



East Cambridgeshire  
District Council

---

Supplementary Report -  
in relation to the  
November 2017 and May  
2018 Evidence Reports  
on Strategic Transport

---

August 2018

---

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1.1. In November 2017, the Council issued an ***Evidence Report on Strategic Transport - implications and related issues of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Ref PE28)*** the purpose of which was to provide an evidence base in support of the preparation and examination of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2016-2036 ('the Local Plan'), specifically providing context for the new Local Plan, in terms of strategic transport.
- 1.1.2. In May 2018, the Council issued a Supplementary Note (Ref PE28A) to address matters as raised by, primarily, Cambridgeshire County Council in its representations on the Proposed Submission Local Plan.
- 1.1.3. On 30 July 2018, The Local Plan examining Inspector issued some 'Initial Findings' (ref ED031), detailed below. These Findings have prompted the necessity for the Council to produce this Further Supplementary Report.

## 1.2. Inspector's Initial Findings

- 1.2.1. The relevant parts of the Initial Findings are as follows:

*I am content that the legal provisions of the DTC have been complied with. Nonetheless, I continue to have reservations that the transport evidence (PE28a) sufficiently demonstrates that the cross boundary impacts of the proposed developments, to the south of the district, on the West Suffolk Councils, and Newmarket, in particular, have been adequately considered and that the evidence justifies the plan. These transport impacts, also have potential knock on effects on the multi million pound horse racing industry at Newmarket and the surrounding villages. Further evidence is required to demonstrate that the transport implications of the scale of development proposed can be adequately mitigated.*

*I note, other than the development at Kennett, that the levels of development proposed within the submitted plan are not substantially different to those of the existing adopted plan. However, this does not negate the need for the cumulative impacts of existing, and proposed development to be considered on the road network both within and outside the Borough, including J 37 of the A14. This is particularly the case given that transport patterns may be affected by the Ely southern bypass due to open in October 2018.*

- 1.2.2. This Further Supplementary Note is intended to address the points made above.

**2. Cross boundary impacts of the proposed developments, to the south of the district, on the West Suffolk Councils, and Newmarket, in particular – further evidence to justify the plan.**

**2.1. Introduction**

2.1.1. This part of the Supplementary Note focusses on the specific geographical locations identified by the Inspector, and draws on evidence as published by West Suffolk Councils.

**2.2. Cumulative impact**

2.2.1. Forest Heath is well advanced (examination stage) with preparing revised development plan documents (DPDs), and has submitted a great deal of evidence as part of that process, in order to justify their DPDs.

2.2.2. This includes a ‘Cumulative Impact Study’ prepared by AECOM (Aug 2016), available here:

[https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning\\_Policies/local\\_plans/upload/AECOM-Cumulative-Impact-Study-with-appendices.pdf](https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/local_plans/upload/AECOM-Cumulative-Impact-Study-with-appendices.pdf)

2.2.3. Section 4.5 of that report confirms that growth in East Cambridgeshire was taken into account, in terms of its impact on the transport network. It states:

*“The settlements identified for inclusion as part of East Cambridgeshire are Burwell, Ely, Fordham, Littleport and Soham. This process would ensure that the growth associated with these locations bordering FHDC is captured.”*

2.2.4. That Study broadly uses the ECDC Local Plan 2015 to inform figures to be used in its modelling, and set out in a table (Table 4 of the Study) what the figures are, for the purpose of their assessment. These figures are given below, but also a further column is added below so as to compare the differences with the submitted Local Plan (2018)

	Table 4.1 AECOM study 2013-31 growth assumed	ECDC Submitted Local Plan allocations (2016-36)
Burwell	350	508
Ely	3,948	3,325
Fordham	129	303
Littleport	1,346	1,853
Soham	2,030	2,097
Kennett	N/A	500
Total	7,803	8,586 (8,086 without Kennett)

2.2.5. What the above table demonstrates is what PE28 and PE28A also demonstrates – that there is very little difference between the levels of growth in the 2015 Local Plan and the submitted 2018 Local Plan, Kennett aside. As such, the basis of the AECOM study remains sound, in terms of taking into account the cumulative effects of growth in Forest Heath and East Cambridgeshire.

