



Uttlesford District Council
District Wide Transport Study
Consultation Summary

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This note summarises the responses that were received to a consultation on the draft Transport Study that was undertaken in October 2016.
- 1.2 A copy of the draft Transport Study (including all Figures and Appendices) was circulated by email to the consultees listed in the table below on 6th October 2016.
- 1.3 The table below summarises who provided feedback and comments are reproduced in **Appendix A**.

Table 1 – Consultation Summary

Consultee	Contact	Email	Feedback Comments Received?
Highways England	Mark Norman	mark.norman@highwaysengland.co.uk	Yes
Essex County Council	David Sprunt, Mary Young	David.Sprunt@essex.gov.uk Mary.Young@essex.gov.uk	Yes
Hertfordshire County Council	Roget Flowerday	Roger.Flowerday@hertfordshire.gov.uk	Yes
Cambridgeshire County Council	Karen Kitchener David Allatt	Karen.kitchener@cambridgeshire.gov.uk David.Allatt@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Yes
Stansted Airport	Alistair Andrew	alistair.andrew@magairports.com	No
Braintree District Council	Emma Goodings	emma.goodings@braintree.gov.uk emmgo@braintree.gov.uk	Yes
Chelmsford District Council	Claire Stuckey	claire.stuckey@chelmsford.gov.uk	No
Epping Forest District Council	Amanda Thorn	athorn@eppingforestdc.gov.uk	No
Harlow Council	Paul Macbride	paul.macbride@harlow.gov.uk	No
East Hertfordshire District Council	Claire Sime	Claire.Sime@eastherts.gov.uk	Yes
North Hertfordshire District Council	David Hill	David.Hill@north-herts.gov.uk	No
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Caroline Hunt	Caroline.hunt@scambs.gov.uk Stephen.Kelly@scambs.gov.uk David.Roberts@scambs.gov.uk	Yes
Cambridge City Council	Sara Saunders	sara.saunders@cambridge.gov.uk	No
St Edmundsbury (West Suffolk District Council)	Planning Dept	planning.policy@westsuffolk.gov.uk	No



Appendix A – Feedback Comments



Highways England

Alistair,

4.5.1 The M11 Technology scheme provides the benefits listed; however, this is not a Smart Motorway scheme which is something quite different.

4.5.8 Can the council please confirm it if is their opinion or fact that worn road markings are having a detrimental impact on safety and traffic capacity? If this is unproven then I am unsure of the relevance to their transport study.

4.5.9 Please confirm the cost estimate. Recently ECC were quoting £5m! (If their bid to the Growth and Housing Fund is £14m we need to carefully review their new estimate. Or has the scope increased to include other improvements?)

4.6.1 I think the text should be amendment to say "...the government has agreed for Essex County Council, with support from Highways England, to lead on the work to develop options for widening the route."

A few comments from our side

Regards

Mark

Mark Norman

Highways England | Woodlands | Manton Lane | Bedford | MK41 7LW

Tel: +44 (0) 300 4704938

Web: <http://www.highways.gov.uk>

GTN: 0300 470 4938



Essex County Council

Hi Alastair

Re Marks comments. **(Ref: Mark Norman – Highways England comments)**

4.5.9 the bid to the housing and growth fund remains as £5m, the scheme costs have risen from about £10m (50% share from HE fund ie £5m) to around £13m. The remainder coming from a variety of sources including C&P and SE LEPs. The scheme can obviously, and would be, installed in stages so funding could match the stages.

4.5.8 I'm not aware that ECC has specifically raised this but understood HE were to reinstate the markings. I can only comment at this stage that these markings are the only real indications of the correct lanes to use and as such their lack of clarity is likely to mean late lane changes to those unfamiliar with the junction.

Regards

David (**David Sprunt, ECC**)

Alistair

Further to my comments last week, I omitted any comments on 4.6.8, as needed to check with David first. Please see below for suggested text, which corrects the misconception that ECC are undertaking Vissim modelling of Saffron Walden. This has never been ECCs intention'

4.6.8 Automatic number plate recognition surveys (ANPR) were undertaken across the town in early 2016 to determine patterns of traffic movement within and through the town to check the assumptions that were made for the Highways Assessment work done by Essex Highways in 2013. Early findings are anticipated in October 2016.

Hope this is OK

Regards

Mary Young

Mobile: 07779 587075

Office: 03330 133067

From: Mary Young Transportation Project Manager
Sent: 07 October 2016 13:17
To: 'alstair.gregory'
Cc: David Sprunt, Principal Transport Strategy & Engagement Officer; Alan Gillham; Mark Norman (mark.norman@highways.gsi.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Uttlesford Transport Study

Alistair

Just reviewing the Study report, and I note that you have incorporated most of our suggested comments, thanks. However, there are still a few queries outstanding:

Not picked up previously but should para 3.2.1 state 23.6mppa to be consistent with rest of report?

