



## Strategic sites committee agenda supplement

Date: Thursday 11 February 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: MS Teams

Agenda Item	Time	Page No
<b>5 CC/0015/20 - New dual carriageway link road including: roundabout junction B4443 Lower Road, roundabout junction at A413 Wendover Road, railway bridge, footway/cycleways, noise attenuation barrier, street lighting, earthworks and landscaping between B4443 Lower Road and A413</b>		<b>3 - 6</b>

If you would like to attend a meeting, but need extra help to do so, for example because of a disability, please contact us as early as possible, so that we can try to put the right support in place.

For further information please contact: Charlie Griffin on 01494 732011, email [democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank



## Buckinghamshire Council

[www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk](http://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk)

### Corrigendum to Buckinghamshire Strategic Sites Committee

---

<b>Application Number:</b>	CC/0015/20
<b>Proposal:</b>	New dual carriageway link road including: roundabout junction B4443 Lower Road, roundabout junction at A413 Wendover Road, railway bridge, footway/cycleways, noise attenuation barrier, street lighting, earthworks and landscaping between B4443 Lower Road and A413
<b>Site Location:</b>	Land Between The A413 Wendover Road And The B4443 Lower Road In The Parishes Of Stoke Mandeville, Weston Turville And Aylesbury
<b>Applicant:</b>	Buckinghamshire Council
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Sue Pilcher
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	Wendover, Halton and Stoke Mandeville Aston Clinton and Berton
<b>Parish Council:</b>	Stoke Mandeville and Weston Turville
<b>Date valid application received:</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> April 2020
<b>Recommendation</b>	It is recommended that permission be deferred and delegated to the Director of Planning and Environment to <b>GRANT</b> permission subject to conditions as considered appropriate by Officers and completion of a memorandum of understanding regarding the delivery of the transport mitigation

1. Correction/clarification to reports:
  - a. Para 5.118 – very limited negative weight (not limited weight) should be given to the impact on BMV agricultural land (as set out in the planning balance)
  - b. Para 5.138 – the report refers to the bridge having a long span of 78m at a maximum height of 10m. Including the 1m depth of the bridge deck, where the land falls away on the western side of the bridge the height of the bridge above ground level would be 12.3m. The clearance height of the bridge over the railway line would be 6.45m with the overall height of the bridge at this point being 7.5m.

2. Further representations:

A further letter of support (taking the total to 12 in support) has been received commenting that:

- Would like to see the improvements of Churchill avenue/B4443 Roundabout Improvements measures for the Link Road

A further letter of objection has been received from the Hampden Fields Action Group commenting again on the mainly transport related objections they previously made:

- The AM Peak hour model period in the ATM model base year has been changed. The modelled morning peak is now 07.00 to 08.00, not 08.00 to 09.00 (as in previous versions of the Aylesbury Traffic Model and the current Countywide Model being used for the Local Plan Examination). No explanation has been given for this potentially very significant change. Nor has any response been received from the Highways Authority. It simply lacks credibility to state that this is a labelling error
- The model needs to be representative of the busiest weekday hours for it to have any credibility. A full explanation is again required if this is not to be judged a significant error
- A study must/should have been carried out to support the development of the SEALR business case and the Aylesbury Transport Model. ATC's cannot be located for the SEALR application, or in the development of the Aylesbury Transport Model and the Local Model Validation Report
- The lack of specific detail on the performance of the ATM model in representing flows at the Walton Street gyratory is a serious omission. The gyratory observed flows are not validated and there cannot be any confidence in the assertion that future year problems at the gyratory have been solved.
- Surprising that no comparison was carried out for the Walton Street Gyratory and the A413/Camborne Avenue roundabout, both of which will be affected by the changes proposed in the current application
- No assessment of the wider impact and validation has been performed for a scenario that includes ELR(S), SLR, SEALR, SMRR and SWALR and the associated land use developments. Not been demonstrated that the current version of the ATM Model is fit for purpose for examining the cumulative impact scenarios reported in the TAA.
- The standalone case is now defunct. It cannot be achieved as we are already in 2021. New standalone scenario should be developed for 2025 or 2026.
- Highly unlikely that even if the council were able to proceed this road could be physically opened before 2024 at the earliest and probably more realistically 2026 due to CPO process, design matters and construction
- Committee reports for 16/00424/AOP and 16/01040/AOP of October 2017, said that the SEALR would be in place by 2021 because "early works" had begun. Neither the public nor the committee should be so easily put off this time.
- Developer funding for SEALR is very unlikely to be obtained from the Hampden Fields developer before 2025-6.
- There are a number of Warnings that are associated with many of the data Runs, it is difficult to see how the Highways Authority can have enough confidence in the approach taken and the modelled outcomes.

