

Project name	15/00619/FUL - South West Milton Keynes		
Design note title	Draft: Transport Statement of Common Ground - Hydrock for Milton Keynes and Icenis for Rule 6 Party		
Document reference	16414-HYD-XX-XX-RP-TP-0005		
Authors	James McKechnie BA (Hons) PGDip FCIHT CMILT (Hydrock for Milton Keynes) Clive Burbridge BSc (Hons), MSc, FCIHT, CMILT, MRTPI, FIHE (Icenis for Rule 6)		
Revision	PO2 -DRAFT		
Date	31 March 2021	Approved	✓

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 This Draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) reflects current points of agreement between Hydrock and Icenis Projects. Review of elements of the recent WSP transportation evidence is still underway, and both parties will endeavour to provide the Inspector with an updated draft as soon as possible.

2. POLICY

2.1 The appeal proposals are inconsistent with the requirements of:

- Plan MK policies CT1, CT2, CT5 and SD15.
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 7, 8, 102, 104, 108, 109, 110 and 111.

2.2 They are also inconsistent with the following parts of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG):

- Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 42-004-20140306
- Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 42-005-20140306.
- Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 42-007-20140306.
- Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 42-015-20140306.

3. 2020 TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT (TA)

3.1 The 2020 TA did not present a suitable evidence base for the determination of the appeal proposals. Large elements of the 2020 TA have been superseded by Transport Response Notes (TRNs) 1-3.

4. TRAFFIC NETWORK MODELLING

4.1 The traffic models in the 2020 TA and TRNs do not enable the analysis of:

- Interaction between traffic queues at adjacent junctions.
- Exit blocking at junctions (where queues from the downstream junction block the exit of the preceding junction).
- Redistribution of traffic across the network.

- Traffic signalised crossings located between junctions.

4.2 The TA/TRNs could have included such analysis – e.g. through the use of VISSIM or other models which are commonly used in the assessment of large development proposals.

5. TRN3

5.1 Modelling in TRN3 indicates that there would be queues extending between a number of key junctions including Windmill Hill, Emerson, Elfield Park and Bleak Hall roundabouts on the A421. These queues are of sufficient length that TRN3 indicates they would block the exit of, or block through, the preceding junction.

5.2 There is no assessment within TRN3 (or elsewhere) of the scale, location and effect of any redistribution of traffic which may result from the network exceeding capacity as predicted, including its environmental impacts.

5.3 In identifying the effect of mitigation proposals, the proper comparison is between the 'without development' future year operation and the equivalent year 'with development' (with mitigation) scenario.

5.4 The NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) require that Transport Assessments present a comprehensive and complete analysis of the likely transport implications of development proposals, alongside deliverable mitigation required to ensure that there are no severe operational or unacceptable safety impacts.

6. MITIGATION PROPOSALS

6.1 The modelling and proposed design of Bottledump and Tattenhoe roundabouts is unacceptable.

6.2 At Bottledump Roundabout (Junction 6 in the TRN):

- The junction modelling is not agreed as suitable for assessment purposes - e.g. in respect of the modelling of entry flares.
- The proposed layout does not address existing issues with large vehicles over-running the kerb/verge.
- Tracking plans have not been provided for all turning movements, and those that have been provided indicate that HGVs would over-run adjacent lanes to the extent that, in places, they would collide with a car running alongside.

6.3 At Tattenhoe Roundabout (Junction 5 in the TRN):

- The model does not properly assess the limited queuing capacity on the roundabout. In reality, queues on the roundabout gyratory would prevent vehicles from exiting at the preceding arm.
- The proposed Keep Clear markings are not enforceable and are not generally used at roundabouts. Yellow box markings should be used instead.
- Vehicle tracking drawings indicate the potential for HGVs to collide with cars running alongside on the roundabout.

- The proposed scheme drawing lacks important details including road markings. Details should also be provided with regard to street furniture, which would need to be re-provided as part of the scheme.
- The proposed changes to the Buckingham Road entry and exit do not appear to be achievable in practice.
- The proposed carriageway widening in the northern quadrant of the junction appears to lie beyond the application red line boundary.

6.4 These are not matters which can be left to s278 stage, as they relate to the acceptability and deliverability of the proposed mitigation works.

6.5 There are deliverability issues at the following junctions; these issues include conflicts with geometric design standards, street furniture, utilities, land availability, safety, and arboricultural issues:

- Junction 1: Buckingham Road / Sherwood Drive / Water Eaton
- Junction 2: Buckingham Road / Shenley Road Double Mini Roundabout
- Junction 12: Kingsmead Roundabout
- Junction 14: Furzton Roundabout
- Junction 15: Bleak Hall Roundabout
- Junction 16: Elfield Park Roundabout
- Junction 17: Emerson Roundabout
- Junction 18: Windmill Hill Roundabout

6.6 Assessment at these locations is ongoing and both parties will endeavour to provide the Inspector with additional detail on these issues at the earliest opportunity.

7. TRAVEL PLAN (TP)

7.1 A Travel Plan Manager (TPM) would be appointed for a 12-month period, but there is no formal commitment as to how long the role would persist (a change from the earlier TP).

7.2 Initial funding would mirror the period of appointment of the TPM, with subsequent funding requirements passing to the Travel Plan Co-ordinators of elements of the appeal site (no specific funding identified at this stage).

7.3 The measures proposed in the Travel Plan do not go beyond the norm and do not justify a separate modelling scenario, particularly given that a proportion of the TRICS sites used to inform the trip generation exercise have Travel Plans, meaning that their effect is already accounted for in the trip rates.

8. AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATION

8.1 The amended application relies on the same TA evidence as the appeal.

- 8.2 The amended application is currently being considered by Buckinghamshire Council (BC), which has issued technical responses citing multiple issues with the application documents. These responses have led to the production of three TRNs which largely supersede the 2020 TA.