Para 3.5.2 short and long term parking totals quoted don't correspond to Table 9 (long term spaces sum to 739, and short term to 539, so not ~600 and ~800 respectively).

Thanks for improving Fig 10, the rail network info is now much clearer. However you now include reference to Witham station in the report, which is not illustrated on Fig 10. Is there merit in showing the 3 public highway network level crossings on the figure?

Para 3.9.3 refers to 3 main residential settlements, but these are referred to as market towns in para 3.9.1.

Paras 3.9.4-6 refer to specific cycle routes and it is suggested that Fig 11 is amended to show labels on the illustrated routes that are referenced in the text.

Para 4.5.5 should include reference to J8a, being part of J8 that connects M11 directly with the A120 E.

There is no specific mention of any improvements required at the A120/A1250 junction immediately west of M11 J8 (as previously suggested in relation to para 4.5.20). This junction has direct impacts on J8 and its improvement is integral to delivering additional capacity at J8.

Paras 5.2.8-10: should the Gt Chesterford AoS be included here as TN5 table 2 shows this NS has similar Site Accessibility to the other AoS that are referred to in para 5.2.10 (w of Btree, w of GD and at Elsenham)? With regard to TN5, para 10.2 only references train use in relation to London, but not to Cambridge, which would be a key destination for Gt Cfd travellers and therefore unaffected by capacity issues to the south (and is supported by some of the quotes you have included in the Study report for S Cambs/Cambridge transport policies).

Para 6.3.11 should include specific bullet for the B1051 Grove Hill signals, rather than to B1051/Lower St junction.

Table 27 total person trips are significantly greater in Scenarios 10 & 11 than previously reported (in now superseded Tables 23 and 24), being 7928 and 8093 vs 4629 and 4629 respectively. Individual mode values are also significantly different. The total no of dwellings in each scenario has reduced, as has the level of employment in Scenario 10, so it is not immediately apparent why there is such a large upward change. (Para 6.6.1 also states ~6k car trips as opposed to ~3.5k in the earlier draft, as well as other mode changes.)

Para 6.8.11 should definitely refer to 2014 Base, not 2015 Base models, as should all subsequent references to the Base year.

Table 31, suggest modification in relation to A505/A1301 roundabout mitigation wording (& possibly M11 J10?), as could have greater than minimal impact were Gt Cfd to go ahead.

Para 8.2.6 should include ref to A120/A1250 junction improvement as not covered by current para wording.

Para 8.2.13 ECC are currently developing improvement proposals for the A131/B1008 junction as part of the A131 Route Based Strategy, and this scheme is likely to be in place within the next 2-3 years.

We raised a number of queries with regards to discrepancies between Figures (see comment TR12, TR14 & TR15 on p19 of draft, for instance) which don't appear to have been addressed. Also A120/Round Coppice Rd reference not added to bullets 3.3.12.

Fig 5 appears to only show specifically commissioned traffic data sites, which needs clarifying on the Figure title, and means that there are no plans showing the full set of traffic data sites (ie post-Jan 2013) used in the assessment/study.

With regard to specific responses to your queries below on the findings of the report, I'll confer with David early next week and come back to you accordingly.

With regard to your request just now for contacts, Roger Flowerday would be the person at Herts CC, but I don't have any contacts for Cambridge CC.

Regards

Mary Young
Mobile: 07779 587075
Office: 03330 133067



Hertfordshire County Council

Hi Alistair,

As requested please find attached our comments on the draft Transport Study report.

In general we are concerned that the transport study offers little consideration of neighbouring authorities, particularly East Herts. This is despite some development scenarios including a significant proportion of the growth in close proximity to Herts.

Despite referencing several local and national policies aimed at increasing sustainable travel in Chapter 3, Para 6.6.3 dismisses the idea of creating modal shift as unrealistic due to the rural nature of the district. It further states that small scale local improvements will be brought forward by individual developments. This would appear to miss a large opportunity to affect modal shift across the district by integrating the aims of policy at the plan making stage, which can then shape the developments as they come forward. This would seem to be particularly appropriate where significant growth is focussed in one or two areas and a critical mass can be reached for sustainable travel initiatives. It is considered that this should be explored in more detail through the modelling work to establish what level of modal shift would be needed to reduce the quantum of mitigation identified.

