts.	EWR Co to share proposed mitigation measures and a detailed strategy to manage impacts to surrounding villages resulting from any temporary closures all routes.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
HW.2	Health and Wellbeing	Technical Report	<u>Section 12.3.2 Hauxton Junction and level crossing number 37</u> Residents have raised concerns re community severance between Newton and Harston, and the closure of the level crossing and the resultant difficulties accessing GP and school, onward journeys/ trip chains need to be considered as do horse riders and the impact of proposed changes on parking. Step free access is crucial for accessibility reasons, and it is not clear if this has been considered.	EWR Co to engage with Harston and Newton residents including the parish council to seek to address concerns regarding community severance between Newton and Harston.
HW.3	Health and Wellbeing	General: cycle storage and cycle infrastructure and connectivity with VOI provision.	Cambridge and Oxford are both renowned cycling towns. To support the health and wellbeing benefits that cycling offers and remove barriers to cycling, it is key that stations are designed to support travel with cycles including cycle access on and off trains and required amounts of cycling storage which is in demand at existing stations. The Council would like to highlight that an extension to Cambridge's existing VOI (electric scooter and bike scheme) is currently under consideration and should be included in door-to-door access provision.	EWR Co should engage with community cycling groups and other local cycling organisations to inform station design on an ongoing basis to better understand impacts. Engagement with VOI to ensure effective integration into door-to-door access.
HW.4	Health and Wellbeing	Factsheet: EWR and the DCO Process and what it means to Landowners	Impact of EWR on those receiving Land Interest Questions, those affected by statutory blight and compulsory acquisition is likely to have a detrimental effect on mental and physical health. This document does not reference Land Interest Questionnaires which many of our residents have received. Residents advise of difficulties assessing information on whether their properties are likely to be affected or not and request that this information is provided as soon as possible. Large numbers of residents, homes, businesses, and farms are affected by proposed changes and every effort should be made to proactively update and support those affected.	EWR Co should prioritise engagement with residents that have previously received land interest questionnaires as to the current status/ risks to their properties. EWR Co should also engage with affected landowners to determine how best to keep them up to date.
HW.5	Health and Wellbeing	All consultation material	The risk of community severance both physically (e.g., rail infrastructure creating barriers) and socially, is of particular concern within the South Cambridgeshire villages. As noted within other sections of this schedule of comments, such barriers could lead to isolating communities, limiting access to services, employment opportunities, and increasing social inequalities during the construction phase and operation of the railway.	EWR Co should outline how construction programme and works can mitigate risks of community fragmentation and should explore with the Council design solutions and mitigation that seeks to minimise potential fragmentation.
H.1	Heritage	Factsheet: Approach to the Historic Environment	The factsheet states that EWR has begun the process of collating survey and archive work to understand the impacts of the proposals on the historic environment, and to design ways to reduce or remove impacts. The Council has not seen any detailed information on this work relating to the built heritage. There are a number of bronze age barrows at the eastern entrance to the proposed tunnel through Chapel Hill, which also provides a viewpoint above the Haslingfield clunch pit.	EWR Co to share the built historic environment data and assessment of impacts with the Council at the earliest opportunity. Early engagement and a continued dialogue should be established through heritage specific working groups, which also involves representatives from the county council.
H.1	Heritage	Technical Report Train maintenance depots and sidings	Potential locations for infrastructure maintenance depots are identified with a number on the Harston to Cambridge South section of the route – this area is highly sensitive in terms of heritage assets. EWR recognise that several structures will be very prominent or pass through areas of visual or cultural interest and that further architectural work will be undertaken, and details provided at statutory consultation. The Council would like to see this design work including all engineering options explored together with the companion work on the likely impacts on the built heritage at an early stage, before the statutory consultation stage.	EWR Co to share design and options work on the various structures proposed and their likely impact and potential mitigation with SCDC.
H.1	Heritage	Environmental Update Report	The proposed railway line is continuously fenced, EWR states that the fences will vary depending on whether railway is on embankment, cutting or at grade. It is recommended that vegetation used for screening.	EWR Co to discuss the location/siting and format of boundary treatments as part of ongoing engagement with the Council.
L.1	Landscape and visual impacts	Environmental Update Report (EUR) Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>EUR Section 4.4, paragraph 4.4.5 - Cumulative impacts</u> Detailed information on the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) transport projects which are close to the proposed rail corridor has not been included in the consultation material.	Detailed information to be added to the Environmental Report/EIA and more detailed plans/drawings to be provided to the Council. Early and continued engagement with the Council should be established via landscape specific working groups.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
L.2	Landscape and visual impacts	Environmental Update Report (EUR) Technical Report Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>EUR Section 4.4 - Cumulative impacts</u> Cumulative effects of other rail projects i.e. Cambridge South station must be included. The construction of the new station and addition of new tracks impacts on Hobsons Park, the biomedical campus and the areas south of the new station. New planting, drainage and mitigation implemented as part of the Cambridge South project should be protected and retained.	Detailed information on all adjacent or connected projects and developments to be added to the Environmental Report/EIA and to plans/drawings, which should be shared with the Council for review and comment. Early and continued engagement with the Council should be established via landscape specific working groups.
