Matter 6: Transport and Other infrastructure- Responses to Hearing Statements on behalf of Countryside Properties for EIP session

December 2019

# North Essex Authorities - Shared Strategic (Section 1) Plan



Matter 6: Transport and Other infrastructure- Responses to Hearing Statements on behalf of Countryside Properties for EIP session

December 2019

# North Essex Authorities - Shared Strategic (Section 1) Plan

Prepared by: Prepared for:

Steer Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium &

28-32 Upper Ground Countryside Properties
London SE1 9PD The Drive, Brentwood

Essex CM13 3AT

+44 20 7910 5000

www.steergroup.com Our ref: 23451103

Steer has prepared this material for Countryside Properties plc. This material may only be used within the context and scope for which Steer has prepared it and may not be relied upon in part or whole by any third party or be used for any other purpose. Any person choosing to use any part of this material without the express and written permission of Steer shall be deemed to confirm their agreement to indemnify Steer for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Steer has prepared this material using professional practices and procedures using information available to it at the time and as such any new information could alter the validity of the results and conclusions made.



North Essex Authorities - Shared Strategic (Section 1) Plan | Matter 6: Transport and Other infrastructure- Responses to Hearing Statements on behalf of Countryside Properties for EIP session

### **Contents**

Matters arising from Statement of North Essex Authorities (NEAs) and statement of Common Ground of ECC and HE	1
Matters arising from Response of Rayne Parish Council	
Matters Arising from Hearing Statement by Steve Johnstone of Lawrence Walker limit	
Q14 RTS Costs	
O18 Public Transport funding	



# Matters arising from Statement of North Essex Authorities (NEAs) and statement of Common Ground of ECC and HE

#### Matter 6, Question 1 (b).

1.1 Our understanding from discussion with the NEAs, and the proposed modification 58 to SP5 which does not include reference to the WoBGC, was that as the A120 Millennium Way Slips (Braintree) scheme has confirmed funding for delivery by 2021, the delivery of the major A120 scheme was not required for the delivery of the WoBGC. However, it is noted that the response for the NEAs states:

"It is considered that the new A120 scheme is essential for the delivery of the full WoBGC, however, a number of homes could be delivered in the Plan period, in advance of the new A120. Key development related traffic movements in the Plan period are likely to be to the west (to Stansted and beyond via the M11 to Cambridge and Harlow) and south (to Chelmsford and beyond), with a relatively low proportion of trips to the east (to Braintree and beyond). There are numerous improvements to the strategic infrastructure which are underway in the short term to help facilitate these movements."

By contrast, it is noted from the draft statement of common ground **SCG.017A** between ECC and Highways England (the highway authority for the A120) that HE:

with reference to the A120 Millennium Way Slips (Braintree) scheme stated that it:

"... will support economic growth locally and along the A120 corridor, and assist in the delivery of new housing development in the Braintree area and the wider A120 corridor"

Funding for this scheme was procured through the Department for Transport's National Productivity Investment Fund for the Local Road Network. ECC's successful application for this funding (<a href="https://www.essexhighways.org/uploads/files/NPIF-Application-Form-Millennium-Way-Slips.pdf">https://www.essexhighways.org/uploads/files/NPIF-Application-Form-Millennium-Way-Slips.pdf</a>) stated:

"...the scheme will deliver (amongst other benefits):-

- Localised housing growth Braintree 9,650 homes including the proposed Garden Community during the plan period up to 2033 (for further details appendix J)
- Further growth along and near the corridor (57,000 new homes), including Uttlesford, Colchester, Chelmsford and Tendring"
- 1.2 There was no suggestion that the current WBGC local plan allocation is dependent on the A120 scheme. We await clarification from ECC and HE regarding the full development.
- 1.3 Indeed, our initial analysis of likely trip distribution and assignment to the road network suggests that only around 6% of traffic from WBGC could be expected to reach as far as the A120 at Marks Tey Applying 6% would suggest less than a 5% increase in traffic once fully developed to the section of A120 that is referred to in Q6.1.(b).
- 1.4 It could also reasonably be assumed that the significant investment in the RTS and other sustainable transport initiatives that would come forward with the delivery of the GCs would result in a welcome mode shift away from the car for existing trips along the A120 corridor.
- 1.5 In light of the above, we reconfirm our belief that the delivery of WBGC is not reliant on the delivery of the A120 improvement scheme as queried in Matter 6, Question 1 (b).

