

Meeting: Traffic and Transport Forum – September 2025

Door-to-Door Connectivity and Active Travel

Held on: 17/09/2025

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees:

1. Adam Remiarz (AR) – National Highways Technical Partner, National Highways
2. David Elliot (DE) – Transport Planner (Multi Modal Model Consultant), Milton Keynes City Council
3. Ismail Mulia (IM) – UNKNOWN, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service
4. Jack Eagle (JE) – Principal Transport and Infrastructure Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council
5. James Hemingway (JH) – National Highways Technical Partner, National Highways
6. James West (JW) – Project lead (Integration), England's Economic Heartland
7. John Gordon (JG) – Planning Manager (HS2 / CSC Nationally Significant Infrastructure), National Highways
8. Joy White (JW) – Principal Transport Planner, Oxfordshire County Council
9. Julian Sykes (JS) – Principle Policy Planner, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service
10. Katherine Wilkinson (KW) – Regional Engagement Manager (East of England), Active Travel England
11. Mingfei Ma (MM) – Analysis and Modelling Manager, England's Economic Heartland
12. Navin Panesar (NP) – Consents Project Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council
13. Peter Simons (PS) – Senior Officer (Transport Policy) Bedford Borough Council
14. Prutha Shah (PS) – Senior Transport Planner, National Highways
15. Rachel Lambert (RL) – DCO Lead, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service
16. Suzanne Winkels (SW) – Head of Technical Programme, England's Economic Heartland
17. Tam Parry (TP) – Principal engineer Transport Assessment Team, Cambridgeshire County Council
18. Tim Neate (TN) – Senior Planning Manager, National Highways
19. Verity Quinn (VQ) – Representative of England's Economic Heartland
20. Yo Higon (YH) – Active Travel Lead, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
21. Ben Nicholass (BN) – Traffic and Transport Lead, EWR
22. Tom Wilson (TW) – Head of Economic Development, EWR
23. Lucy Millier (LM) – Active Travel Lead, MWJV (for EWR)
24. Paula Cuthbertson – Traffic and Transport Routewide Studies Lead, MWJV (for EWR)
25. Juan Fernandez (JF) – Senior Economist, EWR
26. Jonathan Cornwell (JC) – Cambridge Area Manager, EWR

- 27. Hetty Thornton (HT) – Deputy DCO Stakeholder Engagement Lead, EWR
- 28. Chloe Smith (CS) – Deputy DCO Stakeholder Engagement Lead, EWR
- 29. Edward Mason (EM) – Traffic and Transport Forum Lead, EWR
- 30. Michael Flynn (MF) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (Oxford), EWR
- 31. Sunisha Tharappan (ST) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (MVL), EWR
- 32. Richard Starkey (RS) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (Bedford), EWR
- 33. Ben Savona (BS) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (Core), EWR
- 34. Ellen Dennison (ED) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (Cambridge), EWR
- 35. Charlotte Fleeson (CF) – Stakeholder Engagement Coordinator (Oxford), EWR
- 36. Esme Davies (ED) – Stakeholder Engagement Coordinator (MVL), EWR
- 37. Paulina Wawrejko (PW) – Stakeholder Engagement Coordinator (Bedford), EWR
- 38. Tom Hemmings (TH) – Stakeholder Engagement Coordinator (Core and Cambridge), EWR
- 39. David Paull (DP) – Network Rail Engagement Lead, EWR
- 40. Maddie Spellman (MS) – Active Travel Engagement Lead, EWR
- 41. Joshua Dairo (JD) – Active Travel Engagement Coordinator, EWR

Meeting minutes:

Item	Text	Action																		
0	Introductions																			
0.1	BN welcomed all to the September 2025 Traffic and Transport (T&T) Forum and outlined the agenda.																			
1	Actions from previous meeting and programme update																			
1.1	BN outlined the actions from the previous meeting (July 2025): <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Action</th><th>Update</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Juan Fernandez (EWR) and Lou Mason-Walsh (CCC) to discuss car time penalties applied to station access and CSRM 2 findings.</td><td>BN noted that meetings regarding the station choice model are ongoing and received comments are being reviewed.</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Ben Nicholass (EWR) to confirm with Bedford Borough Council that they are content with the UDX trip generation assumptions.</td><td>BN noted that once the new timetable has been issued, the assumptions will be updated. An update on Universal Destinations and Experiences (UDX) demand assumptions will be included in the next T&T Forum (November 2025).</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Ben Nicholass (EWR) and Verity Quinn (EEH) to organise a call to discuss the new project that supports Bedford Borough Council prepare the public transport network for UDX.</td><td>BN highlighted that work is still ongoing between EWR Co. and Bedford Borough Council regarding UDX impacts. VQ also noted that England's Economic Heartland (EEH) is supporting Bedford Borough Council on the Department for Transport governance structure.</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Ben Nicholass (EWR) and Verity Quinn (EEH) to discuss the sharing and local authority input of the core assumptions in the demand model offline</td><td>BN noted that the core assumptions have been shared and a model development report is scheduled to be issued late 2025/early 2026.</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>Ben Nicholass (EWR) to share the agenda for future T&T Forum meetings so that local authorities can forward the invite to the necessary officers</td><td>BN noted that upcoming T&T Forums will focus on the UDX demand analysis and an update on construction logistics.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	#	Action	Update	1	Juan Fernandez (EWR) and Lou Mason-Walsh (CCC) to discuss car time penalties applied to station access and CSRM 2 findings.	BN noted that meetings regarding the station choice model are ongoing and received comments are being reviewed.	2	Ben Nicholass (EWR) to confirm with Bedford Borough Council that they are content with the UDX trip generation assumptions.	BN noted that once the new timetable has been issued, the assumptions will be updated. An update on Universal Destinations and Experiences (UDX) demand assumptions will be included in the next T&T Forum (November 2025).	3	Ben Nicholass (EWR) and Verity Quinn (EEH) to organise a call to discuss the new project that supports Bedford Borough Council prepare the public transport network for UDX.	BN highlighted that work is still ongoing between EWR Co. and Bedford Borough Council regarding UDX impacts. VQ also noted that England's Economic Heartland (EEH) is supporting Bedford Borough Council on the Department for Transport governance structure.	4	Ben Nicholass (EWR) and Verity Quinn (EEH) to discuss the sharing and local authority input of the core assumptions in the demand model offline	BN noted that the core assumptions have been shared and a model development report is scheduled to be issued late 2025/early 2026.	5	Ben Nicholass (EWR) to share the agenda for future T&T Forum meetings so that local authorities can forward the invite to the necessary officers	BN noted that upcoming T&T Forums will focus on the UDX demand analysis and an update on construction logistics.	
#	Action	Update																		
1	Juan Fernandez (EWR) and Lou Mason-Walsh (CCC) to discuss car time penalties applied to station access and CSRM 2 findings.	BN noted that meetings regarding the station choice model are ongoing and received comments are being reviewed.																		
2	Ben Nicholass (EWR) to confirm with Bedford Borough Council that they are content with the UDX trip generation assumptions.	BN noted that once the new timetable has been issued, the assumptions will be updated. An update on Universal Destinations and Experiences (UDX) demand assumptions will be included in the next T&T Forum (November 2025).																		
3	Ben Nicholass (EWR) and Verity Quinn (EEH) to organise a call to discuss the new project that supports Bedford Borough Council prepare the public transport network for UDX.	BN highlighted that work is still ongoing between EWR Co. and Bedford Borough Council regarding UDX impacts. VQ also noted that England's Economic Heartland (EEH) is supporting Bedford Borough Council on the Department for Transport governance structure.																		
4	Ben Nicholass (EWR) and Verity Quinn (EEH) to discuss the sharing and local authority input of the core assumptions in the demand model offline	BN noted that the core assumptions have been shared and a model development report is scheduled to be issued late 2025/early 2026.																		
5	Ben Nicholass (EWR) to share the agenda for future T&T Forum meetings so that local authorities can forward the invite to the necessary officers	BN noted that upcoming T&T Forums will focus on the UDX demand analysis and an update on construction logistics.																		
1.2	BN outlined the forward look and key milestones for the EWR T&T team. Key activities include: • updating the UDX pedestrian demand and stations model to																			

