

East West Rail 2021 Public Consultation Feedback Form

Please use this form to share your views on our consultation on the East West Rail Project.

The feedback we receive during this consultation will be considered as we refine our proposals before seeking government approval for its construction.

For more details about the Project, please refer to our consultation document which can be found online at www.eastwestrail.co.uk.

You can also fill in this form:

- Online at www.eastwestrail.co.uk/feedback
- Return a paper copy to Freepost EAST WEST RAIL
- Scan electronic copy to consultation@eastwestrail.co.uk

For large print copies of this form or versions in alternative languages, please email contact@eastwestrail.co.uk or call 0330 1340067.

Please submit your feedback by 9 June 2021 when this Consultation will close.

You can fill out as many or as few questions as you would like. If you require more space, please attach any extra pages to this form.

The following questions are in the same order as they appear in the Consultation Document. The main headings show which section the questions relate to.

Introduction to the project so far

The approach to Cambridge

1. Please share your view on

Because EWR alignments closer to north Cambridge are now being considered, we have looked again at whether we were right to have favoured Route Option E and approaching Cambridge from the south as we confirmed after our last consultation. In particular, we have reviewed our previous assessment that concluded approaching from the south was the better option taking account of a Cambourne North Station outside of Route E to see if we would have made a different decision. We consider that the advantages of approaching Cambridge from the south continue to support this conclusion and that a number of challenges remain for a northern approach even with a Cambourne North station. We'd welcome your comments on our assessment.

Roxton Parish Council (RPC) believe that due to the insufficiently detailed information available during 2019 consultation on route options A, B, C, D & E that the selection of route E is flawed. RPC believe that parishioners were misled by the costing information available in 2019 stating route E as the most expensive leading them to assume EWR would not pick the most expensive route resulting in a low response rate. 7,000 responses from a population in excess of 400,000 does not constitute widespread public engagement therefore any conclusion drawn from 1.3% of the population does not represent public opinion.

During RPC's public consultation events in March – April 2021 the majority of attendees confirmed they did not receive any EWR post cards announcing the 2019 consultation. EWR should publish the un-redacted list of postcodes EWR claim were sent post cards. The 1.3% response rate to the 2019 consultation does not constitute widespread public engagement and therefore the 2019 consultation was flawed and the subsequent selection of route E is flawed.

The continued lack of detailed visual information in the 2021 consultation has resulted in public confusion hindering public understanding of the proposed alignments and therefore hindering public engagement in the process. RPC and local resident groups have prepared their own visual material to aid our parishioners understanding of alignments 1, 2, 6, 8 & 9.

Customer experience and railway operations

The train service

2. Please share your views on:

- How you might use EWR services - for example for work, to visit friends and family, or to get to leisure destinations?
- Based on your experience of rail travel in the UK what do you think are the main areas that could be improved?
- If you don't currently travel by rail, what are the reasons for this? Is there anything that would persuade you to use rail services?
- Are there ways in which we could help improve your entire journey? For example:
 - How and where you research your trip
 - The actual rail journey itself
 - Getting from your home at the start of the journey, to the point that you reach your end destination
- How could we support our net zero carbon ambitions through the delivery of services to customers? For example, through the design of stations, the trains we operate or through forms of active travel, for example cycling or walking.

Following public meetings and survey residents of Roxton have advised they are unlikely to use the EWR service as the improved access to Cambridge by road will be cheaper and more direct to places of leisure and work in Bedford and Cambridge.

As there are no proposed roads, cycle route or footpaths linking Roxton to the proposed St Neots South/Tempsford North station there is no easy access to EWR.

Residents of Roxton believe travel by rail does not represent value for money and for many the cost excludes them from using rail services.

Residents of Roxton do not use rail because it is not convenient and it is expensive when you include the cost of parking.

To meet your net zero carbon ambitions EWR should be electrified from the start, EWR should also provide free secure covered cycle parking at all stations; EWR should also provide cycle/footpath routes from surrounding residential areas to all stations; EWR should also provide free parking and charging to electric vehicle users.

