

## East West Rail 2024 Non-statutory Consultation – assessment of EWR response to Bedford Borough Council’s recommendations

*NB questions where we gave no response, or that requested contact information etc. are not listed here.*

Bedford Borough Council consultation response	EWR updated plans
<b>Q7 – preferred option for Marston Vale Line stations</b>	
Preference for Option 2 (consolidated stations); new consolidated station combining Stewartby and Kempston Hardwick.	EWR is now making firm proposals to consolidate the stations on the MVL.
<b>Q9 – preferred location for Stewartby station</b>	
Preference for Option 2 site, north of Broadmead Road, which would serve new housing on Kempston Hardwick Brickworks and Stewartby Brickworks sites.	EWR has selected Option 2 as the location for the station, and directly cite our preference for it as one of the reasons. Work to determine its exact position relative to the Universal development is ongoing.
First mile / last mile solution required for students and staff at Kimberley College.	New walking and cycling routes to destinations including Kimberley College are proposed, and discussions ongoing with bus operators and local authorities about bus access.
Sustainable travel arrangements required to provide safe walking and cycling to and from Stewartby village and the new housing developments.	EWR response directly recognises these needs (detailed proposals to follow).
<b>Q10 – comments on proposals for level crossings</b>	
Generally support closing level crossings and replacing with bridges.	EWR is revisiting its proposals on level crossings in light of Universal and increase in planned frequency of trains. More details to follow in 2026; direction of travel is likely to be towards replacing more level crossings with bridges.
Non-motorised users must be provided for fully, including equestrians in more rural areas.	Referenced in glossaries in consultation response report.
Proposal to keep some of the crossings open is a retrograde step. We question the data and analysis used to support the proposal.	EWR is revisiting its proposals on level crossings in light of Universal and increase in planned frequency of trains. More details to follow in

	2026; direction of travel is likely to be towards replacing more level crossings with bridges.
Green Lane level crossing: we require a bridge, to accommodate traffic growth due to new development	Awaiting detailed proposals in 2026.
Stewartby level crossing: closure acceptable if bridge provided	Awaiting detailed proposals in 2026.
Broadmead Road: we require a bridge, to accommodate traffic growth due to new development	Awaiting detailed proposals in 2026.
Wootton Village: proposed closure of crossing and diversion of footpath to Kempston Hardwick crossing is acceptable, provided a safe route along Manor Road is provided (currently there's no footway).	Awaiting detailed proposals in 2026.
Kempston Hardwick (Manor Road): we require a bridge	Awaiting detailed proposals in 2026.
Woburn Road: we require closure and replacement with bridge	Awaiting detailed proposals in 2026.
<b>Q11 – Further comments on Fenny Stratford to Kempston section</b>	
Passing loops between Ridgmont and Stewartby: exact nature of requirements is unclear from consultation documents, but all potential locations would require land from development sites. We would therefore support the loops being situated outside Bedford Borough.	Increase in planned frequency of passenger trains requires further work on passing loop proposals. More details to follow in 2026 consultation.
Noise mitigation measures will be necessary in proximity to the two ex-brickworks sites.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
Construction compound on Stewartby brickworks site should be located elsewhere.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We request early sight of detailed carbon assessment and mitigation measures.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
Design and mitigation must follow design guidance for the Forest and Local Plan Policies 36S Forest of Marston Vale and 37 Landscape Character and the adopted SPD	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We require construction on the MVL section to be undertaken quickly, using a blockade that will close the line temporarily.	No specific reference in consultation response report.

