

# Review of Transport Documents Lubenham

Ver	Date	Author	Review	Approve	Comments
1	24 Nov 2014	Duncan Forbes	Neal Edwards		Initial Draft for comments
2	27 Nov 2014	Duncan Forbes			Update following review
3	2 Dec 2014	Duncan Forbes	Neal Edwards	Duncan Forbes	Final Document following review by Client

## 1 Summary

- 1.1.1 EAE Consultancy have been asked<sup>1</sup> by Lubenham Parish Council to review the latest documents related to the developments within the North West of Harborough Strategic Development Area (SDA) in order to provide the parish with robust information that can:
- Inform elements and policies of their Neighbourhood Plan
  - Provide the parish with accurate and trusted information to be used in responses to the soon to be determined applications within the SDA.
- 1.1.2 This has been a very limited study, and cannot hope to form a complete picture of either good or bad points within the transport assessment. It aims to raise points pertinent to Lubenham Parish Council that can be discussed with the developer, Leicestershire County Council Highways Development Control (LCC HDC) and the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in order to agree whether the impacts on the village and parish are robustly assessed and whether measures to improve safety, connectivity or accessibility are required in the village/parish. It should be read in conjunction with a note<sup>2</sup> prepared by EAE Consultancy for Lubenham Parish Council in April 2013 which highlighted concerns which have not been adequately addressed.
- 1.1.3 This note specifically highlights broad concerns with the way that the **strategic outputs** of LLITM have been used directly without considering the **local effects** that would arise close to the development and particularly within the village/parish of Lubenham. These concerns arise from factors such as:
- Locally derived trip rates (LLITM rates have not been calibrated against TRICS with respect to the type of developments proposed and consistent with the specific Smarter Choices interventions that are proposed on the development.)
  - Not using a specific local traffic distribution (eg school trips, retail trips, leisure trips).
- The result is that the Transport Assessment (TA) has trip volumes that are likely to be low, and not robustly distributed to local destination (eg Lubenham primary school, leisure facilities)
- 1.1.4 The more robust approach to adopt would be to have the LLITM core strategy modelling and report acting as a strategic overview of the high-level impacts within Market Harborough and Lubenham with the detailed assessment of the developments undertaken using locally derived trip rates and including the impacts of specific local distributions (eg school trips) or roads and junctions within the vicinity of the SDA. This would have included Lubenham village and the highways impact related to

<sup>1</sup> Transport Study Brief2.docx: Diana Cook, November 2014

<sup>2</sup> Lubenham Transport Evidence v1.1.docx Duncan Forbes, April 2013

---

the village school. It would also include the impact of through traffic on the link road between the A4304 and B6047. This detailed assessment does not appear to have been undertaken.

1.1.5 Concerns are also raised with respect to the core scenario which is used as a reference within the assessment. This is not a true 'No development' option as the number of households with and without development scenarios are broadly the same. Householders who are now not residing at the SDA are assumed to live elsewhere in Harborough/Leicestershire and travel on the county highway network. **The result is that the comparison of the with/without development scenarios are not acceptable. They do not truly represent that contribution, nor the change that is due to the development at the SDA**

1.1.6 If a review of this evidence was undertaken it is likely to demonstrate that the SDA has a larger impact on Lubenham village/parish than currently estimated. It is out of the scope of this note to propose appropriate mitigation, however it might include

- Pelican crossing on A 4304 in Lubenham village
- Improved junctions between Foxton Road/A4304 which might include
  - Signalisation
  - Mini-roundabout
  - Shared space environment
- Improved walking/cycling facilities between the SDA and Lubenham school and SDA and Foxton School
- Improved walking/cycling facilities along Foxton Road between A4304 and Gartree estate
- Improved crossings (ped/cycle) across the A4304 in Lubenham
- Improved walking facilities between Bramfield Mobile Home Park and Lubenham Village

## 2 Documents reviewed

2.1.1 The Transport Assessment for the Manor Farm development of 450 dwellings within the (SDA)

- 450 dwellings
- Document dated June to Sept 2014 (Watermans on behalf of Davidsons)
- Complete TA
- [13\\_01483\\_OUT-APPENDIX\\_9.1\\_TRANSPORT\\_ASSESSMENT\\_PAGES\\_1\\_TO\\_70-506227.pdf](#)

2.1.2 An Addendum TA for the Airfield Farm Development

- Document dated Oct 2013 (Watermans on behalf of Hallam Land Management and William Davis)
- Addendum to the original TA to address points raised by LCC Highways Development Control (HDC)

## 3 Detail

### 3.1 **INAPPROPRIATE USE OF LLITM MODEL RESULTS**

3.1.1 The Transport Assessments make extensive use of LLITM model to determine trip rates, distribution and impacts. The core strategy assessment is a strategic LLITM study which gives the broad overview. It identifies the 'big', strategic, issues. A detailed transport assessment (TA) is then required to detail the local impacts of the development. **This has not been undertaken. All results are derived from the strategic core-strategy modelling.**

---

3.1.2 The following points should be addressed

- Use trip rates derived from TRICS relating to the specific development that is proposed. LLITM is known to produce low trip rates based upon NTS and not TRICS. TRICS trip rates are required for consistency with other proposed development within Leicestershire
- Model specific smarter choices measures (hard and soft) at the development that might lead to a reduction in vehicle trips. These should be tested with a with and without the soft (travel planning measures) inline with DfT WebTAG recommendations in WebTAGM5.2
- Use latest LLITM version 5. The current assessment is based upon the use of LLITM version 1 or 2. This is a very old version of LLITM which seems completely inappropriate for a TA dated Sept 2014.
- Factor in Local distributions. These have not been factored in at-all. Especially school trips. Lubenham schools catchment area will include parts of the SDA. LLITM produces strategic distributions which are perfectly robust for the wider area, but need to be augmented when considering the impact of local schools and leisure and retail trips.

### **3.2 CORE SCENARIO IS NOT A TRUE 'WITHOUT DEVELOPMENT CASE'**

- 3.2.1 LLITM shows that traffic on A4304 Lubenham Road increases by around 30% between 2008 and 2026. (Appendix I of LLITM report accompanying application). **What is required to assess the impact of the development is the volume and proportion of that growth that is specifically due to the SDA.**
- 3.2.2 The analysis undertaken by AECOM and Watermans does not address this question because the core scenario (which does not include the dwellings at the SDA) includes the households and population that could have lived in the SDA, and distributes them within Harborough/Leicestershire. These households make trips that are included within the background growth, with the effect that the core scenario includes the trips made by residents who might live in the SDA.
- 3.2.3 This methodology is perfectly robust for comparing the impacts of different scenarios, but it is **not** appropriate for assessing the impact of a new development where the IMPACT due to that development is required.
- 3.2.4 This can be addressed by undertaking select link analysis from the development in order to determine the proportion of trips due to the development and the proportion due to background growth. However the comparison needs to be done against the 2008 base year.