- No analysis was carried out for 2021 Scenario A for Stoke Mandeville Hospital access roundabout.
- The standalone situation at a crucial emergency junction must be addressed by the Highways Authority. Increased queuing could seriously hamper the speed and efficiency of emergency vehicles to access the emergency entry/exit and ambulance station. Real possibility that SEALR will be brought forward before other applications and associated infrastructure.
- The SEALR is designed to decrease the need to access radial routes, it has no or negligible benefit in the fully built out 2036 scenario, even with the inclusion of the South West Aylesbury Link Road. An example, among others, of the purported benefits of SEALR not being realised. That the situation will be improved when the full schemes are built out in 2036 is simply unacceptable given that this situation could be in place for over a decade.
- In the 2021 Scenario B PM peak SEALR is actually shown to increase congestion, not been addressed. The Inspector report into the gyratory found that even small increases in queue lengths were significant enough for him to reject the application
- Significant difference between the figures presented by SEALR and those shown in the Cumulative 2 2036 scenario presented in the 16/00424/AOP and the 16/01040/AOP joint Cumulative assessment
- In the standalone scenario there are significant increases in traffic flows along Camborne Avenue. This is not acceptable as it leaves a severe residual impact created by the development which has not been addressed. An open ended “commitment” of addressing it in the future is no binding commitment at all. Mitigation has to be clear from the outset and appropriate provision made in the s106 agreement.
- For Eascote Road the promise by the developer that commits the Council to future monitoring is not sufficient, needs to be supported by clear S106 binding commitments, must be addressed before the application is allowed to progress. Otherwise the probability of residents of the Eascote Road/Patrick Way area being left ‘high and dry’ is unacceptably high.
- Road safety issues not addressed, straight road should be re-designed, will be uncontrolled speeding.
- Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), no further figures appear to have been published, despite the changes to the 2036 scenario. The public is significantly prejudiced by this and it brings into question the data on which both the Environmental Statement and the Transport Assessment have been based.
- Concerned about the Highways Authority scrutiny of the key issues and their responses, or lack of them, to many key issues. Would like a full and objective assessment of all the issues raised.
- No AADT’s have been published for the new 2036 scenario but no changes to the 2036 Air Quality assessment have been made. This is an omission that needs correcting only show differences in scenarios not the actual data.

1 other objection has been received making the following comments:

- Option 1 is the worst possible implementation of the original 10 options. Option 9 results in the minimum impact on existing dwellings, removes the need for the CPO of the protected green space and the changes to Eascote road. Option 9 also utilizes a tunnel, which is the only solution to minimize visual and audible intrusion on existing residents. Option 9 utilizes the existing Hampden Hall roundabout and due to its staggered nature

will help reduce speed in the final Aylesbury ring road. Option 9 is clearly stated as having a cost similar to Option 1 and is the optimal solution to the SEALR requirements.

1 further representation on behalf of Land Improvement Holdings (LIH) commenting that they support the SEALR application and are helping to facilitate it's delivery by safeguarding land within their ownership through dialogue with BC in relation to flood mitigation design, servicing, access etc. Support is conditional on the SEALR scheme ensuring that it does not impede or delay the delivery of housing on LIH's land within the D-AGT1 allocation, if not would requested deferral until matters are dealt with. This includes securing appropriate mitigation (a number to be secured by conditions) in respect of:

- Securing the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes up onto the SEALR carriageway rather than just 'passive provision'. The level crossing should be stopped up and diverted.
- A detailed noise attenuation scheme which provides adequate mitigation for future residents of the D-AGT1 allocation, not just existing residential receptors.
- A number of junctions would be impacted and it seems BCC are proposing no mitigation.
- Need appropriate landscaping
- Question whether alternatives for securing biodiversity net gain have been considered which could do so through acquiring less land from LIH. Land included within the SEALR red line which overlaps their planning application boundary can be used by LIH in calculations of BNG and Green Infrastructure.
- Additional service ducts should be provided beneath the SEALR.
- The proposed diversion of the UKPN power line along the south of the SEALR through LIH land is not acceptable and any such diversion must be discussed and agreed with LIH
- A number of the above matters can be addressed through appropriate conditions. Subject to a satisfactory response on these matters and confirmation that LIH will be consulted on the terms of conditions to be determined by Officers we will maintain our public support for the scheme. If a satisfactory response is not provided LIH would intend to request a deferral until these matters are addressed. Failing that, all the issues raised will be included in LIH's CPO claim covering direct and indirect affection.