- 2.2.6. Thus, we can confidently move on to the recommendations of the AECOM Study, set out in its Section 9. Of most relevance to the examination of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan is para 9.2.23, which sets out, *'based on the preliminary indicative results of the highway mitigation options assessed in this study, a number of improvements are suggested to accommodate the level of development identified in the future year scenarios'*. A list of such improvements then follows. This includes, of relevance to this Note,
- *"Junction 17 - A14 / A11 (junction 38) – A need for an upgrading of the existing road markings at the merge and diverge junctions has been identified;"*
  - *"Junction 18 - A14 / Fordham Road – The enhanced signalised option for the junction to be explored and progressed to an increased level of detail" (junction 37)*
- 2.2.7. This conclusion, and the more broader conclusion of AECOM that the two authorities of East Cambridgeshire and Forest Heath should work together (see para 10.5, for example, of their Technical Report published alongside their Study at: [https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning\\_Policies/local\\_plans/upload/FINAL-160512\\_Forest-Heath-Transport-Study-TN\\_Rev2-2.pdf](https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/local_plans/upload/FINAL-160512_Forest-Heath-Transport-Study-TN_Rev2-2.pdf)), has been positively and proactively acted upon.
- 2.2.8. ECDC is working with West Suffolk Council and other partners on proposals for improvements to both of the above identified junctions.
- 2.2.9. With ECDC support, Suffolk County Council has submitted a Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) funding bid for the period 2020 to 2025, for A14 junctions 37 improvements and a feasibility study looking at other A14 junctions. This is confirmed by this Minute: <https://democracy.westsuffolk.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=11530>
- 2.2.10. Whilst full design details of these improvements are not within the public domain (and therefore not disclosed in this Note), it can be confirmed that detailed design options for significant improvements to that junction are well advanced, in cooperation with a wide range of highway and other public authorities. In short, the proposed new layout for junction 37 will result in a reduction in accident rates due to new compliant grade separated junctions and result in better flow of traffic and additional capacity. ECDC position is that it believes it is not a matter of 'if' improvements 'might' be made to this junction, but more a matter of precisely 'when', and all parties are actively seeking that 'when' to be sooner rather than later (i.e. 2020-25).
- 2.2.11. Separately, a joint ECDC/FHDC group have commissioned a study of junction 38, though again, details are not available in the public domain at present.

## **2.3. Conclusion**

- 2.3.1. This part of this Note hopefully helps illustrate that an assessment of the cumulative impacts of growth in Forest Heath and East Cambridgeshire have been undertaken, and remain valid, for the area identified by the Inspector (namely 'to the south of the district, on the West Suffolk Councils, and Newmarket, in particular'). Mitigation measures have been identified, and solutions available. Clear joint working to achieve implementation of such solutions are well advanced.

2.3.2. Overall, therefore, there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the cross boundary impacts of the proposed developments, to the south of the district, on the West Suffolk Councils, and Newmarket, in particular, have been adequately considered and, consequently, that the evidence justifies the Local Plan.

### **3. Transport Effects on the multi million pound horse racing industry at Newmarket and the surrounding villages**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

3.1.1. This part of the Note similar draws on evidence published for the Forest Heath DPDs., primarily:

- Note 2 – Traffic and Horse Movements Crossings (2017), available here:

[https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning\\_Policies/local\\_plans/upload/Note-2-Traffic-and-Horse-Movements.pdf](https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/local_plans/upload/Note-2-Traffic-and-Horse-Movements.pdf)

- Newmarket Horse Crossings Survey Review (2018), available here:

[https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning\\_Policies/local\\_plans/upload/Newmarket-Horse-Crossing-Survey-Review-04-07-18.pdf](https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/local_plans/upload/Newmarket-Horse-Crossing-Survey-Review-04-07-18.pdf)

3.1.2. In short, what the above two documents conclude is that clear and deliverable (i.e. cost effective, with funding identified) mitigation measures are available to mitigate the impact on horse movements arising from growth/an increase in traffic. The mitigation is, in simple terms, through the provision of signalised horse crossings. The evidence demonstrates that the signalisation of horse crossing is anticipated to have an acceptable impact on the operation of the local network whilst providing a safer crossing environment for horses.