The lack of Environmental Impact Assessment of routes A, B, C, D & E means the impact of the environment was not fully assessed, therefore the choice of route E is flawed.

Station experience

3. Please share your views on:

- Thinking about your experience of stations, how would you like your rail journey to link with other parts of your journey? For example, arriving or leaving the station on foot, by bike, car, or bus.
- How can station forecourts and approaches be designed to offer the most convenient access for walking, cycling and bus services?
- What sort of facilities would you like to see at stations – both those that contribute to the overall journey experience, as well as those that might serve a wider community purpose?
- Are there any particularly good examples, either in the UK or abroad, of stations with good facilities or facilities for changing between different transport modes?
- Are there specific factors that you would like us to consider that may improve safety and security at stations?
- How can stations be better designed to manage customer flows around the station environment?
- How can customers be guided through the station experience (Particularly during busy periods)?
- How should we ensure inclusivity, for example in terms of accessibility and the broader station experience?

When arriving at a destination free access to bus service to take you to the heart of Cambridge would be essential for leisure users and free access to bus services to take you to surrounding employment centres would be essential for workers.

Free changing facilities and free secure parking would be essential for cyclists to encourage their use of any rail service.

Station forecourts should be accessible in the following order of priority 1st foot, 2nd cycle, 3rd bus, 4th taxi and 5th private car drop off.

4. Please share your views on:

- How can we create an engaging environment that suits the unique needs of our customers, for example, working effectively, relaxing or being entertained?
- What types of things should we put in place to create a clean, safe and secure environment for you and your belongings on your train journey?
- What facilities and services would provide the optimal train experience for customers on the EWR route?
- What types of areas/spaces would you like to see on EWR trains beyond seating and standing space?
- What on-train experience(s) might encourage customers to switch to rail from other modes of transport?
- Are there any examples, either from the UK or from abroad, of good seating layouts or on-train facilities?
- How might we consider sustainability in the on-train environment?
- How can the on-train environment support customers' wellbeing throughout their journey?



Interaction with colleagues

5. Please share your views on:

- What types of attitudes and behaviours would you like to see our staff displaying to make your experience with EWR a positive one? This may relate to contact you have online, over the phone, at the station or on the train.
- How and where would you like to have access to staff members on your journey and why? Again, this may relate to virtual support or face to face contact.



Customer information

6. Please share your views on:

- What sort of information do you find most critical when you are making a train journey?
- What ways of communicating travel information do you think will be most effective as you arrive at the station or on the train?
- Are there other types of travel information, not directly relating to the train journey, that you think it would be valuable for EWR to provide before or during your journey?
- How could we provide better or different customer information, to help our customers be more relaxed and feel in control throughout their journey?



Section B: Bletchley and the Marston Vale Line

10. What do you think is important to consider when developing our proposals for the Bletchley and the Marston Vale Line area?

In particular, what do we need to take account of:

- a. In relation to the existing stations on the Marston Vale Line and whether they should be kept open or consolidated through closure and relocation
- b. When we provide alternatives to existing level crossings
- c. In delivering the improvements to the Marston Vale Line
- d. In delivering works to Bletchley station
- e. In relation to the impact of reinstating a second track between Bletchley and Fenny Stratford.



11. Please rank your preference for the proposed options for the existing stations on the Marston Vale Line.

Please use a scale of 1 to 2 to indicate your preferences where 1 indicates your preferred option and 2 the option you favour least.

Options	Option 1: retain existing service (in a modified form) and introduce limited-stop Oxford to Cambridge services alongside it, calling at Woburn Sands and Ridgmont	Option 2: provide a more frequent, faster service with some new and relocated stations and improved community access
Option preference ranking		

Please provide us with your view on the options for the level crossings on the Marston Vale Line:

13. Fenny Stratford: vehicular traffic – three options	
14. Fenny Stratford: pedestrians and other non-vehicular road users – three options	
15. Bow Brickhill (V10 Brickhill Street) – four options	
16. Browns Wood – three options	
17. Pony – three options	
18. Woburn Sands existing crossings – two options	
19. Aspley Guise and Husborne Crawley level crossings – two options	
20. Husborne Crawley Footpath No. 10 and Station Road in Ridgmont level crossings – three options	