Item	Text	Action
	account for the revised timetable (initial results to be shared at the next T&T Forum) • modal split development and engagement • Full Corridor Model validation and recalibration following local authority feedback • uncertainty log updates and operational local junction modelling • identification of mitigations and modelling re-runs to identify the impacts of EWR and planned mitigations • 2026 Consultation (expected spring/summer 2026).	
2	Modal shares	
2.1	PC explained that previous work focussed on a worst-case scenario of scheme footprint to inform robust assumptions. This resulted in modal shares being vehicle centric. Local authority feedback requested a fresh look into modal shares, which: • is more integrated with local policies and development proposals • considers more ambition around bus and cycle mode shares, and seeks a reduction in car parking requirements. PC highlighted that EWR has established a revised methodology for modal shares in response to local authority feedback. PC provided an overview of the revised methodology: 1) Evidence review – Review available evidence for existing stations or similar comparator sites. Engagement with local authorities to develop a starting point for target mode shares 2) Benchmarking tool – Combine NRTS/NRPS with Census and ORR station patronage data inputs to identify existing mode shares for a sample of similar locations 3) Testing the vision – Testing if the local highway authority and local planning authority aspirations for modal shares with EWR are realistic based on developments proposed and local evidence/ and future plans 4) Do minimum – Consider what would happen without EWR (to form a comparison and validate transport assessment conclusions). This will require local authority involvement (e.g. development of uncertainty logs).	
2.2	PC explained how EWR is expected to change travel patterns, such as: • offering new destinations accessible by rail	

Item	Text	Action
	• providing opportunity for mode shift from road to rail • increasing walking and cycling catchments around stations • improving east-west connectivity across the Oxford-Cambridge corridor • reducing the need for rail passengers to route via London • providing new stations on the East Coast Mainline and connections to other north-south strategic rail routes • providing links with UDX proposals at Stewartby • acting as a catalyst for future development.	
2.3	IM highlighted that it will be important to align programmes between EWR and Cambridgeshire County Council so that local plans and their transport assessments (including base assumptions) are consistent. PC agreed, noting that further engagement with local authorities is part of the next steps for modal shares.	
2.4	PC presented an overview of next steps for modal shares, which include: • continuing with steps 2-4 of the methodology • identification of potential benchmark examples • testing the vision for each scenario with and without Dependent Development • updating demand data to include UDX • updating facilities models to understand revised parking accumulation • continued local authority engagement in late Autumn 2025.	
2.5	PC provided an overview of the modal shares expected outcomes, including: • a reduction in car reliance and associated facilities at stations (based on the logic of more people from near the station accessing via sustainable means) • an increase in walking and cycling, particularly from developments close to the station.	
3	Active travel	
3.1	LM provided an introduction to active travel, and the work undertaken to date. LM reminded meeting attendees of the Bucket definitions: • Bucket 1 – these interventions will facilitate access to EWR stations and will be funded by EWR	

Item	Text	Action
	• Bucket 2 – these interventions are focussed on mitigation of impacts caused by station closure or a new railway line creating severance between communities and amenities. Focus is on retaining connectivity • Bucket 3 – these interventions support wider initiatives for improving active travel connections which may be away from the railway. EWR will support the delivery of these through others to enable modal shift but will not fund them directly. LM highlighted that EWR is interested to gain local authority views on the approach. Likewise, engagement with local authorities will remain ongoing throughout the process (e.g. the sharing of data and information between EWR and local authorities will remain important to develop business cases for developments).	
3.2	LM provided an overview of the work undertaken to date regarding Bucket 1 and Bucket 2, noting that: • more than 200 identified interventions have been considered and refined • approximately 60 interventions under Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 have been recommended (equating to 50 km of new active travel routes already included in EWR designs) • inclusion of known Bucket 3 interventions would expand this to approximately 160km of new active travel routes.	
3.3	LM explained how interventions have been allocated across the buckets, noting that: • Bucket 1 is about providing access and filling gaps in the existing network close to stations • Bucket 2 is about mitigating severance caused by EWR • Bucket 3 are wider initiatives generally unrelated to station access or mitigation.	
3.4	TW explained the division of buckets and next steps for active travel. The key points were as follows: • Interactive workshops have been scheduled to refine the Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 proposals. Attendees will receive the active travel intervention maps in advance for review so they can come to the meeting ready to discuss comments. LM requested that local authorities ensure the right people are at the meetings (active travel and PROW officers). • TW explained that bucket 3 interventions include ‘known	