Connectivity for active travel should include both secure and free bike storage at stations	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We believe EWR's modelling underestimates likely traffic on the A421, especially at the eastern A6 junction; EWR should model and mitigate these traffic impacts more effectively.	EWR has been working to develop its modelling of both construction and operational impacts.
<b>Q12 – comments about proposals in the Bedford route section</b>	
<b>Bedford St Johns station area</b>	
Any trees that are removed should be replaced on the basis of two new trees for every one lost.	EWR will avoid and mitigate tree loss as much as possible. Re-provision will be within the local authority area, and close to the original site, as much as possible. No confirmation on 2-for-1 policy.
Buildings and facilities for St Johns station should be on the same side of the railway as the hospital, not the opposite side as proposed.	EWR's proposal is now more along these lines, with buildings spread across both sides of the railway and on the island platform. Still more building on the north side than the south, but with road access only on the south / hospital side. A footbridge, free for public use, will link the two sides of the railway over the new St Johns station.
Vehicular access to the station should not be via Melbourne Street, through our South of the River development site, as proposed.	Proposal for vehicular access via Melbourne St dropped.
New St Johns station building should be delivered to BREEAM 'excellent' standard to minimise operational carbon.	EWR is committing to BREEAM excellent standard for all buildings in CS2 and CS3
New MSCP should be delivered to BREEAM 'excellent' standard.	EWR is committing to BREEAM excellent standard for all buildings in CS2 and CS3
MSCP design should incorporate renewable energy	In line with national energy strategy and local planning policy, the scheme will seek to incorporate renewable energy solutions to minimise operational carbon.
We support the new MSCP as a more efficient use of space. Charges applied must be appropriate for both railway and hospital users, and there must be enough provision for both.	
Construction will need to be phased so that there is enough parking for hospital users at all stages. Car parking spaces	EWR's design meets the hospital needs, subject to any further requirements put forward by the hospital (discussions ongoing).

taken to allow construction must be re-provided within walking distance before work begins.	
We require the integration of cycle parking into the MSCP.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
The new MSCP must be in place before existing parking is removed.	EWR has confirmed this will be the sequence.
If the railway in this area is lowered, suitable flood prevention and mitigation measures will be essential.	EWR agrees and will adopt appropriate solutions in areas of flood risk.
Reconstruction works to Ampthill Road and Cauldwell Street bridges, if required, will need careful phasing to minimise impacts.	Major works on Cauldwell St and Ampthill Rd bridges now not proposed; lesser works may still be needed to renew fabric of structures.
We require early sight of the proposed timeline for these works, if they are needed.	Major works on Cauldwell St and Ampthill Rd bridges now not proposed; lesser works may still be needed to renew fabric of structures; could still require road closures.
Proposed new access to Cauldwell Close from Holme Street is not suitable.	Reconfiguration of road layout at Cauldwell St no longer proposed.
We support the use of discontinuous electrification to minimise long-term disruption from bridge reconstruction works.	Discontinuous electrification will be deployed on this basis.
Access from Kempston to the hospital across the railway must be maintained for non-motorised users at all times, even if it requires a temporary bridge.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
Construction materials should be brought in by rail when possible, to minimise impact of construction traffic on the roads.	No proposals advanced to shift balance of deliveries from HGV to rail.
Congestion in the area of the hospital cannot be allowed to increase to the point where it puts the care and treatment of patients at risks	No specific reference in consultation response report.
The design of the new St Johns station must consider access for all users, and prioritise people on foot, wheelchair and cycle.	Pedestrian bridge will include lift access; new station will incorporate links to cycle and pedestrian routes.
<b>Bedford Midland Station area</b>	
We support the relocation of the Jowett Sidings to Cauldwell Walk: this avoids using a green field site, and reduces noise compared to the current scrap metal facility.	This remains EWR's proposal.

We do not support the use of the truncated remains of the existing Jowett sidings for stabling EWR trains; this should be made available as a development site, in line with Local Plan 2030.	This proposal is being reviewed as part of a wider depots and stabling strategy. Outcome not yet available.
We support the proposed platform arrangements for EWR and Thameslink.	This remains EWR's proposal.
The proposals fail to include a dedicated up (southbound) fast platform for East Midlands trains, as recommended by Network Rail; this must be constructed as part of the EWR scheme.	EWR are now considering a dedicated up fast platform, which will facilitate the restoration of intercity train services to Bedford. (Their proposed design differs from Network Rail's earlier proposal by extending platform 3 out to meet the up fast line.)
Relocation of the station buildings southwards to a site immediately accessible from Midland Road is a long-standing aspiration of the Council.	EWR's revised station proposal involved moving the station buildings somewhat further south than at present, though their proposed 'plaza' is not envisaged to direct pedestrian flow so directly to Midland Road. However, it leaves the specifics of development to others, so there is still scope to shape this area.
The creation of a 'station plaza' remains an aspiration of the Council, and we support the proposal for a 'plaza' area at the southern end of the site.	EWR's revised station proposal involves a larger plaza area than previously proposed; its location is less focused towards Midland Road, but considerable scope remains for shaping this development. EWR have met our requirement, but our recommendation was on the basis of the Ashburnham Road properties remaining in place, as EWR had been proposing.
A new MSCP on Ashburnham Road could have an adverse effect, and dominate an otherwise residential street. We support the replacement and consolidation of car parking provision, but would be willing to work with EWRCo to find better locations.	EWR proposes to move the MSCP to the west of the Ford End Road Bridge, leaving the Ashburnham Road area free for more suitable development.
Pick-up and drop-off facilities must be maintained at the station throughout construction.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
The proposed temporary car park must be in place before the closure of existing parking.	This temporary location is now the proposed permanent location. It would in any case be the first thing built as part of the Bedford Midland station works.
Walking distance from the temporary location to the station entrance is around 650m. Impacts must be considered for those	EWR now proposes a western entrance.