3.1.3. Crucially, for the purpose of East Cambridgeshire's Local Plan examination, is that this work takes into account the growth from East Cambridgeshire.

3.1.4. The Council sees no need to repeat the extensive work on this matter for the purpose of examining the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and is content to rely on the evidence prepared for the Forest Heath DPDs.

## 4. Transport patterns potentially affected by the Ely southern bypass due to open in October 2018

### 4.1. Introduction

4.1.1. This part of the Note refers specifically to the implications of the shortly to be opened Ely Southern Bypass.

4.1.2. The primary source of evidence used is the Transport Assessment for this road scheme, available here:

<http://planning.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/swift/apas/run/WCHDISPLAYMEDIA.showImage?theSeqNo=4896&theApnkey=36646&theModule=1>

### 4.2. The Transport Assessment

4.2.1. The Assessment is obviously very comprehensive, and this Note only draws out what it considers to be relevant matters for the purpose of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan examination.

4.2.2. Perhaps to sum up the Assessment best is in the executive summary, page 7, which states:

*“The impact on the local highway network will be positive. The impact on the wider highway network overall will be minimal in terms of junction / link capacity in the greater Ely area.”*

4.2.3. Page 31 (5<sup>th</sup> para) gives a little more detail:

*“By its very nature, the bypass will also allow suppressed demand to be released along the A142 corridor. Traffic modelling shows that whilst the bypass will allow this suppressed demand to be released, and therefore accommodate future traffic growth, the increase in traffic levels will not have a negative impact on the wider highway impact. In fact, a positive impact is realised on a lot of the local highway network and where traffic is anticipated to increase this Transport Assessment shows that the local junctions and link roads can accommodate this increase.”*

4.2.4. In short, the opening of the bypass is not identified to have any impact on traffic (i.e. increase or decrease) in the vicinity of the East Cambridgeshire / Forest Heath (Newmarket) border area. The purpose and likely outcome of the bypass is to tackle localised (Ely) congestion and reduce journey times, rather than generate additional traffic on the A142 itself (see last para of p44, for example).

4.2.5. If anything, the opening of the bypass will have a positive effect on traffic congestion in the Newmarket area, because Newmarket-Ely buses will move more freely through the currently congested area (see page 16, for example, for confirmation of this), making bus travel a more attractive option for Newmarket-Ely journeys. However, it is acknowledged this is likely to have negligible positive impact on the highway network around Newmarket.

### 4.3. Conclusion

4.3.1. Other than in the very localised area around Ely, the opening of the southern bypass will have no impact on the strategic highway network.

## 5. Conclusions

5.1.1. This Note should be read in conjunction with previously published evidence reports PE28 and PE28A.

5.1.2. Overall, when taken as whole, there is considerable evidence available to reasonably conclude that:

- the scale of **additional** growth arising from the submitted Local Plan is very limited
- the strategic transport implications of growth have been considered
- the scale of development proposed can be adequately mitigated, and delivery of such mitigations measures are actively being pursued
- the impact on the horse racing industry has been considered, and mitigations measures readily available
- the impact of the opening of the Ely Southern Bypass will lead to positive benefits (primarily localised benefits in the Ely area)

5.1.3. The Council remains confident, therefore, that the scale of development proposed can be adequately mitigated.

5.1.4. Further, the situation will, of course, be constantly monitored, including continued cooperation with all appropriate authorities. Should any unanticipated impacts arise (or be at increased risk of arising), then the various authorities have considerable options available to address this, including of course a review of the Local Plan.