steer

### **Matters arising from Response of Rayne Parish Council**

- The concern raised with regard to indicative alignments for potential RTS routes in and around Rayne Village are noted. The main road running through the village is traffic calmed and clearly it is important that the benefits that Rayne Bypass have provided to local residents should be protected. The selection of suitable routes and other infrastructure associated with the delivery of the RTS would need to be, and would be, carried out sensitively and in full consultation with local communities.
- 1.7 There are three existing local bus routes that serve Rayne Village, but only the A133 service is provided throughout the day, at an hourly frequency in each direction. The introduction of the RTS that could serve Rayne provides an excellent opportunity for enhancing public transport connectivity for existing and future local residents with key employment and leisure centres.
- 1.8 It could reasonably be expected that the RTS would be delivered using electric vehicles. This would mean the RTS would be brought forward with quieter, cleaner vehicles than traditional buses and could help address the concerns raised by Rayne Parish Council and hence provide the opportunity for the RTS alignment to acceptably pass through existing built up areas.



## Matters Arising from Hearing Statement by Steve Johnstone of Lawrence Walker limited

#### **Q14 RTS Costs**

- 1.9 The suggestion that the costs provided for the RTS by NEA are unreasonable in response to Q14, appears unfounded.
- 1.10 Countryside have assumed that on-site infrastructure for the RTS through the Garden Communities will be provided by the developers in a similar way to other roads. The cost of such provision is well understood and can be provided efficiently when being built alongside other new infrastructure on mainly greenfield sites. A low level of optimism bias for those elements is hence justified.
- 1.11 The benchmark prices referred to in EB/079 also appear reasonable. For example:
  - Approximately 40km (75% segregated) of Fastrack RTS in Kent has been delivered for around £95 million since 2006.
  - A further phase of Fastrack which will add more than 20km of new route is being promoted at a cost of £45 million (2016 prices including optimism Bias).
  - Approximately 25km of Fastway RTS in West Sussex has been delivered for around £30million since 2003.
  - Belfast Glider BRT route covers around 25km and was opened in 2018 at a cost of around £100 million.

#### **Q18 Public Transport funding**

- 1.12 Mr Johnstone's response is inaccurate. The role of Public transport in the delivery of the GCs is clearly set out in EB088 and the funding for public transport is explicitly included in the infrastructure cost report EB087, for example at Section 2, row 8.1 -Investment in early phase bus/transit services (WoB14).
- 1.13 The necessary shortfall funding for local bus services and contributions towards the RTS are reflected in the per household costs identified in EB087 that have then been adopted for the viability analysis.
- 1.14 Countryside have assumed that the early phases of the delivery of WBGC will be associated with need for introducing additional bus services to complement existing services to provide links for the GC with key local destinations including Braintree, Chelmsford and Stansted. These local bus routes would complement the RTS providing feeder services and also local connections with traditional multi stop routes. With time, as demand grows with the delivery of WBGC these services would be expected to grow and become commercially self-sufficient.
- 1.15 The public transport investment has been allowed for in costings and this will continue in one form or another throughout the development. Accordingly, it is expected that good quality bus services will be provided from the first occupation, even though subsidy will obviously be needed at an early stage. Later, even if RTS in terms of trackless trams does not come forward, RTS will still be achieved and where applicable segregated lanes for, or priority for good quality (electric) buses, will be provided both on-site and off-site.

steer

## **Control Information**

Prepared for		
Countryside Properties plc		
The Drive, Brentwood		
Essex		
CM13 3AT		
Client contract/project number		
Reviewer/approver		
Distribution		
Client: Steer:		