with mobility difficulties, heavy luggage or young children. A western entrance to the station would mitigate this, and we want to see it included in the proposals.	
We support the proposed footbridge provision at the station; all bridges must include lifts as well as stairs.	New station proposal includes one central bridge, with lifts.
New Midland station building should be delivered to BREEAM 'excellent' standard to minimise operational carbon.	EWB is committing to BREEAM excellent standard for all buildings in CS2 and CS3.
The station building may also offer the opportunity for using new standards, eg UK Net Zero Carbon Buildings Standard	EWB is committing to BREEAM excellent standard for all buildings in CS2 and CS3.
Early consideration should be given to station and platform access design, to accommodate passengers bringing bikes with them.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We support the use of discontinuous electrification to (potentially) minimise the need for engineering work on the Ford End Road bridge. Works to modify the bridge, if needed, would need to be carefully co-ordinated to avoid or minimise traffic disruption. We would require early sight of the timeline for these works.	Discontinuous electrification will be deployed on this basis. Work can be completed without demolition on Ford End Road Bridge, subject to condition of the structure.
In the event that the Bromham Road bridge is modified, the current pinch-point for cyclists should be made safer, either by widening the bridge or by providing a parallel bridge on the southern side.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
If the Bromham Road bridge is modified, the Council will insist on adequate safe provision for cyclists during the works.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
<b>Poets and 4 tracks / 6 tracks</b>	
The consultation does not address any points raised in the SLC report for Bedford BC, and restates the need for additional tracks. Incredibly disappointing.	No further work to address our analysis has been undertaken.
The magnitude of performance benefits from the additional tracks need to be weighed against the negative impacts from their construction.	No such evaluation has been carried out.

We do not believe the additional tracks are necessary, and object to the proposed demolitions on this basis.	EWR still proposes to build extra tracks.
Revised track configuration in Bedford station could enable freight trains to be held, and reduce the conflicts that EWR proposes to address instead with its extra tracks. A more detailed engineering and timetabling study is required to determine whether such a solution might be feasible.	EWR have not undertaken any such work. Their proposal for extra tracks does not address the core problem of north-south freight movements into the congested infrastructure on the Midland Main Line south of Bedford.
We insist that the proposed compound on the former St Bede's School field development site (North of Beverley Crescent) is relocated elsewhere	This site will be needed for a temporary compound. It will not be needed for permanent features as previously proposed (balancing pond etc.). There will be a permanent requirement for access.
<b>Clapham area</b>	
Construction of the viaduct involving night working and floodlights poses significant risks to commuting or foraging bats	Design work in this area has been done with ecologists, to maintain permeability for bats and other species, and mitigate lost habitats. Data being gathered. Details not yet shared.
The viaduct will need to be developed sensitively in relation to its surrounding landscape. Its design must be bespoke in order to achieve this	No specific reference in consultation response report.
EWRCO must conduct a full flooding assessment and make it available for review by our consultants before designs are finalised.	Flood assessment is in progress.
The impact of diverting utilities as part of the viaduct construction must be assessed as part of the environmental statement and through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	EWR has done further work on its environmental mitigation and utilities diversions in this area.
Any temporary closures on the Great Ouse Way, Paula Radcliffe Way and Clapham Road must be carefully coordinated to manage their impact.	Consultation response report refers to refining highways designs to address concerns about disruption.
The new bridge to carry the Great Ouse Way over the railway must be able to accommodate a dual carriageway.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
<b>Highway network in Bedford</b>	