L.3	Landscape and visual impacts	Technical Report Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>Technical Report Section 5.4.8</u> This section lists other Network Rail projects and transport projects that interface with EWR – “various large residential and employment developments” are mentioned but no detail on which developments.	Detailed information on all adjacent or connected projects and developments to be added to the Environmental Report/EIA and to plans/drawings, which should be shared with the Council for review and comment. Early and continued engagement with the Council should be established via landscape specific working groups.
L.4	Landscape and visual impacts	Environmental Update Report (EUR) Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>EUR Section 4.5 - Defining the environmental baseline</u> Information on existing trees, hedgerows and trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) is missing and must be added as part of defining the baseline.	Detailed information on existing trees, trees with TPO's, tree removal and retention and compensatory planting must be provided to the Council.
L.5	Landscape and visual impacts	Environmental Update Report (EUR)	<u>EUR Section 2.3 Environmental context and route selection</u> Insufficient detail on the specific characteristics of the landscape to be impacted on and around the rail corridor which is required to guide the design of the route, infrastructure such as bridges, lighting, embankments, drainage features and stations as well as guide design of mitigation.	A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is required. This should refer to the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment (GCLCA) (by Chris Blandford Associates, 2021) and Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (by LDA Design, November 2015). Discussion is then required with the Council on the approach to be followed along the length of the railway to landscape integration and impact mitigation through the detailed design.
L.6	Landscape and visual impacts	Technical Report Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>Technical Report Section 3.82 - Rail systems</u> The rail systems will impact on the landscape and more detail is required to appropriately assess impacts (e.g., heights and materials of overhead lines and gantries (figure 5); heights and materials of fencing (para 3.8.2.7); and lineside equipment and drainage (para 3.8.2.7)).	Full details of rail systems to be provided to the Council and discussion around options to effectively integrate with the design and landscape mitigation. This detail should be provided alongside early engagement with relevant technical officers from the Council.
L.7	Landscape and visual impacts	Technical Report Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>Technical Report Section 3.82 - Rail systems</u> <u>Technical Report Section 3.8.3.2 - Structures</u> The new railway will include construction of numerous structures, such as road bridges, retaining walls, tunnels and foot bridges. The structures are noted on the plans, but no levels or sections have been provided and there is no information on materials, design strategy and accessibility. The structures will have landscape impacts and are critical in providing connectivity between villages and communities. The structures are also a way that the project can create a strong, positive, recognisable identity and help make legible places.	Full design details of rail systems and associated structures to be provided to the Council and discussion around options to effectively integrate with the design and landscape mitigation.
L.8	Landscape and visual impacts	Technical Report Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>Croxton to Toft</u> There are several tree groups and woodland groups with Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) on and adjacent to this section of the railway. Further detail is required of the proposed tree removals, tree protection and compensatory planting. The landscape character on this section of the route is open with large scale fields and blocks of woodland. The rail corridor and associated construction compounds will cut through fields and woodland dividing them up into smaller parcels and potentially changing the scale and character.	The Council requires more detail to assess the impact of the cut and cover tunnel at Bourn airfield on the surrounding landscape and how landscape impacts and the design response might need to vary between the options (11.3.4 of the Technical Report).
L.9	Landscape and visual impacts	Technical Report Plan & Profile Drawings	<u>Comberton to Shelford</u> This section of the railway includes stretches on raised embankments with high level footbridges, a high viaduct over Bourn Brook. More detail is required to explain the strategy for ground levels, impacts on landscape and views and rationale behind bridge heights and design. Further rationale is also	More detail is required of the mitigation and landscape design strategies including mitigation of construction areas. Mitigation must address the wider landscape as well as the immediate boundary of the rail corridor.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
			required regarding proposed balancing ponds – residents' concerns note that the proposed balancing pond south of the existing Addenbrooke's Road overbridge crossing on the western side would encroach on land that replaced land and biodiversity lost from Hobson's Park due to the construction of Cambridge South station. Hauxton Junction (technical report 12.3.2.2 to 4) – the design options for Hauxton Junction do not seem to have been assessed in terms of their landscape impact and the information submitted does not show enough detail for us to comment. To input into a discussion on the junction and provide feedback, information is required on existing and proposed levels, sections and elevations of the railway and views from the surrounding landscape. The junction also impacts on pedestrian and vehicle connections between the villages and introduces new crossing points over the railway. The Newton footbridge has a long-ramped approaches which are likely to deter use and should be re considered. The inclusion of the Hauxton footbridge but more detail required to show the bridge design, height and accessibility, is supported.	This detail should be provided alongside early engagement with relevant technical officers from the Council.
MW.1	Minerals and waste	The Council is not the statutory consultee for this subject area. EWR are expected to consult Cambridgeshire County Council on this matter regarding the proposal (the site and any associated infrastructure that falls within Cambridgeshire County Council's administrative boundary. The Council would defer to Cambridgeshire County Council for a detailed response. However, the Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.		