21. Lidlington level crossings – two options	
22. Millbrook (Station Lane) – three options	
23. Green Lane – two options	
24. Wootton Broadmead (Broadmead Road) – two options	
25. Wootton Village – one option	
26. Kempston Hardwick – three options	
27. Woburn Road – two options	
28. Bedford Carriage Sidings – options to be developed at the next stage	

29. Please rank your preference for the proposed options for the Marston Vale Line upgrade.

Please use a scale of 1 to 3 to indicate your preferences where 1 indicates your preferred option and 3 the option you favour least.

Options	Option 1: series of short blockades	Option 2: a prolonged blockade	Option 3: a mix of short and long blockades
Option preference ranking			

30. Please tell us why you have ranked the proposed Marston Vale Line upgrade options above as you have and provide any other comments.

31. Please rank your preference for the proposed options for the Fenny Stratford additional track.

Please use a scale of 1 to 2 to indicate your preferences where 1 indicates your preferred option and 2 the option you favour least.

Options	Option 1: building new bridges next to the existing bridges to carry the new track	Option 2: replacing the existing bridges with wider bridges that would carry both tracks
Option preference ranking		

32. Please tell us why you have ranked the proposed Fenny Stratford additional track options above as you have and provide any other comments.

Section C: Bedford

33. What do you think is important to consider when developing our proposals for the Bedford area?

In particular, what do we need to take account of:

- a. Regarding changes to Bedford St Johns station and the area around it
- b. Regarding changes to Bedford station and the area around it
- c. Regarding our emerging preferred option for the area to the north of Bromham Road bridge (North Bedford).

- a) The location of Bedford St Johns station is of little benefit to residents of Roxton; it will still be easier and cheaper to visit the hospital by car, taxi or bus
- b) The proposed changes to Bedford Midland will have no benefit to residents of Roxton.
- c) The proposed 6 track option north of Bromham Road Bridge is not supported by RPC due the unfair loss of people's homes.

Overall the quality of the mapping material provided in this consultations does not allow an informed assessment of the all three questions.

34. Please rank your preference for the proposed options for Bedford St Johns station.

Please use a scale of 1 to 2 to indicate your preferences where 1 indicates your preferred option and 2 the option you favour least.

Options	Option 1: relocating Bedford St Johns station to the west	Option 2: relocating Bedford St Johns station to the south
Option preference ranking	1	2

35. Please tell us why you have ranked the proposed Bedford St Johns options above and provide any other comments.

Proximity to hospital

36. What do you think is important to consider when developing our emerging preferred option for Bedford station?

Loss of housing from any 6 track solution is unacceptable.

Private car use towards town centre stations will increase as a result of increased rail use; this would be avoided with an out of town EWR station as is happening elsewhere around Oxford & Cambridge.

The negative financial impact from construction disruption over the 5year construction stage should be factored into any financial appraisal of the proposed route E. The mediocre GVA gain to the Bedford economy does not justify the negative environmental damage of route E and its alignments 8 & 9.

37. What do you think is important to consider when developing our emerging preferred option for the area north of Bromham Road bridge (North Bedford)?

The cost of subsidiary works required to facilitate the route through the town centre should be factored into any economic appraisal of the project. There will be up to 5years of disruption through construction works to the town and surrounding rural area. This disruption will be to homes; businesses; livelihoods; mental health; access to work & leisure; access to the rural countryside all of which are not outweighed by the mediocre GVA uplift.

Section D: Clapham Green to The Eversdens

38. Please rank your preference for the proposed Clapham Green to The Eversdens alignment options.

Please use a scale of 1 to 5 to indicate your preferences where 1 indicates your preferred option and 5 the option you favour least.