Closures and other disruption to traffic will have a negative impact on the local economy. We require early sight of the proposed timelines for all such works.	Consultation response report refers to refining highways designs to address concerns about disruption.
EWRCO should pursue electrification options that minimise the requirements for reconstruction of bridges.	Discontinuous electrification will be deployed on this basis
<b>Environmental and sustainability</b>	
Linear projects can cut through significant bat commuting routes: EWRCO should conduct the relevant surveys to understand the impacts.	Work ongoing on connections for wildlife, including improving bat flight corridors.
<b>Active travel and door to door connectivity</b>	
Measures must be introduced to reduce the need for rail users to drive to Bedford and Bedford St Johns stations. This would reduce the parking required at both stations	Plans referenced for active travel access to stations along the route.
There is an opportunity to review access to the rail network to the south of Bedford more broadly, with the EWR changes and opening of Wixams station.	Plans referenced for active travel access to stations along the route.
<b>Community benefits and impacts</b>	
The significant benefits of the project for Bedford, boosting GVA by over £13M, need to be considered against the negative impacts, including the impacts on residential properties, and on businesses during construction.	EWR maintain that the benefits and impacts are being analysed in line with DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance. No specific new analysis has been presented.
<b>Noise</b>	
Visually acceptable acoustic fencing, or other suitable forms of mitigation, should be provided to reduce impacts on residential properties and other sensitive receptors.	Acoustic mitigation will be integrated into the design when found to be needed. Could include acoustic barriers, retained cuttings or other measures. Visual impact will be considered.
Detailed noise modelling will need to be undertaken to determine where mitigation will be required, including in rural areas that currently have very low background noise levels.	Detailed noise modelling is being developed as part of the assessment of operational impact. Noise impact of construction will also be assessed.
We expect to see assessments of the impact of both the construction and implementation phases of the project.	Detailed noise modelling is being developed as part of the assessment of operational impact. Noise impact of construction will also be assessed.



Construction should be programmed to avoid night-time and weekend working except where absolutely necessary; in these cases, measures to reduce noise, dust and vibration should be implemented.	A Code of Construction Practice will be developed, with the aim to avoid sensitive periods (evening and night) for construction, but recognising that some works will have to be carried out at night.
Advance notice of working periods and associated impacts to both the Council and residents is essential.	EWR expects to notify the Council and affected residents of works.
Any out of hours working may need to come forward through s61 applications under the Control of Pollution Act.	Usual practice is for the contractor undertaking the works to apply for this consent.
EWRCo's construction plans must be fully informed by the British Geological Survey's survey of the area around Cleat Hill, following the explosion in 2024.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
<b>Q13. Proposals for Clapham Green to Colesden</b>	
<b>Roads, tracks and paths that cross the new railway</b>	
<p>The plans for the railway's route east of Bedford do not currently appear to address the following national and local policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPPF para 100; Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.</li> <li>• NPPF para 104; Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.</li> <li>• Bedford Local Plan 2030 Policy 91 – Access to the countryside.</li> <li>• Bedford Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2025-2030 Aim 1.5 – Improve the contribution the network makes to enhancing non-motorised travel.</li> <li>• Bedford Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2025-2030 Aim 3.2 – Develop a better connected and safer network.</li> </ul>	No explicit acknowledgement of these policies (NB this does not automatically mean EWR's plans contradict them; just that we haven't had sight of whether / how they have been taken into account).
We want to see much fuller detail on the railway's impacts on the Right of Way network north and east of Bedford, and mitigation proposed in line with the above policies.	Some further detail now provided of RoW closures / diversions / bridges and other structures.
Mitigation measures will be necessary to lessen the impact of construction, including temporary noise barriers, dust	Detailed noise modelling is being developed as part of the assessment of operational impact. Noise impact of construction will also be assessed.