NV.1	Noise and vibration (SCDC)	Environmental Update Report Technical Report Consultation Document General Comments	<u>Complexity and early challenges</u> The scale and complexity of the proposed railway scheme make it difficult to provide detailed feedback due to limited available information. Noise and vibration impacts are anticipated during construction and operation, necessitating thorough assessments and robust mitigation strategies to address potential disruptions. <u>Noise and vibration impacts</u> Construction noise, although temporary, could last for extended periods due to the magnitude of work. Assessments must align with BS 5228 standards, and mitigation should be site-specific, employing best practical means. In areas like Caxton Gibbet Junction, elevated road surfaces and new railway noise sources may cumulatively impact developments like Cambourne West. Operational noise mitigation, including barriers and bunds, must be carefully modelled and designed to meet BS 8233 guidelines without compromising urban design or open space quality. <u>Disruption in key areas</u> The A428 Bourn Airfield tunnel construction will be particularly disruptive, affecting existing properties in Highfields and Caldecote and potentially new residents in the Bourn Airfield development. Noise from railway construction and future station activity at Cambourne will add to the impact. Increased road traffic to the station must also be considered for its contribution to noise levels in surrounding areas. The Council are concerned about the proximity of the proposed Cherry Hinton turnback to nearby residential areas, with housing on both sides of the existing railway track and the proposed turnback location. These properties are likely to currently experience infrequent train movements at very low speeds, therefore any current operational railway noise is likely to be very low level. <u>Mitigation and environmental management</u> Acoustic barriers and other noise control measures will be essential and must evolve through detailed assessments. Impacts from road realignments and construction compounds require careful evaluation, especially where they affect previously unaffected properties. Transparent environmental management plans are crucial to addressing local sensitivities and minimizing disruption. <u>Lighting and construction vehicle impacts</u> Artificial lighting can disrupt nearby residential areas. A lighting impact assessment should address spillage, illumination hours, and mitigation measures. Construction vehicle movements require strict regulation to prevent disruption in village areas, with enforcement ensuring compliance.	Emerging detail is required as part of the EIA/DCO process. Mitigation to be assessed, and EWR Co to engage with the Council on the potential impacts and mitigation approach.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
			<u>Community engagement</u> Engaging with affected communities is vital. Residents must receive timely updates on construction activities, particularly in areas expecting night work. Transparent communication will help manage expectations and mitigate concerns. <u>Guidance and standards</u> All assessments and mitigation must adhere to relevant guidance, including the “Greater Cambridge - Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document” and applicable British Standards. Following these frameworks will help minimize environmental and social impacts while ensuring the project meets planning requirements.	
PROW.1	Public Rights of Way (PROW)	The Council is not the statutory consultee for this subject area. EWR Co are expected to consult Cambridgeshire County Council on this matter regarding the proposal (the site and any associated infrastructure that falls within Cambridgeshire County Council’s administrative boundary. The Council would defer to Cambridgeshire County Council for a detailed response. However, the impact of the construction and operation phases on the effective and enjoyable use of the PROW network, and opportunities for enhanced accessibility through the design and thoughtful implementation of the project is a matter of interest to the Council and it therefore reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.		
RW.1	Route wide matters	Environmental Update Report	It is an expectation that all indirect and cumulative impacts of the project are assessed, as well as impact interactions and inter relationships.	EWR Co should ensure that all indirect and cumulative impacts of the project are assessed.
RW.2	Route wide matters	Technical Report	<u>Section 14.3 – EWR Co’s approach to freight</u> It is understood that the potential for rail freight is a large part of the economic growth case for EWR. The existing freight proposals appear to be fairly limited, and it is understood that there is significant potential for freight expansion on EWR, but this is currently restricted by capacity constraints along the line such as at Haughley junction near Ipswich and dualling of the line to east of Cambridge, but also to the west and north of the line.	The Council request further information on the constraints to future freight expansion, the level and nature of future the freight activity along the EWR route and to understand whether these have been taken this into account in current mitigation proposals.
RW.3	Route wide matters	Technical Report	The project presents an opportunity to explore opportunities for infrastructure that could share the corridor (e.g. digital infrastructure or potable water pipelines). In particular, the Council believes that opportunities for enhancing NMU access between the city and the countryside alongside the railway should be explored fully.	Further engagement on opportunities for enhancing NMU access between the city and the countryside with wider stakeholders is needed.
RW.4	Route wide matters	Consultation documents and guides	Residents have questioned the strength of the business case for the project and indicated that the consultation material does not include a detailed business case for the proposal.	EWR Co to ensure that the full business case for the project in published as part of the formal consultation process for review and consideration by the Council and local communities.