Options	Alignment 8 – yellow: Tempsford Option B station to Cambourne South station	Alignment 1 – dark blue: St Neots South Option A station and a Cambourne North station	Alignment 2 – red: St Neots South Option A station and a Cambourne South station	Alignment 6 – light blue: St Neots South Option B station and a Cambridge South station	Alignment 9 – purple: Tempsford Option A station to Cambourne North station
Option preference ranking	5	1	2	3	4

39. Please tell us why you have ranked the proposed alignment options above and provide any other comments.

In considering the proposed alignments RPC have assessed the routes in two broad camps routes 1, 2 & 6 running north of Roxton and alignments 8 & 9 running south of Roxton. Following two public meetings and two surveys of parishioners 97% of residents are against alignments 8 & 9. RPC & Roxton Residents Group Against EWR have identified 18 issues where alignments 8 & 9 negatively affect Roxton more than alignments 1, 2 & 6. The full list of these can be seen in our appendix A which also includes all the individually different comments received during our two public meetings.

A key concerns of RPC and its parishioners is how alignments 8 & 9 will land lock Roxton by road and rail. Roxton has suffered many decades of noise & air pollution and disruption from the A1, A421 and Black Cat. The proximity of alignments 8 & 9 will result in all 250 dwellings in Roxton being trapped by road & rail, trapped by noise and air pollution; trapped by 9m to 12m embankments and concrete viaducts. The rural character of Roxton will be destroyed by all 250 households by alignments 8 & 9. For these reasons as well as the full list of reasons highlighted in Appendix A RPC and its parishioners are against alignments 8 & 9.

RPC believe it will cause less harm to Roxton if EWR alignments followed ran north of the A421 & Black Cat; this would allow the new A421 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet elevated road and round about to partly screen Roxton from EWR alignments 1, 2 or 6.

RPC are a member of the BFARe group and fully support their campaign to re-run the 2019 consultation with full detailed information of route corridors A, B, C, D & E.

Section F: The Shelfords to Cambridge station

41. What do you think is important to consider when developing our proposals for the The Shelfords and Cambridge area?

In particular, what do we need to take account of:

- a. In relation to our options for the Hauxton Road level crossing
- b. In relation to our proposed modifications to the Shepreth Junction
- c. In relation to our emerging preferred option to increase the existing railway line between Shepreth Junction and Addenbrooke's bridge from two tracks to four tracks
- d. In relation to our emerging preferred option to increase the existing railway line between Long Road Sixth Form College and Cambridge station from two/three tracks to four tracks
- e. Anything we should consider at Cambridge station.



We will collect and process the information you provide to us in order to record and analyse any feedback or questions you raise during the Consultation. If you give us personal information about other people you must first make sure that you have obtained all necessary permission from that person for you to pass this information on to us. We may need to share personal information with third parties which could include public bodies and third parties working with us on the Project. You have the right to object to the processing of your personal data in certain circumstances and you may ask us to delete your personal information if you believe that we do not have the right to hold it. For further information in relation to how we process personal data, please see our Personal Information Charter at www.eastwestrail.co.uk/personal-information-charter

And finally, please tell us a bit about yourself

Title: Mr Full Name: Justin Griffiths

Address: 15 Ford Lane, Roxton,

Postcode: MK44 3EL

Telephone: 07867540750

Email: justin.jpgarchitects@gmail.com

Organisation (if applicable): Roxton Parish Council

Please select the option that best represents the capacity in which you are responding to this consultation. I am a:

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| ☐ Local resident | ☐ Commuter to the area | ☐ Visitor to the area |
| ☐ Local business owner | ☐ Future resident | ☒ Elected representative |
| ☐ Local authority | ☐ Statutory body | ☐ land/property owner |
| ☐ Other
(please specify): Chair of
Roxton Parish Council | | |

☐ Age range (choose one):

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ☐ 18 and under | ☐ 19-34 | ☐ 35-50 |
| ☒ 51-65 | ☐ Over 65 | |

Would you like to receive further information from East West Rail as the proposals develop? By selecting 'yes' you consent to us contacting you with occasional information and updates about East West Rail.

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

ROXTON PARISH COUNCIL FEEDBACK FORM 2021

APPENDIX A

Roxton Parish Council notes from public meetings

Held on 25th April 2021 and 29th April 2021

To discuss East West Rail

During the open air meeting held on the 25th April 70 households attended.

During the online meeting held on the 29th April 15 households attended.