Additionally, there are some points of data which do not seem to follow the expected logic. For example, in Table 28 the link flows on B1008 at Great Dunmow are virtually the same through all three scenarios, despite the fact that Scenarios 10 & 12 have considerably more development at Great Dunmow than scenario 11. Likewise the flows on the A120(T) north of Takeley are the same for Scenarios 11 & 12, when you would logically expect them to be more similar in 10 & 12 due to the locus of the major residential developments. These inconsistencies raise questions on the accuracy of the distribution of traffic within the model and the conclusions drawn from it.

In the mitigation section it is identified that the proposed mitigation measures will not actually create enough capacity to mitigate the effects of the growth, although they do improve the junction performance over the existing layouts and would provide short to medium term relief. What happens after this period is not discussed other than stating that Highways England are looking a long term improvement for M11 J8. No mention of mitigation for the highway network in Hertfordshire, despite Table 3 showing that 10% of residents travel to work in Herts (3rd biggest destination behind London and Uttlesford). For scenario 10 in particular, where development is concentrated close to the A120, this is likely to represent a significant quantum of cross border trips, but is not investigated further.

Additionally it would appear that there are forecast problems on the A120 in Hertfordshire, and it would appear nothing is proposed to address this. We are also concerned the extent of the modelling work does not include the local network in Bishops Stortford which is likely to be significantly impacted.

In summary the issues being forecasted in broad terms seem to be highway capacity solutions not necessarily just at junctions but along links. The mitigations being put forward are highway capacity focussed and seem to fall short which suggests the need for a more sustainable modal shift. The study appears to have looked at travel patterns and travel planning which is discussed as being an option to increase sustainable travel measures and thereby mitigate the impacts of growth, but only on an individual site by site basis rather than at a strategic level, which is less likely to provide the major shift in travel behaviour which appears would be necessary to mitigate the impacts. A more strategic, holistic and co-ordinated approach to sustainable transport measures needs to be applied to the whole district.

The key to realising modal shift is to understand where people are travelling from and to, so that opportunities can be identified for modal shift. Mitigating some of the consequences of growth is likely to be challenging and cannot solely be solved through capacity driven highway infrastructure improvements. Alongside the relevant sustainable transport infrastructure, the introduction of policies in the Local Plan which promote sustainable modes to facilitate a change in travel behaviour will be a necessity.

Regards

Roger Flowerday
Development Manager

Hertfordshire County Council, County Hall, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8DN
T: 01992 658371 (Comnet: 58371) | W: www.hertsdirect.org/highways



Cambridgeshire County Council

Uttlesford Transport Study – Cambridgeshire County Council response

21.11.16

Introduction and general comments

Thank you for consulting Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) on the Draft Uttlesford Transport Study (version Rev 3b). This involvement is welcome but further, more detailed, earlier engagement on the methodology and issues would have been prudent. These comments have been agreed with South Cambridgeshire District Council. However, the district council may wish to make additional comments in due course.

CCC believes the methodology and approach used in the study is generally reasonable for the purposes of considering Local Plan implications on transport *links*, but it does not give sufficient consideration of *junctions* particularly those in Cambridgeshire. Given that the methodology focus is purely on link capacity and does not consider detailed impacts at individual junctions in Cambridgeshire, it is difficult to understand the likely impacts of development in Uttlesford on the transport network in Cambridgeshire. This is particularly important given that the majority of Uttlesford is within the Cambridge Travel to Work Area (2011 Census). Uttlesford District Council should also consult Highways England, Network Rail and the rail operators on the West Anglian line to ensure the impacts on the strategic road and rail networks in Cambridgeshire are not severe.

With 1,400 new homes and 38,000sqm of employment proposed at Great Chesterford, very close to the county boundary, there is not enough detailed analysis within the draft Transport Study to show the likely impacts or to demonstrate a clear mitigation strategy.

The study acknowledges that currently, around 9% of Uttlesford residents travel to Cambridge or South Cambridgeshire for employment. If this trend were to continue then there would be a considerable number of new trips between Saffron Walden, Great Chesterford and Cambridge/South Cambridgeshire at peak times. As acknowledged by the draft study (based on its analysis of *link* capacities), the highway network in this area already experiences congested conditions at peak times, with the A505 between Royston and the A11 one of the most heavily trafficked routes in Cambridgeshire.

However, as alluded to above, several *junctions* in the area also experience significant peak time congestion. These include the junctions of the A505/A1301, A11/A1307, accesses to the Granta Park site, and Junction 10 of the M11. It is important to acknowledge that when links or junctions are already congested, any additional trips will have a compounded impact and need to be appropriately mitigated.