RW.5	Route wide matters	Factsheet: Approach to the management of construction	<u>Construction management</u> Concern raised relating to a number of construction management matters: • The construction phase, size and location on construction zones (especially those on, adjacent and near to homes), road closures, road congestion, air quality, noise, visual appearance and likely long duration of such disruption • The impact of the development on schools – especially in terms of noise and general disruption (e.g., during school hours, examinations etc.) • Further impacts to the condition of roads from construction traffic (e.g., requirement of road repairs, and mud on the road) • Impacts from working sites and the construction duration • Construction traffic routes, road closures and traffic management: concerns regarding HGV movements along inappropriate road and with inappropriate driver behaviour, as well as diversion routes and closed bridges • Need to maintain access along all affected roads (including bus services) and all footpaths to be maintained	EWR Co to work with the local transport authority and district councils on a comprehensive plan for the mitigation and management of construction impacts, including arrangements for the reporting and enforcing of construction mitigation controls and measures by the relevant authorities in concert with EWR Co. Formal consultation phase to include a detailed draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and dynamic traffic management plans to ensure proposed management measures are adequate in mitigating adverse impacts throughout the delivery phases.

Item no.	Topic area	Consultation material	Comments and key issues	Proposed mitigation measures and actions for EWR Co to address
			Community engagement: Suggestion of a “Construction ombudsman” or Council representative who can communicate with EWR Co about issues and concerns raised by residents during the construction phase (estimated to be between 7 and 10 years)	
RW.6	Route wide matters	Maps and plans	Concern regarding impact of development on loss of farmland/viable agricultural land especially during and post-construction phases.	Further assessment required and statements in support of the formal consultation phase that provide details of how the project will sustain viable farming enterprises with reference to protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land within the area.
TT.1	Traffic and transport	The Council is not the statutory consultee for this subject area. EWR Co are expected to consult Cambridgeshire County Council and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) as Transport Authority. The Council would defer to Cambridgeshire County Council and the CPCA for a detailed response concerning the projects contribution to the delivery of the objectives within the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. The growth plans for Greater Cambridge outlined in the emerging Joint Local Plan and the commitments from both Councils to maximise sustainable travel options to achieve sustainable growth objectives means that the Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.		
T.1	Trees	Environmental Update Report Technical Report	Other than an overview of nearby woodlands and pockets of trees potentially being classed as ancient or important in respect to habitat as part of certain sections of the route, overall, there is limited information and data provided regarding trees to reflect the potential impact by the EWR route. This is also reflected in images (figures) as part of the Technical Report not showing complete tree cover, only pockets of woodland or tree groups.	Detailed information on existing trees, trees with TPO's, tree removal and retention and compensatory planting must be provided.
W.1	Water resources and flood risk	The Council is not the statutory consultee for this subject area. EWR Co are expected to consult Cambridgeshire County Council on this matter regarding the proposal (the site and any associated infrastructure that falls within Cambridgeshire County Council's administrative boundary. The Council would defer to Cambridgeshire County Council for a detailed response. However, the Council reserves the right to comment on this subject through technical working groups and future consultation.		

Table 2: Summary of comments received by parish councils

The following table summarises the comments received from parish councils during the non-statutory consultation period. Parish Council representatives have been advised that their full and detailed comments regarding the proposal should be submitted directly to EWR Co

These comments are made by parish councils and do not form part of the Council's formal response to the consultation.

Parish Council (Date of correspondence)	Summary of key issues and comments
Barrington Parish Council	<u>Effects of the development</u> - Environmental impact of the line upon Barrington - vibration, noise, visual impact. - Fundamental loss of the unique setting of Barrington as one of a group of villages separated by open views of the green southwestern ribbon around the city of Cambridge. - Disrupted access to Cambridge with the line intervening between Barrington and city amenities - especially main route A10 via Harston but also via Haslingfield. - Consequential traffic impact long term if the main arterial routes are disrupted. Barrington already is used as a "rat run" to Cambridge because of the delays caused to the A10. This will be worsened – it is unclear what the exact effect of EWR will be - but it will likely exacerbate the situation currently caused by the main line level crossing (LC) at Foxton. Traffic impacts need to be properly modelled and closely examined. A tunnel or bridge at Foxton LC should be part of the "strategic" assessment. - Absolutely no benefit to Barrington in terms of rail links. Reductions in road traffic will not happen but will likely worsen. All the benefits are to Addenbrookes Biomedical Campus and its distant workers. - The business model for this proposal and for this route needs to be examined very closely given the environmental impacts during construction and thereafter. Given the experience of HS2 the level of Optimism Bias within the EWR proposal needs to be properly understood. - If spoil from tunnelling through Chapel can be used to hasten the infilling of the Cemex quarry on Chapel Hill that is the only direct potential benefit – subject to careful assessment of the potential damage to the Barrington Chalk Quarry SSSI. <u>Effects during construction</u> - Major disruptive traffic impacts through the village and including Barrington Conservation Area with associated social, economic and environmental costs. - Environmental impacts - vibration, noise, dirt and dust, visual impact, effects on Barrington Chalk Quarry SSSI. - Barrington access roads to and from Shepreth and Foxton already experience significant flooding during poor weather – increased traffic movements will exacerbate the effects. - Social connections between local villages will be severely hampered. - Significant detrimental impact upon access to Cambridge - Cambridge will be isolated for several years.
