

Meeting: Traffic and Transport Forum – November 2025

Construction Traffic Analysis, Base year calibration and validation + Active Travel Update and Public Rights of Way

Held on: 12/11/2025

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees:

1. Adam Remiarz (AR) – National Highways Technical Partner, National Highways
2. Alice Cassidy (AC) – Representative of Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service
3. Amrik Manku (AM) – Regeneration Lead, Oxfordshire County Council
4. Ben Fryer (BF) – Technical Lead (Transport Planning) Place Planning North, Oxfordshire County Council
5. Chris Mills (CMills) – Transport Strategy and Planning Programme Manager, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
6. David Elliott (DE) – Transport Planner (Multi Modal Model Consultant), Milton Keynes City Council
7. George Gurney (GG) – NSIP Principal Planner, Oxfordshire County Council
8. Ismail Mulla (IM) – UNKNOWN, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service
9. Jack Eagle (JE) – Principal Transport and Infrastructure Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council
10. James West (JW) – Project lead (Integration), England's Economic Heartland
11. John Kell (JK) – Senior Transport Policy Officer, Bedford Borough Council
12. Joy White (JW) – Principal Transport Planner, Oxfordshire County Council
13. Mingfei Ma (MM) – Analysis and Modelling Manager, England's Economic Heartland
14. Navin Panesar (NP) – Consents Project Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council
15. Prutha Shah (PS) – Senior Transport Planner, National Highways
16. Richard Jefferies (RJ) – Representative of Oxfordshire County Council
17. Tam Parry (TP) – Principal engineer Transport Assessment Team, Cambridgeshire County Council
18. Tim Gent (TG) – Representative of England's Economic Heartland
19. Verity Quinn (VQ) – Representative of England's Economic Heartland
20. Yo Higton (YH) – Active Travel Lead, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
21. Amir Farooq (AF) – Economic development manager, EWR
22. Ben Nicholass (BN) – Traffic and Transport Lead, EWR
23. Chris Milne (CMilne) – Deputy Chief Analyst, EWR
24. Peter Weller (PW) – Traffic and Transport Construction, MWJV (for EWR)
25. Tony Milward (TM) – Strategic Traffic Modelling Lead, MWJV (for EWR)

26. Paula Cuthbertson (PC) – Traffic and Transport Routewide Studies Lead, MWJV (for EWR)
27. Rupal Patel (RP) – Statutory Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation, EWR
28. Joe Harris (JH) – Statutory Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation, EWR
29. Hetty Thornton (HT) – Deputy DCO Stakeholder Engagement Lead, EWR
30. Chloe Smith (CS) – Deputy DCO Stakeholder Engagement Lead, EWR
31. Edward Mason (EM) – Traffic and Transport Forum Lead, EWR
32. Michael Flynn (MF) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (Oxford), EWR
33. Sunisha Tharappan (ST) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (MVL), EWR
34. Richard Starkey (RS) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (Bedford), EWR
35. Ellen Dennison (ED) – Stakeholder Engagement Lead (Cambridge), EWR
36. Charlotte Fleeson (CF) – Stakeholder Engagement Coordinator (Oxford), EWR
37. Esme Davies (ED) – Stakeholder Engagement Coordinator (MVL), EWR
38. Tom Hemmings (TH) – Stakeholder Engagement Coordinator (Core and Cambridge), EWR
39. Maddie Spellman (MS) – Active Travel Engagement Lead, EWR

Meeting minutes:

Item	Text	Action						
0	Introductions							
0.1	<p>BN welcomed all to the November 2025 Traffic and Transport (T&T) Forum and outlined the agenda.</p> <p>BN explained the purpose of the recent station surveys at Marston Vale Line (MVL) railway stations, which aim to improve the evidence base for travel mode splits and station access patterns.</p>							
1	Actions from previous meeting and programme update							
1.1	<p>BN outlined the actions from the previous meeting (July 2025):</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Action</th><th>Update</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td> <p>Peter Simons (Bedford Borough Council (BBC)) questioned if the initial modal split assumptions can be shared with local authorities (LAs).</p> <p>Ben Nicholass to check if the initial modal share assumptions are available via the EWR business case team and share with PS.</p> </td><td> <p>BN confirmed that the updated assumptions will be shared December 2025/January 2026. BN to provide an overview of the previous and current assumptions to show they key changes for transparency.</p> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	#	Action	Update	1	<p>Peter Simons (Bedford Borough Council (BBC)) questioned if the initial modal split assumptions can be shared with local authorities (LAs).</p> <p>Ben Nicholass to check if the initial modal share assumptions are available via the EWR business case team and share with PS.</p>	<p>BN confirmed that the updated assumptions will be shared December 2025/January 2026. BN to provide an overview of the previous and current assumptions to show they key changes for transparency.</p>	
#	Action	Update						
1	<p>Peter Simons (Bedford Borough Council (BBC)) questioned if the initial modal split assumptions can be shared with local authorities (LAs).</p> <p>Ben Nicholass to check if the initial modal share assumptions are available via the EWR business case team and share with PS.</p>	<p>BN confirmed that the updated assumptions will be shared December 2025/January 2026. BN to provide an overview of the previous and current assumptions to show they key changes for transparency.</p>						
1.2	<p>BN outlined the forward look and key milestones for the EWR T&T team. Key activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The station choice model has been updated to reflect latest Department for Transport (DfT) Edge forecasts and demand growth estimators Integration of Universal Studios (UDX) into the station choice model. Station choice model recalibration and validation, with 2034 and 2049 forecast models in development Collaboration with LAs on uncertainty logs and growth forecasts. Following the upcoming EWR design freeze, the latest design will be overlayed onto the station choice model, showing the impacts of EWR and Universal on highway networks. Engagement with local highway authorities (LHAs) will be scheduled for early 2026 to share the forecasted impacts and 							

Item	Text	Action
	required mitigations.	
1.3	<p>VQ requested that England's Economic Heartland (EEH) is also included in the upcoming engagement sessions as it is supporting BBC on the UDX development.</p> <p>BN agreed, noting that engagement sessions will be set up with all organisations who attend this forum.</p>	1
1.4	<p>AM questioned if the current modelling is focussed on both the railway and highway demand modelling. BN confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rail demand model forecasts the amount of demand on the EWR network, and assigns demand to stations • The highway demand model forecasts the impacts of EWR and UDX on the highway network. <p>AM requested that EWR Co. share its key modelling findings with the appointed Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) consultants in support of the Oxford Parkway master planning exercise. BN agreed, noting that OCC should get in touch with EWR Co. when ready to discuss and agree the scope of what is required.</p>	2
1.5	<p>IM noted that it would be useful to have a meeting with South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify cross-programme dependencies across highways schemes across the area.</p> <p>BN agreed, and noted that separate meetings can be scheduled to run through the forward EWR T&T programme if it will be beneficial to stakeholders.</p>	3
1.6	<p>BN noted that Steer Group have replaced Jacobs as the EWR Co. consultants working on the station choice model.</p> <p>In addition, BN explained that an overview note is in development which outlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what is driving demand • how the demand is forecasted in the model • how its impacts are assigned to the highway network. <p>The note is anticipated to be issued in December 2025, and a meeting will be set up to present the overview note to members of this forum.</p>	4
1.7	<p>BN provided an overview of the Planning and Infrastructure Bill (PIB). BN noted that the EWR Co. approach is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align with government policy 	

Item	Text	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable meaningful two-way dialogue • Plan for a consultation on final proposals before submission – lighter touch than a traditional statutory consultation. <p>BN noted that the requirement for statutory engagement has been withdrawn, but continuous engagement will remain ongoing with LAs.</p>	
2	Emerging EWR Construction Traffic Analysis	
2.1	<p>BN provided an introduction to the emerging construction traffic analysis, noting that it is based on the previous design freeze. BN acknowledged that there will potentially be more disruption on the highway networks during construction than there will be during operation. As such, it is key that conversations on the impacts of construction are undertaken early, so that mitigations can be identified and put in place.</p> <p>BN explained that all analyses undertaken to date reflect the baseline scenario, with no highway mitigations in place. Mitigations will be identified in collaboration with LAs in early 2026, which will be subsequently added into the traffic model.</p>	
2.2	<p>PW noted that the analysis of the latest construction data from the EWR Co. Construction & Logistics (C&L) team is still underway. Work will continue to further refine construction data analysis, with T&T expecting to receive new construction data from February 2026 onwards. Likewise, Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) volumes, schedules and other construction data will continue to evolve alongside design changes.</p>	
2.3	<p>PW provided an overview of the construction data analysis, which takes into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road closures lasting over 12 weeks • Temporary road realignments • Permanent road realignments • Works requiring Temporary Traffic Management. <p>PW explained that three scenarios are primarily driven by Bedford area bridge closures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2028 - Q1 2031 (combines mostly existing network with some construction demand, including mobilisation along the core section) 2. Q2 2031 - Q4 2033 (combines multiple road closures with peak construction demand) 	