The Transport Study should also take account of the significant development proposals which are being delivered/proposed in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire as these will bear a strong relationship to any new residential development that comes forward in Uttlesford. These development proposals include:

- Wellcome Trust, Genome Campus, Hinxton (1,000 new jobs)
- Granta Park, Great Abington (3,200 new jobs)
- Babraham Research Campus (1,000 new jobs)
- Cambridge Southern Fringe (4,400 homes)
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Addenbrooke's (10,500 new jobs)
- Sawston (540 homes)

The proximity of Stansted Airport is important to the Cambridgeshire economy and it is essential that connections are attractive and reliable. The corridor between Cambridge and Stansted and London is a region of dynamic growth with an economic output in 2014 of £226 billion and an increasing global presence¹. The ability of the network to continue to support reliable movements between Cambridgeshire, Uttlesford and Stansted should be an important element of the study.

Given all of the above, the Council believes there is a strong need for detailed junction analysis for the following junctions in Cambridgeshire:

- M11 junction 10;
- A505/A1301 roundabout;
- A11/A1307 Four Wentways roundabout; and
- Junctions in the vicinity of Granta Park.

In addition, the Draft Transport Study should give more consideration towards an evidence based mitigation and funding strategy. The draft study contains limited information about how the transport impacts in Cambridgeshire could be mitigated and seems to rely on Park & Ride sites on the edge of Cambridge (which are already close to capacity), the delivery of Greater Cambridge City Deal schemes – see below, and proportionate S106 contributions for transport improvements.

It is essential that all new development planned within the Cambridge Travel to Work Area fully mitigates its own impact regardless of which authority each specific impact occurs. This should include the links already identified in the draft strategy, but also the junctions set out above.

Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) Long Term Transport Strategy

¹ London-Stansted-Cambridge Corridor Economic Review, 2016

The TSCSC identifies the need for a network of walking and cycling routes in and around the A1301 corridor, linking transport interchanges, employment centres, and Sawston Village College catchment area. Particularly, the strategy focuses on:

- Improving interchange facilities at Shelford, Whittlesford Parkway and Great Chesterford Stations
 - Increasing frequency of services calling at Shelford and Whittlesford Parkway stations
 - Creating a cycle network connecting employment sites at Babraham, Granta Park and Genome Campus
 - Creating a cycle network connecting to transport interchanges along corridors
 - Continuing the cycle route from Shelford out towards Whittlesford Parkway Station
 - Creating a cycle network focusing on the catchment area of Sawston Village College
- A comprehensive programme of small scale highway and safety improvements

The Draft Uttlesford Transport Study could therefore make more of the potential for rail travel to and from the proposed development scenarios, particularly given the new Greater Anglia franchise improvements, including exploration of how access to and from stations can be facilitated.

A new railway station planned for the Chesterton sidings area of Cambridge, to be known as Cambridge North, is due to open in May 2017. In addition, John Laing (one of the developers at Cambridge Biomedical Campus), is undertaking a feasibility study for a new railway station at the Cambridge BioMedical Campus. A new station serving the Campus is identified in the Cambridgeshire Long Term Transport Strategy. These projects reinforce the potential role that rail could play in mitigating impact from proposed development in Uttlesford.

Even with an enhanced role for rail, the A505 corridor, including its junctions, will remain a constraint. Because of this, the County Council (through the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough LEP), is bidding for funding for a feasibility study to examine options for the A505 corridor. An announcement on whether this has been successful is expected in the 2016 Autumn Statement.

The County Council considers that development in Uttlesford should demonstrate that its impact on the Cambridgeshire network could be mitigated. Whilst in practice, and dependent on the A505 study outcomes should this proceed, this might potentially be through reasonable contributions to larger solutions, CCC believes that the Uttlesford Transport Study should demonstrate that these impacts could be implemented.

Greater Cambridge City Deal

The Draft Transport Study implies that CCC has sufficient funding to deliver the transport improvements required for growth. The Greater Cambridge City Deal has secured £100m of funding for the period 2015-2019. With an additional (up to) £200m for 2020-2025 and 2026-2030 if certain conditions are met. Even, with this significant amount of funding there is still a considerable funding gap for transport infrastructure in Cambridgeshire given the extensive growth planned for the county. Therefore, while the City Deal is helping to deliver transport improvements to support planned growth within Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, additional funding such as Section 106, CIL and other grants is still required in order to provide transport services and infrastructure for these new developments.

The Three Campuses to Cambridge (A1307) City Deal scheme is developing options to improve connections between Granta Park, Babraham Research Campus and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus for bus, cycling and walking journeys. Consultation on some initial ideas took place between 16th June and 1st August 2016. Detailed work is now taking place to develop a preferred option for the A1307 corridor and will be presented to the City Deal Board in March 2017. We are undertaking traffic counts in and around the A1307 over the coming weeks to help inform the development of the 'Three Campuses to Cambridge' City Deal scheme.