Barton Parish Council	- Suggestion of banning construction traffic through Barton on the B1046 (New Road, Comberton Road). - Limit construction traffic through Barton on the A603 (Cambridge Road, Wimpole Road) to daytime and avoiding rush hour – it is noted that restricting HGVs using a main trunk road such as the A603 is difficult. - Ensure that the bus service (18) – which runs from Cambridge to St Neots through Barton on the B1046, Comberton, Toft and on to Cambourne - continues to run. It is used by people travelling to work and to school (schools in Cambridge such as Hills, and children going to Comberton Village College (CVC)), by many elderly residents living in Barton to travel between villages during the day as well as travelling into Cambridge, and others that do not drive and rely on the bus. - EWR (given that it goes ahead as planned on the southern route) would not directly impact Barton when built – therefore, the main concerns are around construction noise, traffic and disruption close to Comberton Village College, for which Barton Primary School is a feeder school. - An integrated transport system in and around Cambridge is required, with a particular focus to reduce traffic and speeding through Barton. Concerns are raised that development along the A428 corridor with no mass transport system in place, will likely lead to congestion within the village similar to pre-COVID days when there were often queues from 07h00 – 09h00 (A14 construction probably had some impact). Many drivers travelling towards Cambridge / M11 / medical campus, cut through Barton. EWR Co are encouraged to take the opportunity to run light rail alongside EWR with frequent stops between the main stations – establishing an integrated transport system that benefits everyone.
Comberton Parish Council	The proposed alignment of the EWR crosses the road between Toft and Comberton in between the Meridian Golf Course and Comberton Village Collage. It then proceeds south alongside South Street and Royston Lane and crosses the current Royston Lane then the A603 and proceeds on to Harlton and through Chappel Hill. Concerns about the projects impact on Comberton village and its residents are: - The need to maintain access along all affected roads such as: the road between Toft and Comberton; Royston Lane; the A603; Washpit Lane; and the road between Harlton and Haslingfield. - The need to adequately maintain road surfaces where construction traffic will be using local roads. Ensuring all potholes and broken edges of roads are kept repaired as quickly as possible from any damage occurring. They are already in an appalling state of disrepair (especially Royston Lane/South Street).

	• The need for mitigating the disruption to the CVC secondary school, especially during exam times. • Mitigating noise pollution from the construction. • Reduction in the height of any embankments to the lowest height possible. • Any construction compounds to be a minimum of 150 meters from any residential properties. • Ensuring all footpaths are maintained, especially the Lot Way between the Church in Comberton and Toft. • All footpath bridges to also cater for bicycles. • Ensure that all local bus routes remain unaffected. • The need for a construction ombudsman or SCDC representative who can communicate with EWR about issues and concerns raised by residents during the construction phase (estimated to be between 7 and 10 years) so that locals have a voice and to ensure EWR listen. Unlike in Buckinghamshire where EWR completely ignored residents concerns and issues. • Can a footway and cycle path be built alongside the route?
Harston Parish Council and the Harston Residents' Working Group	<u>Reject this route as impractical, costly and of no benefit to Harston</u> • See Map on Section 7 Sheet 3 Option 1 and Option 4 - Option 4 is EWR Co's preferred route for a new road connecting Station and London Road. EWR Co currently intend to run the railway line from an exit of the Haslingfield/Chapel Hill tunnel across and very close to the Western boundary of Harston village, where it then joins the Shelford branch of the Cambridge to London Kings Cross line. At this point on the east side of the village, taking a large bite out of Rowley's Hill, the line may be six tracks wide, which gives some feeling for the scale of the construction works. This is not the best route for a "commuter" passenger service from the West of Cambourne into the Medical Campus. And further, it is not understood why freight would want to travel through Cambridge on a track not designed for it. • The following is therefore suggested: ○ EWR line to be realigned to the north of Cambridge via Northstowe and Waterbeach and comes down the Greater Anglia Line to Cambridge South, and the CBC. This would enable freight to be carried north of Cambridge towards the Ely link towards the east <u>OR</u> ○ EWR line to be realigned via a route south of Cambridge it is not built to take freight – so saving both build cost and the cost and pollution of running freight trains on a badly designed passenger track, and thereby avoiding two passing loops along the track that will further impact Harston negatively. • The current preferred route shown on the map referenced above, with the construction of the EWR two lines and a holding loop wrapping around two sides of the village is much too close to residents' houses and many of the village facilities, and there is a limit to how much mitigation can be put in place to protect Harston's interests, in the widest sense. • It is not understood why there's the need for passing loops at this point when there are no stops between Cambridge South and Cambourne. Any passing loops or parking areas could be created past either end of that section, rather than at the very busy intersection with the Kings Cross mainline. <u>Suggestion from Harston Parish Council that EWR consider moving the projected track approximately 400-500m to the west of Harston</u> • It is suggested that EWR Co conducts a full scale engineering evaluation of the potential to move the proposed line around 400m -500m further to the west, towards Foxton, so that it runs close to Hoffers Brook, and to position the very substantial crossing of the two railway lines (EWR and Kings Cross mainline) a similar distance to the west, so that the crossing falls approximately half way between Harston