In no particular order below are the comments made by parishioners to parish councillors at the public meetings on the 25th and 29th April 2021:

1. Wixams was promised a station, why has that not happened?
2. We will end up paying for this through our council tax.
3. All footpaths will be unusable.
4. Landlocked village.
5. House price will be effected, decrease.
6. Pollution, air quality, concerns regarding asthmatics residents (this point was a major concern for all those who attended).
7. Where will the access road be for all construction lorries?
8. Why have they not chosen the cheaper route?
9. What compensation are we going to get?
10. Still a lot of residents adamant they have never been informed about the original 2019 consultation.
11. Village will be ruined visibly.
12. Cost again, how can they justify it, no need for trains, everyone working from home, due to Covid?
13. HS2 objections completely ignored so it will happen to us?
14. No option on consultation to say no preferred route.

15. A few villages have just moved in and this never appeared on the house search, why?
16. It must be electrified.
17. How can it be built on a flood plain?
18. When do we find out the final decision?
19. Where is the earth coming from to build?
20. Noise, how will this be addressed?
21. Will it be a concrete wall?
22. Over 95% of attendees to both meetings objected to route alignments 8 and 9.
23. Current Network Rail policies require all new rail lines to be electrified, was is EWR not following its own industry policy?
24. Tarmac Trading Limited are significantly against route alignments 8 & 9 as it prevents them fulfilling their obligations under the Gravel Extraction Plan by sterilising designated sites in the Mineral Extraction Plan.
25. Residents would like help in completing the 2021 consultation response.
26. The consultation documents are too vague and lack any detail to allow people to understand what the embankments and viaducts will look like.
27. The consultation period should be extended pass the 21st June to allow for face to face consultation post lifting of national Covid restrictions.
28. Route alignments 8 & 9 will result in the unacceptable loss of significant amounts of prime agricultural land damaging the viability of rural businesses.
29. The land left between the embankments of route alignment 8 & 9 and dwellings will not be viable to use as farm land due to access or size.
30. The viaducts on route alignments 8 & 9 will damage the viability of the fishing lakes near Lock Cottage.
31. Route alignments 8 & 9 will result in the loss of wildlife habitats for row-deer, monk jack deer, badgers, rabbits, field mice, door mice, newts, frogs, pheasants, wood pigeons, doves, collard doves, yellow hammers, green woodpeckers, lesser spotted woodpeckers and many more small wild birds and insects of all types.
32. Route alignments 8 & 9 will result in significant adverse visual impact to all residents of Roxton.
33. Route alignments 1, 2 & 6 will result in significant adverse visual impact to residents of Roxton living along or near the C44 (old A421).
34. The consultation documents are over whelming.

35. The maps are insufficiently detailed to appreciate how close the alignments will run to people's homes.
36. EWR have not provided any visuals illustrating what the embankments and viaducts would look like; these will improve people's understanding of the impact.
37. Route alignments 8 & 9 is result in Roxton being a landlocked village.
38. Route alignments 8 & 9 will result in the loss of much used footpaths.
39. Route alignments 8 & 9 will cut off access to bridleways and footpaths to the wider countryside.
40. Route A from the 2019 consultation runs partly along the disused lengths of rail tracks that could be reinstated.
41. It appears the information provided during the 2019 consultation has been manipulated.
42. Why did Route E become cheaper after the 2019 consultation closed?
43. Was the Kilborn report biased?
44. Who is paying for this e.g. council tax?
45. There is no commitment in this 2021 consultation to maintain afterwards.
46. The new railway will make Bedford a ghost town, as passengers will go to Oxford and Cambridge and will not visit Bedford.
47. Concern over noise, sleep patterns, mental health.
48. Tarmac, gravel extract, will they oppose 8&9 blocks all their access to gravel.
49. Public need to be informed they do not need to do consultation form they can email or just write in objections. By law any comment is as good as a consultation.
50. We need to help the villagers by writing a letter as before where they can just sign and date.
51. No environmental study carried out. Need environmental impact statement. A full 4 seasons worth, not just one month. We can challenge this. Green Woodpeckers, beer badgers, wildlife, protected trees etc. Build up case.
52. Alternative motive, very bad consultation, why?
53. Highways England good, EWR not good. Why?
54. Needs to be stated that the first consultation was not open to all, not everyone able to access online.
55. Need to consider joining forces with local parish councils.
56. Great Barford have done an idiot proof guide, freepost we might need to consider this.
57. Wixams should have the train line they were promised residents moved there because they assumed it was happening.