Transport Impacts Methodology

The Draft Transport Study highlights that cumulative trip generation has been determined using TRICS (v7.2.4²) which is supported as a methodology. The omission of London, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland is supported in this case as is the emphasis on peak movements. We are generally content with the robustness of the approach for the purposes of Local Plan assessment, recognising that the trips will apply to sites across the District. We consider the use of Census 2011 data for modal splits to be reasonable for the purposes of Local Plan assessment though would recommend validating through more recent survey data if available. We are content with the use of a VISUM model for assignment in concert with a spreadsheet analysis based on surveyed link flows and forecast flows.

As previously stated, CCC is generally content with the approach taken to forecasting the impacts at a strategic level, though is concerned that that assessment is too Uttlesford-centric and would welcome a more granular analysis that takes into account the ground level impacts over the boundary in Cambridgeshire, into which there will be key flows from Uttlesford. In particular, this must include consideration of junctions and not simply connecting links between them.

²Note the version used is not the latest (v.7.3.3) but relatively recent so no objection.



Braintree District Council

From: Goodings, Emma [<mailto:emmgo@braintree.gov.uk>]

Sent: 22 November 2016 16:13

To: Alan Gillham

Subject: RE: UDC Transport Study consultation

Hi Alan,

Our only comment will be that we would like to continue to work together on the highway implications of our respective local Plans and the cross boundary implications that this brings.

Kind Regards

Emma Goodings

Planning Policy Manager

Braintree District Council | Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, CM7 9HB

☎ 01376 552525 Ext. 2511 | www.braintree.gov.uk | ✉ emma.goodings@braintree.gov.uk



East Hertfordshire District Council

Dear Alistair,

Thank you for your email and the opportunity to make comments on the draft study. Unfortunately, it has not been possible for all of my colleagues with an interest in the work to give the document their attention so far, so it would be very much appreciated if it were possible to extend the deadline by a couple of weeks to 13th November if at all possible?

In the interim, I have a few comments to make from my initial observations:

1. P39 – 40: Price of P&R quoted is for the bus element only & doesn't include the £1 per vehicle parking fee at each P&R location.
2. P56 para 4.3.7: The text should be amended to reflect the fact that four-tracking will be required even if Crossrail2 were not to come to fruition and that HCC, ourselves and the LSCC, amongst others, are pressing for its early implementation in advance of Crossrail2 proposals. The West Anglia Taskforce has just published its report, setting out the need for investment in the West Anglia Main Line. Reference to this should be made (see: www.upgradewaml.co.uk). Membership of the Taskforce is wide ranging and has the support of relevant local authorities, LEPs and other bodies and interested parties along the route.
3. 4.3.10: While the crossing closures may not have effects on future housing proposals, some text should be added re protecting existing access routes through replacement crossing facilities, as appropriate.

I hope that the above is of help to you and I would be grateful if you could please confirm whether an extension of time to allow other colleagues to comment would be possible.

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

Kay

Kay Mead (Mrs), BA (Hons), Dip TP, MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer, Planning Policy

Direct Dial: 01992 531625
East Herts Council
Wallfields
Pegs Lane
Hertford
SG13 8EQ
kay.mead@eastherts.gov.uk
www.eastherts.gov.uk
Days of work: Tuesday, Thursday, Friday and every other Monday

(Note: No objections were raised to an extension of time for receipt of comments but no further comments have been received at the time of writing 05/01/2017)



South Cambridgeshire District Council

From: Roberts David [<mailto:David.Roberts@scambs.gov.uk>]
Sent: 22 November 2016 09:25
To: Alan Gillham
Subject: RE: Uttlesford Transport Study - CCC comments

Alan

We basically agree with the comments that the County have sent. I would say there is a very good chance that we will not submit anything else at this time on the transport study but cannot be definitive at this time.

Dave

David Roberts | Principal Planning Policy Officer



South Cambridgeshire Hall | Cambourne Business Park | Cambourne | Cambridge | CB23 6EA
t: 01954 713348 | e: david.roberts@scambs.gov.uk
www.scambs.gov.uk | facebook.com/south-cambridgeshire | twitter.com/SouthCambs

SIGN UP FOR BUSINESS SUPPORT NEWS AND INFORMATION

Joining our business register will also ensure you will be the first to know about financing and funding opportunities, contracts and tenders, updates on infrastructure or new developments, business workshops, awards competitions and local business news, including subscription to Open For Business - an e-newsletter sent out every other month