and Foxton in open country, where it will have much reduced impact. • There are many positive aspects to an EWR route that is moved in this way, both during the construction stage which may last three to five years and operationally thereafter which of course is likely to persist for 50-100 years – the lifetime of the railway. The reasons for moving the line west are identified below: ○ A significant number of houses and businesses will not be subjected to the continuing disruption by construction traffic accessing work areas associated with the EWR track that is currently shown as very close to their dwellings or businesses. In particular: houses on the A10/Royston Rd western exit from the village and Station Road to the east of the village (approximately 40-50 houses on the A10 and Station Rd including Lawrence Lea, Pightle Close and Mill Road); a substantial technology business with many hundreds of jobs at the western end of the village, and directly adjacent to the EWR track; and various businesses and houses on or near the Button End industrial east on the north western side of the village. ○ By moving the track this distance away, it will move much of the expected air, noise and dust pollution away from the village and reduce the incidences of health problems. It has been found in Buckinghamshire that these impacts have been very detrimental to their population who live close to the track. ○ It appears that it would be less generally environmentally damaging to have the EWR line moved this distance away from the village and it should be easier to enable the 10% bio-diversity net gain that EWR has promised, by accessing more appropriate land around the River Rhee crossing and the fields between Harston and Foxton. ○ If the track is moved 400m-500m to the west, the junction of the EWR line and the Kings Cross mainline may then be at the western end of Rowley Hill and will be lower topographically, than it would be if the interchange occurred near the current Station Rd/Newton Road. This may enable significantly lower amounts of spoil to have to be removed, with less HGV traffic and smaller spoil storage areas. It will also allow a road bridge to be used compared to the existing level crossing at that location.

	○ If it is possible to also move the A10 bridge over the EWR track a similar distance, this will ensure that a very high road bridge will not then be built directly on the edge of the village, which will be visible from those living at the West end of the village, and will diminish noise and traffic light pollution; and the even more significant, the impact of air pollution generated from A10 traffic. In reality the A10 continuing pollution and impact on Harston could be more than the railway. ○ This would save building and re-routing alternatives to Station Road as this road and related footpaths could stay on the same alignment although we hope remodelled – a substantial cost saving. ○ It would save travel times and access to both the Harston School and the Harston Surgery in addition to the local businesses and farming enterprises which are all based at that end of the village. A substantial benefit to the local communities both in Harston and the Neighbouring villages that it serves. ○ The only negative would be the marginal increase in actual travel time by rail – this we estimate as a difference of less than one minute at your expected travel speed of 75mph; we submit this is hardly significant for travellers, whom EWR would serve. EWR Co has in the past responded to some requests to move the track, somewhat, at the Western end of its railway, and we would hope they would respond positively to a request from the district council to look at evaluating this track realignment and agreeing to support the changes. • EWR Co to evaluate the potential to build a short loop of new road that would directly join the A10 and Haslingfield Rd, so that traffic (both EWR construction traffic and ordinary vehicle traffic) does not have to travel down the very narrow Church Street and use a restricted weight and narrow bridge over the River Cam/Rhee, which is on the Western side of the village. Such a road may act in a very positive way to enable those who seek to drive from the west, on the A10 towards Haslingfield and Barton, to bypass Harston village. This road could pass from near Hoffers bridge on the A10 across open land to the West to join the current Haslingfield Road near Charity Farm. The distance is approximately 1km. <u>Suggestions in terms of measuring and managing impacts of the construction and operation of the EWR line, should it go ahead</u> • This section deals with the expected disruption to Harston village life that we fear will happen during the construction phase, possibly from as early as 2028, but probably continuing into the mid-2030s. This disruption will affect the A10 and will have a considerable negative impact on the GDP. Reference is made to the Buckinghamshire Council document dated 1 February 2024 titled “East West Rail Progress Report”, which details the areas of negative impact that Buckinghamshire Council residents near the EWR track have experienced during 2023. It is, we feel, very likely to be an accurate guide to what Harston – and all the other villages along the Southern Approach to Cambridge that EWR intends to take – will suffer. As such in our view the document requires your careful consideration. • It is, we believe, imperative that South Cambridgeshire District Council examines areas that it has responsibility for and develops strategies and operational plans for dealing with similar disruptions to residents and businesses in the district. • To help in this process we precis some of these issues below, and urge South Cambridgeshire District Council to plan to measure and manage them (e.g., convene a group of parish councils between Caldecote and Cambridge/Fulbourn): ○ Road closures and traffic management: Especially of concern: HGV movements along inappropriate road and with inappropriate driver behaviour; and diversion routes and closed bridges. Acoustic barriers have also figured in Buckinghamshire to alleviate construction disruption, we might request the same. ○ Road repairs: It is known that EWR HGVs have damaged roads in Buckinghamshire. So, it's both temporary repairs and those that are done permanently at the end of the construction