

The Welborne Plan EiP
Issue 7: Transport, Access and Movement WEL23 to WEL28
On Behalf of Bovis Homes Group LLP (WP475)

26th September 2014

21 Garlick Hill
London EC4V 2AU
Tel: 020 7489 0213
Fax: 020 7248 4743
www.dwdllp.com

Response to Inspector's Questions

Introduction

1. This written statement sets out a response to The Welborne Plan Inspector's Issues and Questions (August 2014), including a response to Questions 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11 and 7.12 as these questions go to the heart of Bovis's concerns regarding the soundness of The Welborne Plan. Bovis has an option agreement with the landowner (Mr Hedges) affected by the employment land designation and J10 of the M27 motorway works. Bovis has sought to become a member of the Welborne Standing Conference, which meets approximately 4 times a year to discuss issues and progress of the delivery of Welborne. At the time of writing Bovis has not been permitted to sit on the conference to contribute to the delivery of Welborne.

Question 7.1

2. Bovis considers that it is not possible for the Highways Agency or any other body to have yet fully assessed the J10 of the M27 works in the absence of an environmental impact assessment to consider and assess alternatives and any necessary mitigation measures. In the absence of an outline application for the Welborne scheme there is no certainty about delivery or impacts or selection of the preferred solution. Over the last four years or so there have been many options considered and Bovis considers that the current preferred option is sub-standard and will not deliver the transport and access benefits required by the Welborne transport policies.
3. We do not consider that all realistic options have been considered and that the current preferred options development has been hindered and restrained by:
 - by land ownerships limits
 - the creation of roads with conflicting multipurpose uses
 - the use of the development internal road network as a gyratory system to support the new Jct 10 scheme
 - and the possible capacity limits of the new slip lanes.

Question 7.2

4. Any delay to the scheme will limit the ability to develop the Welborne plan in a comprehensive and manage approach. This will inevitably lead to the need to restrict the rate of development so as to not saturate the inadequate road network until a comprehensive and appropriate Junction 10 scheme is forthcoming.

Question 7.3

5. The lack of an agreed and comprehensive scheme for Junction 10, means that the regional, local, public transport and development traffic will all be competing for the limited road space in and
6. around the development on the new and existing network. In some cases the preferred scheme due to the land restraints and junction configuration means that all users are forced to use the same carriageway and junctions.

Question 7.4

7. There are multiple documents which have been prepared related to transport, with differing options, phasing and interaction of modes as the development has progressed, much of which is linked to specific Junction 10 option being considered within those documents. How can any validity been attributed to the documents, when the core transport mitigation scheme that of Junction 10 has not to date been determined. All modes and packages of works hang off this one scheme as does the site masterplan. Any delay or redesign has a material impact on any content or outcomes addressed in the historical transport reports.

Question 7.6

8. Bovis recognises that the Council is seeking to attract funding from sources such as the Local Growth Deal (July 2014). We understand that approximately £19.7m has been secured for Welborne and the J10 of the M27 works. However, this is substantially below the level of funding required for the junction works and clearly means there is a significant risk that without all the funding in place the junction works will not commence or a substandard solution may be determined in the absence of funds for the necessary junction works.
9. Clearly for a new settlement that is required to meet the housing needs of the area, the appropriate solution for the J10 of the M27 works must be found in order to sustain the new community proposed.
10. As defined in our response to 7.4, with the phasing and design of Junction 10 mitigation scheme still fluid, there can be no certainty that the supporting package of junction improvements can be verified with any certainty until the Junction 10 decision is concluded.

Question 7.8

11. Inevitably if the new junction 10 scheme is delayed or a compromised scheme implemented there are limited alternate routes that regional, local and development traffic can utilise therefore the north and local village roads will become more attractive for through trips and rat running. It is key that the principle strategic and national routes are to the south and therefore the connectivity between the development and the southern road network is solely reliant on the implementation of the correct solution for junction 10.

Question 7.10

12. We support the principle of BRT; however we consider the impact of the convoluted Junction 10 scheme coupled with the conflict of regional and local traffic routes with the BRT will conflict with the scheme and limit its efficiency. This will limit its ability to support the high modal shift required to support the BRT and seek to minimise car use to a level that the road network can support. Any delay to Junction 10 scheme will reduce the capacity on the road network and therefore influence the reliability of the BRT and its attractiveness to users. In addition any build rate limitation due to the delay in Junction 10 will limit the patronage for the BRT in the early phases.

Question 7.11

13. As defined in our response to 7.10, the BRT is critical to secure a sustainable development which isn't car dependent; therefore the phasing, viability and ability to be self-supporting and remove need for any high risk subsidies are key to the developments and road networks viability. Any delay or scaled down service due poor funding or patronage linked to a slow build programme will have a critical impact on the attractiveness and success of the BRT.

Question 7.12

14. If Junction 10 were to be further delayed beyond 2022, does this influence any decisions on the viability, need and phasing of a station. Are the future phasing plans and supporting infrastructure packages sufficiently viable and achievable to allow any decision on a station at this stage, given the complexities of securing such schemes?

Amendments to Policies WEL23 and WEL24

WEL23

- i) Delete reference to Transport Framework as this is not defined and is not a technical assessment that can be measured.
- ii) Refer to a Residential Travel Plan and Employment Travel Plan in criteria ii) to accord with known definitions of such documents

- iii) Include reference for a need for a timetable for the delivery of the Bus Rapid Transit network and infrastructure, J10 of the M27 and scales of development associated with the provision of this necessary transport infrastructure

WEL24

- i) Include reference for a need for a timetable for the delivery of the Bus Rapid Transit network and infrastructure, J10 of the M27 and scales of development associated with the provision of this necessary transport infrastructure.