Item	Text	Action
	3. Q1 2034 onwards (combines most of final road network with some construction demand).	
2.4	<p>PW explained that construction traffic routes between compounds and the Strategic Road Network (SRN) have been defined in collaboration with EWR Co. C&L, T&T, Highways and Environment colleagues. The current construction data analysis takes account of revised compound locations and, where possible, learning from previous environmental and traffic analysis.</p> <p>PW noted that additional Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) routes may also need defining following discussions with the EWR Co. Structures and C&L teams. Collaboration to reduce AILs remains ongoing.</p>	
2.5	<p>PW provided an overview of expected impacts to the local road network, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where more than one practical route exists and daily HGV flows are high, construction flows may be shared across multiple routes • Some less attractive routes are assigned low volumes of HGVs to allow their use if necessary for construction resilience/continuity • Routes to and from a particular compound may change during the construction period due to road closures, higher HGV volumes or when construction HGVs are unable to cross the EWR trace • Once construction haul roads are established along the core section, they allow many HGVs to be focused on higher capacity roads during the period of peak construction • In some locations, haul roads will cross public roads at grade and will need traffic control. 	
2.6	<p>JK questioned which three bridges have been used as the basis for the construction logistics model, and what the sequencing for the works is.</p> <p>PW confirmed that the Bromham Road Bridge, Ampthill Road Bridge and Caldwell Street Bridge have been used in this analysis. At present, the sequencing of closures mean that only one bridge will be closed at a time. However, there are expected to be changes in the next design iteration which may reduce the need for closures during construction.</p>	
2.7	JK requested an update regarding BBCs previous request that roads designated for construction traffic be resurfaced prior to the start of	

Item	Text	Action
	<p>construction.</p> <p>PW noted that resurfacing arrangements will be included in the construction management plan. However, specifics cannot be shared at this time.</p>	
2.8	<p>AM questioned who from Oxford County Council has been engaged with do date regarding construction logistics.</p> <p>BN noted that engagement to date has only been undertaken with Cambridgeshire County Council. However, engagement is scheduled to be undertaken with all LA stakeholders who attend this forum (from December 2025). PS added that the purpose of the upcoming engagement is to review the GIS and transport modelling analysis with the LHAs to identify any gaps and finalise the models using local knowledge.</p>	
3	Base year calibration and validation	
3.1	<p>TM provided an overview of the approach to the Base Year Calibration (Iteration 3). Iteration 3 seeks to improve the Base Year model evidence through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional data • network refinements (in particular, the Marston Vale Line, Universal Studios (UDX) and Cambridge East Station) • the construction and operational assessment. <p>TM explained the changes to the Base Year model (since iteration 2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional data applied as ad-hoc Calibration and Validation data • Five new screenlines/cordons • Increased number of calibration counts and validation counts (approximately 1,00 calibration counts and 200 validation counts now included). 	
3.2	<p>TM provided an overview of the Base Year Calibration journey time routes, noting that, the majority of journey time routes remain consistent with Iteration 2.</p>	
3.3	<p>TM presented the Base Year Iteration 3 Model results. Key points raised are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screenlines/Cordons perform to a high standard and exceed the TAG criteria 	

Item	Text	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calibration counts exceed TAG criteria Validation Counts are below TAG criteria (but this is under review) Journey Time Validation exceeds targets for the three modelled time periods. <p>TM noted that the Base Year Iteration 3 Model results is planned to be issued to LHA stakeholders on 21 November 2025. As part of this, the following outputs will be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Count calibration and validation dashboard Supporting GIS files (sites, screenlines and journey time routes) Simulation and Assignment of Traffic to Urban Road Networks (SATURN) model files. <p>TM confirmed that the base year for Iteration 3 has remained the same as Iteration 2 – 2023.</p>	
4	Active Travel update and Public Rights of Way	
4.1	<p>PC provided an overview of the approach to Active Travel, noting that EWR Co. have developed an approach to considering and prioritising Active Travel across the entire route. Discussions are being held with relevant LAs and Active Travel England (ATE). In addition, EWR Co. have consulted its Accessibility Advisory Panel and the Network Rail Built Environment Accessibility Panel (BEAP).</p> <p>PC noted that a draft Active Travel Network map is being developed with input from LAs. This will include changes to urban and rural local networks close to the railway and permanent public rights of way.</p>	
4.2	<p>PC explained the progress made against Bucket 1 and Bucket 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A draft Non-Motorised User network has been developed A review of constraints and environmental considerations is being carried out Discussions around the proposed interventions with LA stakeholders are in progress UDX proposals are being incorporated into our future network around Stewartby. <p>Amir Farooq explained the progress made against Bucket 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active Travel Partnership Framework is being developed in ongoing collaboration with EEH, LAs and ATE. 	