period that matter here. ○ Mud on road: This is a safety Issue for drivers and pedestrians/cyclists. It needs to be monitored and responded to quickly to avoid accidents. ○ Ballast Dust associated with construction: This may be a serious issue given the size of the construction yards around Harston. It's a matter for someone to extract a promise from EWR Co that they will put systems in place to suppress it and not use drinking water for the purpose. ○ Environmental and bio-diversity net gain: The list of environmental hazards would include River Rhee environmental impact of viaduct crossing and silting; impact on water table around Harston both volume and quality; impact on ecology and more broadly on ecosystem and migratory birds on the River (Buckinghamshire Council listed newts, butterflies, bats, birds, badgers, otters and reptiles as species that needed protection all of these are relevant to the EWR track across Cambridgeshire). EWR Co was obliged to plant 500,000 trees to ensure net gain of 10%, their target, we should expect nothing less done in ways that respect the hydrology. ○ Diesel rolling stock: The hybrid passenger trains that EWR Co has foreshadowed are to be welcomed, but diesel remains an issue for the freight trains due to impacts on air pollution, noise pollution and disturbance at night. South Cambridgeshire District Council should seek a no-freight trains policy and if not then demand a restriction on diesel trains to certain hours and no idling engines in passing loops. ○ Compensation: Consideration to be given to the general impact on local businesses, and the daily travelling of residents and employees going about their business. Compensation to residents and business is an area that Buckinghamshire Council have raised with EWR Co Suggestion raised that South Cambridgeshire District Council requests examples of compensation, in which Buckinghamshire Council played a role, so that a similar programme of compensation could be supported. ○ Special officers/marshalls: In addition, Buckinghamshire Council appointed special officers/marshalls to monitor EWR and intervene where necessary. Shouldn't we expect similar employment by your authority. It would be good to get it onto your radar now so that you can budget for the appointments, and it is then funded at the appropriate time.
Great & Little Eversden Parish Council	• Disappointment expressed that SCDC have chosen to not take a position on route alignment, north or south. Given that the majority of new housing in the local plan outside Cambridge city lies to the north, and that the county's transport strategy is aimed at reducing car use, we feel SCDC has missed an important opportunity to get travel infrastructure built AT NO COST TO SCDC to link several of the current and planned new developments via a northern approach into Cambridge.

	• Opposition to route: still think that the Northern approach should be re-examined especially in terms of overall cost, value for money, linking communities, food security and environmental impact. After all, consultation implies the willingness to listen and amend, so if EWR are truly “consulting”, they should be prepared to rethink the route as it becomes clearer how much more costly the southern approach is becoming. • Cost: There is still no clear business case and cost analysis for EWR. New, and very costly, mitigations have been proposed in the latest design including a tunnel at Caldecote and another tunnel under Chapel Hill for example. What effect have all the design changes currently being considered had on the overall cost of Route E, compared to the already cheaper option of a northern approach? Concerns raised that, like HS2, costs will spiral out of control, with the bill ultimately being footed by the taxpayer. • Connectivity: A stated aim of EWR is to provide a route to link workers to jobs and cheaper housing by bringing them in from a greater distance. The Cambridge Local Plan already includes projected growth of 51K homes, with the majority of those located outside the city itself being located in the North and better served by a Northern approach into Cambridge. Additionally, the current Southern approach means many communities affected by the construction of EWR have no easy access to a station. <u>The Eversdens currently have no real public transport links or safe cycleways.</u> EWR Co constantly talks about the improved journey time of 15 minutes from Cambourne to the South Cambridge station, assuming that all commuters taking the train are heading to CBC and ignoring those who work in the Science Parks, the city centre and, of course, the vast majority of the University. The quoted journey time also takes no account of door-to-door travel. Eversden residents have a minimum 20-minute drive to reach Cambourne station for example. Potential mitigations for the Eversdens would be a bus service between Royston and Cambridge and a bus service to Cambourne to catch EWR trains, preferably passing through Comberton as that village also houses a doctor's surgery and shop that residents use. Provision of a safe cycleway/footpath all the way into Comberton (possibly alongside the EWR track?) and another along the A603 to link to the Barton Cyclepath into Cambridge would encourage residents to use sustainable travel options. • Embankments: There has been no change to the height of the embankments passing the Eversdens, if anything as the line approaches the Eversdens from Comberton it is higher than in the previous design, meaning we will be faced with a high embankment for a longer distance than before. One mitigation proposal is to have the A603 pass OVER the railway, instead of the railway passing over the A603, meaning the line could remain at or near ground level all the way from Comberton to the tunnel under Chapel Hill. • Local travel access: This is a big concern. The doctor's surgery is actually a satellite of the Comberton surgery, and many residents often have to travel to Comberton for medical care. Additionally, local shops, Post Office, dentist and both primary and secondary schools are all located in Comberton, as are a variety of leisure activities such as the walking group, college courses etc. Local children travel on school buses to school. There are two main routes into Comberton - Royston Lane and the road from Toft, both of which will be affected by the