suppression measures and the considerate use and positioning of temporary lighting to limit light pollution.	
Mitigation measures such as noise barriers close to sensitive receptors, and planting or landscaping alongside the railway corridor will be necessary to reduce operational impacts.	Detailed noise modelling is being developed as part of the assessment of operational impact. Noise impact of construction will also be assessed.
The amount of land required for construction and logistics seems high; we would like to see this reduced.	Safeguarded area has been revised and is available to evaluate for possible changes in this respect.
There must be a robust mitigation strategy for ecological impacts of works to Carriage Drive, underpinned by surveys and analysis completed to best practice standards. Any new lighting in this area must be minimal.	Additional planting around Carriage Drive now planned, to restore it as a tree-lined avenue and enhance connectivity as a walking and cycling route towards Clapham Park. Lighting not specifically referenced.
Cutting and overbridge at Graze Hill will cause an ecological impact; Graze Hill is unlit and may provide a foraging path for bats and other species.	EWR propose to sever Graze Hill (seemingly at a point that would not restrict farm access): they believe little traffic uses it at that point, and a very high bridge would be needed to take the road across the railway at that point.
Impacts from drainage proposals at Great Wood, Clapham Park Wood and surrounding areas must be carefully assessed to ensure no adverse impacts.	Work has been done on drainage and environmental mitigations in this area. Details not yet provided.
Mitigation must extend beyond the boundaries and edges of the rail corridor so that the railway is integrated with the wider landscape character.	Landscape mitigation measures now being considered include earth banks planted with trees, either side of cuttings and embankments, to reduce the visual impact of the railway.
Detailed landscape and drainage assessments, together with mitigation proposals, must be discussed with local groups and communities prior to work commencing.	Landscape mitigation measures now being considered include earth banks planted with trees, either side of cuttings and embankments, to reduce the visual impact of the railway. Details not yet provided.
It is particularly important for us to have early sight of a detailed assessment of carbon and the mitigation measures in this section.	Not yet put forward.
The Growing Beds facility, which receives all the Borough's kerbside-collected green waste, must remain usable at all times during construction.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We wish to see the proposed cutting around Carriage Drive replaced by a tunnel.	EWR retain their cutting proposal. However, also considering moving the alignment slightly, to run through a lower part of the hill and

	therefore making the cutting shallower and narrower. Details to follow in 2026 consultation.
We would like the land within EWR's red line boundary next to Woodlands Country Park to be used to extend the park once construction is complete.	Not yet addressed.
Access roads to EWR compounds must be resurfaced by EWR before, and if necessary after, work takes place.	Planning for mitigating construction impacts includes options for localised highway improvements.
Consideration should be given to measures that could improve active travel options in this area, including the construction of a lineside cycle route laid out between the tracks and screening vegetation.	Consultation response report says work is ongoing with local stakeholders on linking communities through active travel.
We support the construction of an active travel route alongside the new railway line from Tempsford towards Bedford, which must rejoin the existing highway network prior to reaching Fairhill.	General favourable comments about active travel; no specific commitment to this route.
Noise monitoring needs to commence as early as possible, to obtain a baseline against which to assess the impact of the railway.	Not addressed.
We would welcome confirmation from EWR that it has no plans for an additional station between Bedford and Tempsford, in line with our confirmation that we do not plan any such station.	Not addressed.
<b>Q14 – preferred Tempsford alignment</b>	
We support option 1C (the northerly alignment).	EWR have selected option 1C.
<b>Q15 Proposals for Roxton to east of St Neots</b>	
We believe EWRCo should make use of the logistics hub earlier in construction, not just towards the end.	No plans to do this announced, although the proposal remains to use the hub as previously intended.
We support option B for the logistics hub, but not option F.	EWR have selected option B.
A bespoke station design is required for Tempsford, to address its location and surrounding landscape context.	Tempsford station design is affected by New Town plans, and accelerated ECML station (EWR working with Network Rail for construction by c.2030).
Stations along this section of the route should follow a similar approach to the new Cambridge South station, with a BREEAM	EWR is committing to BREEAM excellent standard for all buildings in CS2 and CS3.