Item	Text	Action
	proposals' which are already outlined through existing schemes (e.g National Highways A428 scheme, Greenways) or known developments e.g. Cambourne West. The other Bucket 3 items are less certain with no clear delivery partner identified. • Additional support is being sought to provide guidance on how to best support the progression of Bucket 3 interventions. Local authority feedback on what support would be beneficial is welcomed. • EWR Co. and EEH (via the Legacy Integration Programme) will ensure that the multi-modal transport networks are thought about in an integrated manner.	
3.5	JS requested further clarity on how interventions have been placed into Bucket 1, Bucket 2 or Bucket 3. LM confirmed that the rationale behind the bucket categorisations is available and will be discussed in detail at the upcoming interactive workshops. She added that demand information for stations and subsequently modal split is currently under review (as per PC presentation) and so the outcome of this may impact interventions.	
3.6	PS questioned if Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 interventions are required for the DCO application, and if Bucket 3 interventions are discretionary. LM confirmed that this is correct, where Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 interventions are around station access and mitigations, while Bucket 3 interventions are on the periphery. As such, Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 interventions have been brought into the scheme design. Although EWR Co. will fund Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 interventions, they may be delivered by a third-party organisation if they are better suited to do so.	
3.7	VQ provided an overview of the Legacy Integration Programme, noting that the programme focusses on Bucket 3 interventions, which seek to meet the ambitions and conditions of success set by local authorities.	
3.3	TW provided an overview of the next steps for Bucket 3 interventions, including: • consideration of procurement of consultancy support to consider the list of interventions and work on developing a delivery mechanism for each of them • confirmation of programme information and timelines.	

Item	Text	Action
4	Q&A	
4.1	JW questioned if the proposed Puy du Fou theme park (Bicester) has been included in EWR Traffic and Transport analysis. BN confirmed that EWR Co. remain aware of the new theme park and have started engagement with the developer to get an understanding of their demand forecasts and the impact on stations. However, at this time, the park has not yet achieved planning permission. SW confirmed that EEH are also supporting Oxfordshire County Council and Department for Transport and have ongoing conversations with Train Operating Companies regarding the new Puy du Fou theme park. VQ noted that an aim from the Legacy Integration Programme is to ensure consistency in mode share targets across the region, forming a better framework in which to operate.	
4.2	PS questioned if the initial modal split assumptions can be shared with local authorities. PS noted that it will be useful to see how the initial assumptions have developed over time. BN confirmed that the initial assumptions have not been published widely to date. However, all assumptions predominantly came from the station choice model.	1
4.3	JS questioned if it has been determined what the EWR patronage would be if just Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 interventions were delivered, and what the increased patronage would be if Bucket 3 interventions were delivered. PC noted that this is an evolving piece of work. The focus to date has been from a benefits perspective, reviewing each intervention and its associated benefit individually. Further clarity regarding the level of patronage increase associated to Bucket 1, Bucket 2 and Bucket 3 interventions will be shared in future engagements.	
4.4	JW questioned if the uncertainty log review deadline can be extended. BN agreed, noted that the deadline can be extended as long as EWR remain informed of the expected completion date.	
5	AOB and close	
5.1	BN thanked meeting attendees for joining the meeting and for the useful discussion.	

Item	Text	Action
5.2	BN noted that the next T&T Forum (November 2025) will focus on the UDX demand analysis and an update on construction logistics.	

Action log:

Action	Action Owner
1. BN to check if the initial modal share assumptions are available via the EWR business case team and share with PS.	BN