construction of EWR. Otherwise, travel would be to Barton and back to Comberton, adding considerably to journey times and clogging Barton's roads. Assurances sought that during construction at least one of our two main access routes will always remain open. Additionally, if Royston Lane is the only route open, will the school buses currently in use be able to use that route or will they have to detour through Barton adding considerably to journey times. • Village college: Concern raised at the proximity of the railway to Comberton Village College and the effect it will have on children and their studies. • Local roads: Concerns raised that Royston Lane (connecting the A603 to Comberton village) is already in a state of poor repair and the further effect of heavy construction traffic on it. • Road safety: Where Royston Lane meets the A603 the sight lines are already quite difficult at times. What are EWR's plans to ensure that during construction this is not made worse. • Land take: Large areas of productive farmland are being taken by the railway. This will have a big impact on food security. Every 600 acres taken equates to 30 million breakfasts as the majority of land is prime Grade 2 arable land. The UK will need to import more food once this land is lost, has that been factored into the cost calculations. • Environmental impact: The route near the Eversdens will have a huge detrimental impact on a number of specialised habitats and species, especially the Barbastelle maternity colony, CRT's Westfield farm site that has been managed for over 20 years using wildlife friendly principals and is home to several red listed species, and a 20 year+ wildlife meadow in Lowfields that is not in the path of the railway but which EWR want to take and plant trees on to tick their Biodiversity Net Gain box. Concern raised that many of the mitigations proposed will actually be ineffective. • Freight: Concern raised that freight will still be diesel as the line is not going to be electrified along its entire length. Additionally, diesel trains pulling up an incline to get onto the embankment (from either end) will be noisier (especially at night) and cause considerable vibration and pollution. A binding commitment that diesel traction will not be used is required. • Noise: EWR Co's land department is STILL not able to provide information on how severely properties adjoining the railway will be affected by noise, not only during construction, but, more importantly, once the railway line is operational. This means that homes that may suffer blight from noise are not currently included in any compensation scheme unless the land is actually required for either the railway itself, the construction compounds or for use in Biodiversity Net Gain schemes. This uncertainty is having a detrimental effect on residents' mental health and wellbeing. • Footpath: The only positive so far is that EWR plans to preserve the existing footpath from the Eversdens to Comberton. • No benefit: Essentially it is ‘no gain, all pain’ for The Eversdens.
Harlton Parish Council	Harlton Parish Council's view has not changed since the last non-statutory consultation. We believe that there is no call for this railway to be built. It does not serve the majority of South Cambs, the cost versus benefit is poor, it is at best circuitous, the design is appalling and the threat to our village and surrounding area is palpable. However, if it does go ahead, this route is nonsensical compared with going to the north of Cambridge and serving developing communities such as Cambourne and Northstowe. Issues and objections on the content within this non-statutory consultation are noted below: • There is still an enormous viaduct (c.11 metres high) at the A603 crossing from Eversden to Harlton. This reduces to ground level and a new bridge on the edge of our village will be built. However, the monstrous height of this construction will be a

	visual blight on the landscape. Plus, a bridge on the edge of the village could well be a safety hazard for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. • Not only is the planned railway very close to Harlton, but the land grab by EWR is extensive. A local farmer has estimated that about 100 acres of his land could be taken by EWR. This land would be mainly used for the construction site rather than the railway itself, but unlikely to be returned to prime farmland. In fact, along the whole route from Bedford to Cambridge about 6200 acres could be lost, which equates to nearly 200 million meals every year. • The railway, in its current form is of no use to Harlton residents, or in fact any villages after Cambourne. There are no stops and there are no plans for stops. • EWR plan to cut off/redirect Washpit Lane and cut off the road between Harlton and Haslingfield whilst a bridge is built. There are only three roads in/out of the village. Harlton residents utilise the pre-school, primary school, church, shops and businesses in Haslingfield and the doctor in Harston, plus the secondary school in Comberton. Access, whether in a private vehicle or a bus, to local amenities could be highly disrupted. • The proposed start date for this project is 2028, finishing c. 2035. Residents are deeply concerned about the length of time they will have to live with noise, pollution, disturbance from building and running of the railway. • The effect on wildlife could be catastrophic. In particular, Barbastelle bats, are highly sensitive. Building such a huge embankment will no doubt impact population levels as flight paths will be disrupted. • Harlton residents are troubled by the proposed plans that show storage of construction materials close to the village. This could well add to air, noise and visual pollution, plus be a health danger. • The vast cost of completing the Bedford to Cambridge railway is estimated at £6.6 billion. There still has been no business case to demonstrate its cost effectiveness. • The economic justification for EWR relies on job growth in Cambridge and dependent development. This could include Cambourne, however water scarcity (even with the planned reservoir in the Fens and Grafham transfer pipe) will not be resolved according to consultants Stanstec. Plus, the additional housing EWR is relying on, is not currently in the Local Plan. • Concerns raised that the project is not value for money.
--	---