58. Costing, Cleat hill, Wilden big hills, the route has not been costed correctly.

59. Bedford is NOT THE HUB for tourism.

In addition to above RPC have the following comments/question?

- i. While RPC remain convinced the 2019 consultation should be rerun and that Route Corridor E is not the right route for EWR we recognise the need to assess alignments 1, 2, 6, 8 & 9 in terms of their impacts on Roxton; hence the following comments ii to xvii.
- ii. With respect to Roxton versus Wyboston alignments 8 & 9 will pass within 200m of 20 dwellings including a grade II listed property while alignments 1, 2 & 6 will pass within 200m of 10 dwellings and no listed properties.
- iii. With respect to Roxton versus Wyboston alignments 8 & 9 will pass within 1km of 250 dwellings including 19 grade II listed properties and the conservation area of Roxton, while alignments 1, 2 & 6 will pass within 1km of 45 dwellings and 12 grade II listed properties and no conservation area.
- iv. With respect to Roxton versus Wyboston alignments 8 & 9 will block long distance views south towards Cardington across the Ouse Valley Way from Roxton, while alignments 1, 2 & 6 will not block this view.
- v. With respect to Roxton versus Wyboston alignments 8 & 9 will close rural footpaths and bridleways towards the River Great Ouse while alignments 1, 2 & 6 will not.
- vi. With respect to Roxton versus Wyboston alignments 8 & 9 will need to cross the A421, C44, 2 farm tracks, 2 footpaths, 1 bridleway, the river Great Ouse and the A1 while alignments 1, 2 & 6 will need to cross Bedford Road, 2 farm tracks, 2 footpaths, 1 bridleway, the A1 and river Great Ouse on the far side of the side the A1.
- vii. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would have a major improvement on air quality while alignment 9 would be neutral.
- viii. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would have a major improvement on air quality while alignment 9 would see minor improvement.
- ix. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would have a minor improvement on ecology & biodiversity while alignment 9 would have minor worsening.

- x. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would have minor improvement on landscape & visual character while alignment 9 would be neutral.
- xi. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would have minor improvement on noise & vibration while alignment would be neutral.
- xii. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would impact on 1,100 dwellings within 500m while alignment 9 would impact on 1,509 dwellings.
- xiii. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would clash with 0 ancient woodlands within 50m while alignment 9 would clash with 5 ancient woodlands.
- xiv. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 would clash with 17 priority habitats while alignment 9 would clash with 22.
- xv. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 will be within 250m of 87,742sqm of ancient woodland while alignment 9 would be within 250m of 251,452sqm of ancient woodland.
- xvi. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 will require 9,700m of noise mitigation measure while alignment 9 will require 12,500m.
- xvii. According to technical documents issued by EWR in support of the 2019 consultation alignment 1 will pass through 43,769sqm of flood plain while alignment 9 will pass through 82,084sqm of flood plain.
- xviii. RPC object to Tempsford Stations A & B as there are no means for Roxton residents to access these locations by road, cycle or footpath.
- xix. At BBC public meetings held on 12th & 13th May Mr Jon Shortland justified the strength of the BBC case for a 4 track solution through Bedford by referring to the fact that Networks Rails analysis in 2019 also backed the 4 track solution. Our question here is why was Network Rails analysis in 2019 that a southern route is preferable was not given the same weight by BBC & EWR?
- xx. A volunteer group of Roxton residents carried out an online & paper survey asking parishioners their preference of alignment 1 or 9, the results are as follows:
 - a. Number of responses: 54
 - b. Number in favour of alignment 1: 49

- c. Number in favour of alignment 9: 2
- d. Number of no preferred alignment: 3