Item	Text	Action
4.3	<p>Due to time constraints, PC skipped the following slides (refer to the accompanying slide deck for details):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy content • Rural and PROW Guidance documents • Considering local context • Design Assumptions. 	
4.4	<p>PC provided an overview of multi-modal integration, noting that alongside the active travel interventions, EWR Co. is working on the following aspects of door to door connectivity in partnership with EEH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus study • Car parking strategy • Mobility hubs at stations. 	
4.5	<p>PC explained the progress made regarding mode shares since the September 2025 T&T Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local evidence and applicable local policies have been reviewed • Initial discussions held with most LAs seeking guidance on local vision for each station • A benchmarking tool has been developed and we are now reviewing mode shares from other stations by distance band. <p>PC noted that the next steps are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip origin data is being analysed and mapped by zone and distance bands • Follow-up meetings with LAs are scheduled from December to provide station-specific updates • Ongoing engagement with stakeholders. 	
4.6	<p>AM requested that the scope of the bus study, car parking strategy, and mobility hubs be shared with the LHAs to enable comparison with existing plans and support future collaboration. Likewise, prior warning of future issues will allow the LAs to plan their resourcing in advance.</p> <p>PC agreed to share the scope of the bus and parking studies with attendees of this forum. It is anticipated that the outputs from the current update will be issued to EWR Co. by the end of 2025 for their review. However, PC offered to provide an update during the follow up sessions on mode shares in the meantime.</p>	5
4.7	<p>VQ confirmed that EEH has contributed to the Heartbeat Network and mobility hub network plans. Once the studies have been finalised, they</p>	

Item	Text	Action
	<p>will be linked into the Legacy Integration Plans and shared with LAs. At this point, VQ suggested that a meeting with EWR Co. would be beneficial to discuss the Active Travel maps. PC noted that the non-motorised user (NMU) network maps are currently being updated following feedback from LAs.</p> <p>PC agreed, noting that Lucy Millier (Active Travel Lead, MWJV (for EWR)) will be the best point of contact for arranging the meeting.</p>	6
5	AOB and close	
5.1	BN thanked meeting attendees for joining the meeting and for the useful discussion.	
5.2	<p>BN noted that the next T&T Forum (January 2025).</p> <p>BN to review the content of future forum meetings and adjust the agenda accordingly to ensure the meeting finishes on time.</p>	7

Action log:

Action	Action Owner
<p>1. VQ requested that EEH is included in the upcoming engagement (following the next EWR design freeze) as it is supporting BBC on the UDX development.</p> <p>BN to set up engagement sessions with all organisations who attend this forum.</p>	BN
<p>2. AM requested that EWR Co. share its key modelling findings with the appointed Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) consultants in support of the Oxford Parkway master planning exercise.</p> <p>OCC to get in touch with EWR Co. when ready to discuss and agree the scope of what is required.</p>	OCC

<p>3. IM noted that it would be useful to have a meeting with South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify cross-programme dependencies across highways schemes across the area.</p> <p>BN to organise separate meetings to run through the forward EWR T&T programme with each LHA as required.</p>	BN
<p>4. BN to organise a meeting with the LHAs to discuss the demand overview note following its issue (expected December 2025).</p>	BN
<p>5. AM has requested that the scope of the bus study, car parking strategy, and mobility hubs be shared with the LHAs.</p> <p>PC to share the scope.</p>	PC
<p>6. VQ suggested that a meeting with EWR Co. would be beneficial to discuss the Active Travel maps.</p> <p>PC / LM to organise a meeting to discuss with EEH as required.</p>	PC / LM
<p>7. BN to review the content of future forum meetings and adjust the agenda accordingly to ensure the meeting finishes on time.</p>	BN