

DATE:	29 September 2020	CONFIDENTIALITY:	Public
SUBJECT:	Cranbrook DPD – Inspectors AQ's relating to Highway Detail / Sustainable Transport		
PROJECT:	70051805 – Cranbrook West	AUTHOR:	Jeff Troake
CHECKED:	Jeff Troake	APPROVED:	Peter Evans

CRANBROOK DPD EXAMINATION

STAGE 2 QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

STATEMENT on behalf of EAST DEVON NEW COMMUNITY PARTNERS

QUESTIONS AQ17-19: ADDITIONAL HIGHWAY DETAIL and SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

Introduction

Prior to the resumption of the EIP into the Examination of the Cranbrook Plan, the Inspector has raised a number of focused questions. AQ17, AQ18 and AQ19 relate specifically to Highway Detail / Sustainable Transport. In response to these AQ's this statement has been prepared by WSP on behalf of the East Devon New Community Partners (EDNCP)

AQ17. Are there any comments or views to take into account from the clarity provided in table 3.10 relating to Section 278 costs relating to highway improvements relating to London Road?

The costs as set out in table 3.10 are considered to be higher than expected for the delivery of the infrastructure identified. Whilst it is noted that the costs also include for adoption and professional fees, this does not explain the higher than expected values. There is also no evidence base as to why these are as presented.

Furthermore and importantly they must be appropriately proportioned to the individual application sites. No details on how this will be allocated have been provided.

In terms of the EDNCP proposals at Bluehayes, the plans no longer include for the provision of a pedestrian / cycle bridge over London Road to connect with Treasbeare. An alternative pedestrian / cyclist solution has been designed to facilitate the linkage between the sites without the need for a bridge. As such the costs associated with the bridge are not reflective of the accessibility strategy for the Bluehayes application as submitted. This has been a matter of some discussion with EDDC and was also discussed in some detail in Round 1 of the Cranbrook DPD EIP.

The costs associated with the delivery of the s.278 works will also be subject to review at the time of delivery, and there must therefore be flexibility to adjust these. Indeed s.278 works may well be carried out by the developer, not the council, in which case the prices will be borne by the developer. This will of course need to be set out in the various legal agreements in due course, and the appropriate apportionment of costs will need to be agreed.

AQ18. Is the revised position of Devon County Council in relation to sustainable transport contributions justified in the light of the available evidence? If it is not, what evidence do you rely on to support your comments?

The EDNCP broadly supports DCC's request insofar as it seeks to change the s106 contributions towards sustainable transport in light of the timescale of delivery of the second rail station. 4.1.1 of DCC's revised transport request sets out the revised request for contributions for public transport. Parts 'a' and 'b' of 4.1.1 are:

"a. concentrate more on provision of enhanced bus provision to serve the expansion areas (cost of £6,128,000 for 5 years, further details below).

b. provide £250,000 to undertake feasibility work for a second station to provide the basis of a potential future bid for Government/third party funding to deliver it."

It is considered that these are reasonable if taken in isolation, although the justification of these figures needs to be provided and considered in the light of the overall transport and section 106 and infrastructure package.

Part c of 4.1.1 states that:

DATE:	29 September 2020	CONFIDENTIALITY:	Public
SUBJECT:	Cranbrook DPD – Inspectors AQ's relating to Highway Detail / Sustainable Transport		
PROJECT:	70051805 – Cranbrook West	AUTHOR:	Jeff Troake
CHECKED:	Jeff Troake	APPROVED:	Peter Evans

"c. S106 provisions to secure the land for a future second Cranbrook rail station in perpetuity".

Whilst the land that is requested in part 'c' is located in the expansion area referred to as Cobdens, outside of the control of the EDNCP, it is considered that this request has a monetary value associated with it which has not been identified. DCC need to set out what the likely s.106 provision actually is in monetary terms, as the combined value of a, b, and c could well exceed the previous values requested. More importantly for EDNCP, clarity needs to be provided as to whether the Cobdens area would be equally liable for 'their share' of parts 'a' and 'b'.

AQ19. The revised amount requested from DCC is lower than that now included in the revised IDP of £7,363,000. The Council is requested to clarify why there is a variance from the £6,378,000 in the DCC document)?

Whilst this question is directed at the DCC, our understanding is that the lower cost is a result of it not being possible to deliver the second rail station in the near future due to Network Rail's plans for the West of England line which puts delivery and funding of the rail enhancements DCC previously requested in question. The West of England Line Study sets out a series of work packages for future rail investment, with enhancement of the existing station, which would significantly increase the cost of the second station, rather than the delivery of the second station at Cranbrook which is the preference of DCC. Whilst Network Rail proposes to consider the potential for a second station in the future, it makes clear that it would be the responsibility of the third-party promoter (ie. DCC) to take forward this scheme. This would evidently be a longer-term, if at all, deliverable.

As a direct result of the above, the measures for encouraging sustainable travel have been revisited with greater focus on bus provision, walking & cycling, shared mobility and travel planning. In the view of DCC these measures can be delivered more quickly, with greater certainty and at a lower cost.

DCC consider that 'if the relief of the peak hour trips removed by rail is eliminated, it is proposed that a significant upgrade to bus services must be provided'. EDNCP are broadly supportive of this approach, but consideration must be given to the comments in relation to AQ18 above – in particular a justification for the figures requested.

WSP