

Supplemental Hearing Statement

Rep ID: 1118661

Matter 3 Development Strategy – Infrastructure

Date: 23rd August 2018

Subject: Statement on Transport Evidence Provided by CCC for Huntingdonshire Local Plan Examination

CCC Evidence

1. As outlined in previous hearing statements submitted on behalf of Hallam Land, the Huntingdonshire Strategic Transport Model (HSTS) was used to inform the Huntingdonshire Local Plan. Four development scenarios, of which Gifford's Park, St Ives was included in just one, were assessed as part of the HSTS First Submission (first submission into the public domain). Out of these four scenarios, the scenario that included Gifford's Park (Development Scenario 3) was deemed the preferred development mix and required the lowest level of strategic highway spending relative to the other three scenarios tested. However, as all scenarios were deemed by the Council to require strategic highway interventions, the HSTS concluded that none of the four original scenarios were deliverable through developer contribution alone and therefore did not recommend any of them as a way forward.
2. The fact that the testing of Gifford's Park was limited to inclusion in just one development scenario, which included other developments, does not permit the appropriate assessment of the merits associated with the site. Based on the scenarios tested as part of the HSTS, the merits of Gifford's Park have been impossible to assess with any precision due to the presence of other developments within Development Scenario 3 and therefore the assessment of merits of Gifford's Park, as part of the Local Plan process, has been distorted.
3. Instead of then assessing a refined range of development scenarios or engaging further with stakeholders, the HSTS went on to assess a single 'bolt on' Development Scenario 5 - with no justification as to how the potential development mix had been selected and why this particular option was determined as the only additional scenario worthy of further assessment.
4. No evidence or justification was presented within the HSTS as to why:
 - this fifth scenario was assessed over other potential development mix scenarios, and;
 - no other reasonable development mix scenarios were considered for assessment.
5. The above points are referenced in Hallam Land Management's representations to the Examination and were further articulated at the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Examination Hearing on both the 17th and 18th July 2018. Subsequently, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) agreed to provide further evidence to support the outputs and conclusions set out in the HSTS, which was used to inform the Huntingdonshire Local Plan. It was also requested by Hallam Land that the methodology used to discount the need for analysis of any alternative development mixes be provided. More specifically, a request was made as to whether standalone strategic developments were assessed as individual scenarios.
6. Since the hearing on the 18th July 2018, evidence has been provided by CCC, on 24th July 2018 and 9th August 2018 by email. This evidence included the raw data (traffic flow data, speed data and delay data on all roads within Cambridgeshire for each development scenario) used by CCC to inform the outputs summarised within the HSTS Report.
7. Following analysis of the data provided, it is now clear that the evidence now made available only provides data for each development scenario in combination. The evidence provided does **not** provide the following:

Supplemental Hearing Statement

Rep ID: 1118661

Matter 3 Development Strategy – Infrastructure

- Assessment of strategic developments as individual scenarios, which would have allowed for the appropriate assessment of the merits of a site such as Gifford's Park, St Ives.
 - Further iterative mixes of development, which would again have allowed for the appropriate assessment of the merits of a site such as Gifford's Park.
 - Standalone input data for each strategic development (i.e. for trip rates, trip distribution/assignment, GFA, sustainability benefits), which would have allowed for this relevant data to have been cross checked against the input data agreed as part of pre-planning application discussions with County Council officers for each standalone strategic development.
 - Standalone raw traffic flow data for each standalone strategic development, which would have allowed for a comparison/check of traffic flows for each development. Whereas the raw data only provides this for all developments combined within their respective development scenario.
 - Standalone outputs (i.e. delay, capacity, journey times) for each standalone strategic development, which would have allowed for the direct impact of each standalone development to be determined and compared like for like. This would have then allowed for a more focused and viable set of alternative development mix scenarios to be assessed and put forward
 - Additional mix of development scenario runs, which should have been used by CCC to justify why only Development Scenario 5 was included for within the HSTS Report as an additional and final development scenario to the exclusion of all other options.
8. It remains clear, therefore, that the HSTS and additional evidence (provided on 24th July and 9th August) concentrates on strategic improvements for a package of development scenarios, rather than mitigation required for each individual development, which would have enabled a diagnostic approach to scenario formulation based on individual merit and strategic interaction. No evidence of engagement with stakeholders to determine standalone deliverability, and/or to test alternative scaled down strategic interventions has been provided within the additional evidence referenced above.
9. The previous hearing statements provided on behalf of Hallam Land therefore still stand. Alternative development mix scenarios, in addition to the original four development scenarios, were not tested fairly against each other in the context of a wider range of mitigation measures more appropriate to the funding levels available.
10. Furthermore, the evidence provided does not suggest how benefits of key sustainable infrastructure, such as the Guided Busway, have been afforded appropriate weight when assessing the impacts of individual sites within each Development Scenario. It was stated by CCC at the hearing of 18th July 218 that the benefits of key sustainable infrastructure were not taken into account as part of the HSTS findings.

Targeted Network Improvements

11. As outlined in Hallam Land Management's Hearing Statement for Matter 3, by delivering viable targeted network improvements, it is considered that the previously discounted development of Gifford's Park (discounted as a result of an untargeted mitigation strategy and inappropriate assessment methodology) can deliver a robust highways solution enabling the delivery of Gifford's Park as a sustainable development of 1,750 dwellings and associated infrastructure, without the need for new strategic infrastructure.
12. The proposed mitigation strategy for Gifford's Park provides for a mitigation package, which has been determined through manual assignment based on a nil detriment highways solution. Based on the outputs of the preliminary modelling, undertaken to date for the full Gifford's

Supplemental Hearing Statement

Rep ID: 1118661

Matter 3 Development Strategy – Infrastructure

Park development using input methodology agreed with the CCC Transport Assessment Team (see appended Statement of Common Ground between Peter Brett Associates and CCC), it can be concluded that the impact of the full development can be mitigated through a combination of physical works and soft measures, without the need for strategic infrastructure. These measures can therefore be implemented quickly without delay (i.e. no delay generated by the requirement for strategic funding). Below is a list of interventions that will mitigate the impact of the full proposed Gifford's Park development:

- Somersham / A1123 / Harrison Way Junction
 - Lengthen flares on all approaches to roundabout
- Meadow Lane / Harrison Way Junction
 - Lengthen Flares on north and south approaches
- Ramsey Road / A1123 Junction
 - Lengthen flares on three arms
- A141 / Huntingdon Road Junction
 - Widen entry width on three arms
 - Extend flares on three arms
- A141 / B1090 Junction
 - Two lane exits (100m merge) on northern and southern arms to allow for two ahead movements through roundabout
 - Busway / Harrison Way Junction
 - Update and optimise signal timings
 - Move stop lines forward
 - Upgrade pedestrian crossing location to meet desire line and allow reduced intergreens
 - Provide two lane flared approach and exit from north and south.
- Low Road / Harrison Way Junction
 - Lengthen Flare on north and south approaches
- Hill Rise / A1123 Junction
 - Kerb realignment and signal timings optimisation
 - Widen eastern approach to allow for a 100m flare.
- Harrison Way / Parsons Green Junction
 - Change give way road markings to allow unopposed north to south route and enforce right turners within roundabout to give way
- Garner Drive / A1123 Junction
 - Signal timings updated to limit green time given to minor arms and focus existing variable signal timings on A1123

Supplemental Hearing Statement

Rep ID: 1118661

Matter 3 Development Strategy – Infrastructure

13. The sustainability and deliverability merits of Gifford's Park clearly demonstrate that the proposal should not have been excluded from further consideration, either as a standalone or as part of a scenario that comprises development that can be delivered without strategic intervention and by developer contribution.