excellent rating, use of timber and green roofs. The renewable energy generation potential should be maximised.	
EWRCo must conduct a full flooding assessment and make it available for review by our consultants before designs are finalised.	EWR is continuing its flood modelling work.
EWRCo's modelling forecast that no additional roads will operate at over 85% of capacity after the opening of the railway will need to be re-tested.	EWR has been working to develop its modelling of both construction and operational impacts.
Connectivity between the new Tempsford station and existing and new communities should be supported through safe routes for cycling and walking, including an active travel corridor alongside the railway, and bike storage at the station capable of serving cyclists from the new settlement at Little Barford and any future developments in the area.	Consultation response report acknowledges desirability of this and says work is ongoing with relevant local transport authorities.
<b>Q22 Comments on route-wide matters</b>	
The Council expects to be closely involved in the refinement of EWR's strategic highways model ahead of statutory consultation.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
There should be a requirement for all MSCPs to have sprinklers included in their construction specification, and Bedfordshire Fire & Rescue Authority should be consulted on the design and build of car parks, to ensure the best possible fire risk mitigation.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We would support the construction of a north-facing cord at Bletchley, to allow direct services between Bedford and Milton Keynes.	EWR "exploring opportunities to extend services from the wider rail network onto EWR". No proposal for a cord has been made at this stage.
In the absence of the cord at Bletchley, we would support Cambridge-Bletchley services reversing at Bletchley and continuing up the line to Milton Keynes, for instance when capacity becomes available on the WCML after HS2 opens.	No such proposal has been made.
We support the use of discontinuous electrification in areas where overhead line electrification would be visually intrusive in the landscape, as well as to minimise works required to bridges.	Discontinuous electrification will be deployed on this basis

It will be important to factor electricity infrastructure requirements into EWR's infrastructure planning.	Discontinuous electrification will reduce the requirements for electricity infrastructure, and associated works.
Proposals for train stabling and maintenance facilities should focus on locations that are less likely to impact local residents; suitable mitigation measures should be incorporated.	A depots and stabling strategy is being developed. A firm proposal for locations is expected "in the near future".
We want to see an assessment of potential for the growth of freight from currently proposed levels, and to understand whether freight traffic is likely to grow from this level, and if so over what timeframe.	No new assessment presented (yet).
We would welcome information about the potential motive power for freight trains.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We support the use of materials with low embodied carbon wherever possible.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
When new or replacement habitats are proposed, we recommend that consideration be given to how the carbon sequestration potential of these habitats can be maximised.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
We would like to understand how wider climate impacts will be considered in the environmental statement, and climate resilience measures.	No detail presented yet.
Station designs must take account of local planning policies and Local Plans.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
Additional effort must be devoted to finding solutions that remove the need to acquire people's homes or gardens, particularly in Bedford where the options have not been fully explored.	No additional work has been done in respect of Poets, and more acquisitions are in fact now planned on Ashburnham Road.
Consideration should be given to accelerating the MVL works through the use of alternative consenting mechanisms for the works on this section of the route.	Former 'Connection Stage 2' work is now being taken forward under the 'MVL Acceleration Programme' by the East West Rail Alliance.
Lessons learned during the CS1 works in Buckinghamshire must be implemented in construction phases in Bedford, including on traffic impacts.	EWR is analysing feedback and data relating to the noise barriers it deployed in CS1, to identify additional requirement for noise barriers in later stages.

EWRCo must employ a first-rate communications strategy to ensure that local residents are clearly informed of all works being undertaken in a timely manner.	EWR states a commitment to engaging openly and honestly with people affected.
The Need to Sell scheme should be adapted to enable any property owners who wish to sell to do so quickly and easily, at a price that includes a premium above market rates to compensate for the blight they have suffered since Route E was selected.	EWR has not expanded its blight or compensation arrangements in any way.
Properties purchased by EWRCo should be quickly made available to the rental market avoid vacant houses potentially attracting anti-social behaviour.	No specific reference in consultation response report.
The Council believes that the statutory blight requirements ought to be enhanced to encompass the provision of independent legal advice for each owner-occupier with property in a safeguarded area, with the relevant fees being rechargeable to EWRCo.	EWR has not expanded its blight or compensation arrangements in any way.
Consideration must also be given to extending the scope of the property purchase scheme to include those that are outside the current red line boundary but are unable to be sold due to the continuing uncertainty over the scheme's proposals.	EWR has not expanded its blight or compensation arrangements in any way.

### **Additional key points in Autumn 2025 update**

- Universal and other developments in the Oxford-Cambridge growth corridor have caused EWR to revise expectations of demand on the railway upwards, and revise their proposals accordingly; analysis is still ongoing, but provisional proposals are below
- Higher frequency of passenger services, up to five trains per hour
- Longer trains, possibly five coaches rather than four
- Possible expansion of capacity at key stations, including Bedford Midland, to accommodate high peak time passenger numbers
- Exploring options to run services beyond the ends of the line at Oxford and Cambridge (unclear if ideas for running services onto the wider rail network would also mean onto the Midland Main Line at Bedford or West Coast Main Line at Bletchley).