

CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION – MATTER 8



Representor: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd and Merton College, Oxford

Representor Reference Number: 536

Date: 6 June 2022

MATTER 8: INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

1. This Hearing Statement has been prepared on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd and Merton College Oxford (hereafter 'Merton College') the respective promoters and landowners of draft allocation HA1 'Land South East of Syston'.
2. The Inspectors' issues and questions as set out in the 'Matters, Issues & Questions' document of 25th April are set out in bold text below. The representations follow in standard text.

ISSUE 1 – THE INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

8.2 Does the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (Appendix 3 of the Plan) enable a coordinated and strategy led approach to the delivery of new and improved infrastructure to support planned growth? Can the priorities, costs and funding sources for the different types of infrastructure be easily identified from the Schedule?

3. The Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix 3 is supported.
4. With regard to proposed allocation HA1, the Schedule includes a requirement for a site of 2-3 ha to be reserved for a new 2 form entry primary school. This requirement is also set out in Policy DS3 (HA1). This requirement for a new 2 form entry primary school is as a result of the cumulative impact of developments in the area, including site HA1.
5. As the scale of the school is the result of need, arising not just from the site HA1, the Schedule and Policy DS3 (HA1) sets out that it is expected that the reasonable costs, consistent with the child yields of the developments, of providing the school will be shared amongst the developments that it would serve. The Pre-submission Draft Local Plan identifies these as sites HA2 and HA3 as well as the HA1 Site. This will require a commercial position to be agreed with the Promoters on the additional land required, over and above the child yield of the development.
6. The Council and the Local Education Authority are preparing a delivery strategy document for all the new primary schools identified in the Pre-submission Draft Local Plan. This will cover arrangements for the timing and funding of the new schools will include matters such as when the land for the schools is required by the Local Education Authority.
7. This position has been agreed between Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Merton College and Charnwood Borough Council in the submitted Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).
8. The infrastructure requirements set out within the Schedule which relate specifically to site HA1 and where there is a requirement for Section 106 developer contributions to enable delivery, including transport and health are acknowledged and supported.

9. With regard to site HA1 the schedule also sets out that, with regard to water and sewage, capacity improvement requirements need to be reviewed in more detail by Severn Trent Water. Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd and Merton College, Oxford are committed to assisting Severn Trent Water as necessary in this regard.
10. The scale of transport mitigation required specifically in relation to Syston is clearly set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS). The works required are wholly consistent with the transport evidence base prepared for the Local Plan and indeed more recent local transport assessments prepared in support of recent planning applications.
11. Two schemes are identified for Syston (SY3 and SY5) and the priority of them being essential is noted. It is pertinent to note the junction of Queniborough Road / Barkby Road (SY3) lies immediately between sites HA1 and HA2. The delivery of improvements at this location could therefore be delivered as part of the housing allocation coming forward or as identified in the IDS via Section 106 contributions. It is clear from the modelling that the traffic impacts arising from the development within Syston are generally modest and low key and can be readily delivered by the proposed allocations. It is further clear that development at Syston has less of an impact on the Strategic Road Network as the majority of demand is to the south (towards Leicester).
12. Given the strategic nature of the modelling, the precise details of the improvements are most appropriately refined and designed at the planning application stage and therefore further detail at the Local Plan stage is considered unnecessary.

8.6 What is the likely effect of the proposed scale and distribution of development on the strategic and local highway network and key junctions? Have the necessary improvements and/or mitigation measures to the strategic and local highway network been identified in the Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, including costs and timing/phasing where necessary?

13. The consideration of transport impacts has been assessed in full accordance with the requirements of the NPPG on Transport Evidence Bases in Plan Making and Decision Taking, and with the NPPF Chapter 9.
14. A strategic transport assessment has been undertaken to inform the Pre-Submission Local Plan using the Pan-Regional Transport Model (PRTM), which is an extension of the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM 2014).
15. Initially two different options for the distribution of development sites were tested and the results were used, along with a wide range of other evidence, to inform the identification of a third hybrid option for further testing. This further testing has informed the final site selection process.
16. The results of this modelling work enabled a package of mitigation measures to be identified which would support the delivery of the scale and distribution of development proposed in the Local Plan.
17. The approach is therefore consistent with the requirements of NPPG Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 54-004-20141010 which requires:

An assessment of the transport implications should be undertaken at a number of stages in the preparation of a Local Plan:

- *as part of the initial evidence base in terms of issues and opportunities*
- *as part of the options testing*
- *as part of the preparation of the final submission*

The last of these stages should highlight the scale of and priorities for investment requirements and support infrastructure spending plans. Like a sustainability appraisal, it will be an iterative process and become more refined and detailed as the process draws to a conclusion.

18. The Submission Local Plan is therefore supported by a comprehensive suite of Transport Appraisal documents including the Sustainable Transport Study September 2020. That report demonstrates the high quality public transport connections between Syston and Leicester, including both frequent bus services and rail services. TW have prepared their own assessment of transport accessibility in relation to site HA1. This clearly concludes that the site benefits from excellent connections to the local public transport networking being within walking distance of the train station and capable of enhancing the already high frequency bus services running from Syston to Leicester.

19. The impact on the Local Highway Network has been assessed both locally and strategically through the various Transport Appraisals that have been undertaken using the Leicestershire County Council strategic transport models. The findings of these reports are that localised mitigation is required within Syston and on the wider Strategic Road Network as a result of cumulative growth across the borough. These include schemes within Syston which include localised junction and public realm improvements.
20. It is clear from the modelling that developments within Syston do not generate significant transport demands on the wider Strategic network as the majority of demand for travel is either within Syston or Leicester to the south (which is discussed above).
21. On an individual and local basis, there is also up to date and current evidence which considers the localised impacts of developments within Syston. Both HA3 and HA2 are subject to planning applications (P/21/2639/2 and P22/0354/2). Cumulatively these propose (195 + 251) 446 dwellings.
22. Both applications are supported by comprehensive Transport Assessments which demonstrate the sites can come forward in a manner consistent with the NPPF without the need for wider strategic transport mitigation or indeed any significant local mitigation which cannot be dealt with through normal development processes.

8.7 Does the transport modelling undertaken so far (EB/TR/11, 12 & 13) enable specific impacts on the highway network to be identified, for mitigation measures to be developed in response to that modelling and then required as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and site allocation policies? Is any further work required to establish this?

23. The position in respect of local impacts and mitigation for Syston are clearly set out in the IDP and these are consistent with the overall evidence base. For the reasons set out above, no further detail is required at this stage to enable the allocations within Syston to be found sound.
24. It is understood that the cumulative strategic impact of the whole plan is still under review and discussions are being held with National Highways and other stakeholders. Clearly the strategy for securing appropriate contributions towards the wider strategic impacts (specifically on the A46 as defined under the “Strategic Infrastructure” section of Appendix 3) requires more detail in terms of delivery streams.
25. The most appropriate way to deal with that would be through the Policy framework already proposed at INF1 and INF2.
26. However, some of the schemes identified go beyond the scope of the Local Plan and are related to wider growth and strategic interventions at a national level. These will require co-ordination and co-operation across a number of different planning and highway authorities and therefore the most appropriate route for promoting, reviewing and if necessary, delivering those schemes should be through the formal Road Investment Strategy (RIS) Process by National Highways and should not hold up or delay the delivery of the local plan. Those schemes identified as RIS Schemes or wide Strategic Growth Plan Priorities can be appropriately attributed to national funding sources rather than be a pre-requisite of the Local Plan. This is consistent with the approach set out in Circular 02.13 Paragraphs 18 and 19.