Dear Mr Tricker

LAND TO THE EAST OF HARDINGSTONE, NORTH OF NEWPORT PAGNELL ROAD, NORTHAMPTON

I have been asked to examine the Statement of Agreed Position (Transport & Access) between you and NCC and to identify what we can agree.

I do so below with reference to the paragraphs in the statement.

Para 3.2.1 – whilst we can agree that the scope was agreed with the highway authorities, we cannot agree that the scoping study was “comprehensive and robust” as stated in the last line.

Para 3.3.1 – we can accept that the details of the traffic surveys are a statement of fact.

Para 3.3.2 – we accept that it may have been agreed between the applicant and NCC that the base data is appropriate for use in the TA, but we do not accept that it is robust.

Para 3.4.1 – this states that a ceiling figure of 1,200 units was used for travel forecasting, and suggests this is robust as the application was submitted for 1,000 units. However, this is incorrect as Table 6-2 of the Transport Assessment calculates the vehicle trip generation based on 1,000 units. We cannot agree this point.

Para 3.5.1 – we can accept that the junction modelling methodology and conclusions were agreed with NCC, and we are not quarrelling with the modelling work carried out for the first four junctions listed.

Section 3.6 – we have no issues with this section.

Section 3.7 – we have no issues with this section.

Section 3.8 – we have no issues with this section other than those under the heading of Local Highway Improvements which we cannot agree.

Para 3.8.2 – we accept that the contribution agreed to NGMS is a statement of fact, but we understand that Highways England has reduced its requirement to £1,192,747.
Section 3.9 – we have no issues with this section.

Section 3.10 – we have no issues with this section.

Section 3.11 – we can accept that it was agreed with NCC that the development’s impacts can be accommodated on the transport network subject to the mitigation measures proposed, but we cannot agree this.

Section 4 – we can accept that there are no areas of disagreement with NCC, but there are areas of disagreement with NBC.

Section 5 – we accept that the planning conditions set out in Annex 1 are a statement of fact.

Section 6 – we accept that the agreement with NCC of transport related Section 106 Heads of Terms is a statement of fact, but we cannot agree those under the heading of Local Highway Improvements. As above, we understand that the NGMS contribution has been reduced to £1,192,747 and that the TRO figure is now £3,100.

Yours sincerely

John Birch
Director
Glanville Consultants