

International Advanced Manufacturing
Park Area Action Plan Examination in Public

Sunderland City Council and South Tyneside Council Local Planning Authorities' Responses to the IAMP AAP Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions

Matter 6- Infrastructure, Transport and Access

(Policies T1, T2, T3, T4, IN1 and IN2)

Final Version 17/03/2017

Matter 6 – Infrastructure, Transport and Access (Policies T1, T2, T3, T4, IN1 and IN2)

6.1 Have the implications of the plan for transport and other infrastructure been robustly assessed and are there arrangements in place to ensure that the necessary mitigation is provided at the appropriate time in relation to the development of IAMP?

Councils' response;

The AAP is supported by a Transport Technical Background Report (PSD19) and Utilities Technical Background Report (PSD20). Both of these documents have assessed the implications of the plan on infrastructure. The Transport TBR is evidenced by technical notes (SD60 - SD66) which established the key issues relating to transport including assessment of the existing road and public transport operations.

Transport

A Paramics micro-simulation traffic model has been produced for the surrounding road network to assess existing and future year traffic operations and also any infrastructure mitigation requirements for IAMP. Using a range of the most recent traffic data and surveys, the base Paramics model has been validated and calibrated, as set out in Doc SD64 (Local Validation Report) and provides an appropriate tool for testing future year network operations, post IAMP. Forecast levels of IAMP development traffic, as derived from Doc SD62 (Multi-Modal Trip Generation Assessment), have then been distributed to the network periphery zones, as set out in Doc SD63 (IAMP Vehicle Trip Distribution). The Paramics model uses a dynamic assignment for traffic on the road network, whereby the model continuously re-evaluates route choice for vehicles based on traffic conditions and as such, also includes for any re-distribution changes in non-IAMP related traffic within the road network considered.

Within the Paramics model, the existing road network has been incrementally loaded with IAMP traffic to determine the point at which highway intervention measures are required; this is set out in SD66 (Existing Network Trigger Point Assessment). A number of highway improvement measures have then been introduced to the model to provide sufficient network capacity to accommodate forecast traffic levels post IAMP. These measures to increase capacity include the A1290 becoming a dual carriageway and a new vehicular bridge over the A19, the justification for which is outlined in SD65 (Washington Road Bridge Option Testing).

The detailed design of highway works and mitigation is being undertaken by IAMP LLP in preparing their DCO application. That application is expected to set out the proposed timing of transport mitigation based on the findings of the environmental assessment and transport assessment which accompany it. It is therefore anticipated that the delivery of transport mitigation will be secured by requirements within the DCO.

Highways England's schemes for the A19 Testo's junction and A19 Downhill Lane junction also form part of the network capacity solution for IAMP, both of which are being progressed as separate DCO applications. These works are currently expected to be completed during Spring 2021. Until such time as the A19 junction improvements are complete, measures will need to be agreed by IAMP LLP with Highways England to manage traffic impacts in the peak Nissan shift change-over periods.

Utilities

The Utilities TBR has been evidenced by two studies (SD68 – SD69) which identify existing infrastructure provision and issues and constraints (Chapter 3.0 – page 4) that will require consideration during the master planning of the site. An assessment of existing capacity has been undertaken through consultation with utility providers and additional capacity has been identified where necessary (Chapter 3.0). The AAP is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (PSD21) which includes delivery phasing when the infrastructure is to be delivered (Page 7). The Delivery Partner has been identified as IAMP LLP.

The Publication Draft AAP does not include reference to obligations on development coming forward in addition to the DCO. However, the proposed modifications to Del 1 (PM 82), requires any application to be supported by a Phasing Strategy to ensure that the infrastructure is in place to deliver an acceptable scheme.

6.2 Does the plan provide for adequate links between IAMP and Follingsby Park Industrial Estate?

Councils' response;

Follingsby Lane provides an important part of the access equation to the IAMP for non-motorised users, as identified in Policy T2 of PSD1 (IAMP Area Action Plan, Publication Draft). The road width is only just sufficient to accommodate two passing cars, has an unfavourable horizontal alignment and is signed as 'unsuitable for HGVs' for its full length. An increase in traffic volume along this link is undesirable.

Access to and from the Follingsby Park Industrial Estate for vehicular traffic needs to be considered on a Network Management basis with the A194M, A184 and A19 being the most appropriate route. Highways England's proposed improvements to the A19 Testo's junction will see a notable improvement in journey times between IAMP and Follingsby Park Industrial Estate.

6.3 Is policy T1, in respect of highway infrastructure, soundly based? Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?

Councils' response;

Policy T1, in respect of highway infrastructure, is considered to be soundly based. As outlined in the response to Issue 6.1 above, the highway infrastructure identified in policy T1 has been tested within the Paramics micro-simulation model to confirm that it offers sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast level of traffic on the road network, post IAMP. It is equally important that the proposed highway infrastructure measures are proportionate to forecast traffic levels and does not notably 'over provide' capacity; this is also demonstrated within the Paramics model.

The modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) are not necessary for the plan to be sound. The Council has proposed these modifications to provide additional clarity and this is set out within the Statement of Compliance (5.2.8 Page 78).

6.4 Are policies T2 and T3, in respect of walking, cycling and horse riding and public transport, soundly based?

And in particular:

Does the plan go far enough in seeking to promote alternatives to the use of the private car?

Councils' response;

The plan promotes alternatives to the use of private car by identifying the requirement for a Travel Plan to form part of a DCO. The Travel Plan should identify a range of measures, initiatives and targets to promote non-car based journeys to and from IAMP. In addition, Policy T2 ensures that non-motorised users are considered throughout the development of IAMP and secures the delivery of a number of measures to encourage walking and cycling.

A modification is proposed to Policy T2 to ensure that it is clear that it can be applied to both the DCO or planning applications coming forward to ensure consistency with the approach outlined in Policy S1.

Proposed Modification

Policy T2

C. Consent shall only be granted for the IAMP where the relevant application ~~the application for a DCO~~ addresses the matters in paragraphs A and B above in the IAMP Design Code.

Does the plan provide adequate and soundly based guidance on public rights of way?

Councils' response;

The plan provides adequate and soundly based guidance on public rights of way. The plan outlines within Section 5.3 that a permeable pedestrian network should be delivered within the IAMP area, with new routes seeking to reflect pedestrian / cycle desire lines. Policy T2 also ensures the provision of bridleways which are linked to the wider bridleway network. In addition, Policy Del2 sets out the approach to securing the mitigation required as part of IAMP, which will be identified during the preparation, submission and examination of the IAMP DCO application.

The Landscape Technical Background Report records the PRowS running through the site, paragraph 78 highlights there are two to the north of the site, in addition to the Great North Forest Trail, which runs along Follingsby Lane. Section 4.2.5 sets out that as part of the scheme *“The principle of incorporating improvements to the PRow and other rights of way network including surfacing and safety into the proposed development would support amenity benefits. Locating paths such as the Great North Forest Heritage Trail or other paths and cycle links along the River Don landscape corridor or other landscaped areas rather than through the built up area of the new development would help users to benefit from the green assets. Paths and access along the river should be set back from the water edge for health and safety and to protect ecological sensitive habitats and species along the River Don.”*

Are the modifications to policies T2 and T3 proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?

Councils' response;

The Council has proposed these modifications to provide additional clarity, strengthen policy or to address representations not relating to matters of soundness and this is set out within the Statement of Compliance (5.2.9 Page 79 and 5.2.10 Page 80).

6.5 Is policy T4, in respect of parking, soundly based? Are the modifications to this policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?

Councils' response;

Parking will play an important role for IAMP and Policy T4 provides the assurance that appropriate levels of car parking are considered during the preparation and examination of the IAMP DCO application. The items included in Policy T4 also seek to be complimentary to Policy T2 and T3 which are aimed at maximising sustainable travel.

The modifications to this policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) are not necessary for the plan to be sound, they are intended to provide further clarity on this policy and strengthen the policy commitment to car and bicycle electric charging points.

6.6 Is policy IN1, in respect of utilities infrastructure provision, soundly based? Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?

Councils' response;

The Statement of Compliance (PSD10a) includes a soundness table for Policy IN1 (5.2.12 Page 82) which concludes that policy IN1 (as proposed) is soundly based. Furthermore, it sets out that the proposed modifications have been made to ensure that infrastructure is delivered and to provide additional clarification.

The contents of this policy have been informed by enquiries to utility companies to ascertain the extent of existing capacity and confirm the requirements to deliver the forecast utility demand for IAMP.

6.7 Is policy IN2, in respect of flood risk, water management and drainage, soundly based? And in particular:

Is it necessary for the policy to seek to ensure that development alleviates flood risk downstream? Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?

Councils' response;

The need for Policy IN2 to seek alleviation to flood risk downstream arises from the aspiration stated in the Planning Practice Guidance that in turn supports the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "*Local planning authorities and developers should seek flood risk management opportunities (eg safeguarding land) ...*". This goes above and beyond the need to directly mitigate the impacts of the proposed development, which are designed to deliver a flood regime that is no different from or worse than the present behaviour of the River Don, Hylton Dene Burn or their tributaries within the prevailing design standards for such works. The aspiration for alleviation is therefore a direct response to government policy on flood risk management and is distinct from the technical requirements of IAMP itself.

The modifications proposed to Policy IN2 in part deal with matters of process rather than the technical aspects of drainage or flood-risk and so are better considered in the context of the scheme's management, not its content. The proposed modification whereby the proposed SuDS system should also be obliged to provide "... multifunctional benefits to wildlife, landscape and water quality ..." over and above the original design intent is considered to be superfluous. PSD15 already notes opportunities for the SuDS elements of the new drainage system to enhance wildlife and landscape elements. Benefit to water quality is a key component of most SuDS measures and would be expected as a default function in using such methods.