

Mead Kay

From: Mead Kay
Sent: 10 June 2015 16:42
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: A414 Issues Requiring Written Response
Attachments: Trajectory 26.3.15.xlsx
Importance: High
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Chris/Dave,

Following yesterday's meeting and your agreement to respond to the points made during the discussion within the next week, which were largely based around matters raised in my previous email dated 19th May, I think that it would be helpful to you in drafting a reply if I restate the issues to which we require a written response, in order to avoid any potential ambiguity or misunderstanding going forward.

The key issues are:

Firstly, as it has been established that the study does not currently factor in all of the planned growth in the district, and also may not deliver all the answers that are needed from it at this time to enable us to progress our Plan, these omissions really must be addressed to enable us to the Plan to move forward.

Secondly, the Study so far concludes that the potential for online improvements to provide any significant additional capacity is limited and not cost effective. Therefore, an appreciation of potential route/costs/delivery timescales associated with an offline option/options is required, as it is most unlikely that the Study in its current form will provide enough evidence to underpin the Plan to enable us to reach Examination stage.

As has been stated several times over the past couple of years, to move our Plan forward we need to understand in particular:

- a) What the capacity of the A414 through Hertford will be in relation to accommodating the likely planned development in the district (confidential draft trajectory previously supplied to you, but attached to this email for clarity).
- b) If the likely planned level of development cannot be accommodated, then we need to know what level of development would be acceptable before safety implications for queuing on the A10 (and possibly the safe operation of other roads/junctions) would prove severe and thus preclude further development.
- c) If b) were to apply then, in respect of the proposed delivery trajectory, we need to know the point in time in the Plan period when it is considered likely that the critical point when no further development could be accommodated would be reached.
- d) If b) were to apply, then, as online mitigations appear limited, we also need to know what work will be undertaken by your department* to ascertain a viable offline solution (or alternative strategies more generally) to enable planned development both in East Herts and neighbouring authority areas to progress and what timescale will this be achieved in.

**Although the Hertford stretch lies within East Herts, the A414 is a key element of the strategic route network with wider implications for the whole county and beyond (i.e. designated M25 alternative diversion route), and therefore it is considered that the issue should be viewed in this route-corridor context.*

We are most anxious to avoid a situation where either progress on the Plan is stalled over this issue, or that your Council would not be in a position to support the Plan as it reaches Examination stage.

As a matter of urgency, we would therefore welcome assurances from HCC (as highway authority and lead on this project) regarding how these matters will be addressed through the A414 Study, the likely timeframe for completion, and suggestions regarding the manner in which we can work together to provide robust outcomes to enable us to comply with requirements and reach Examination.

Beyond these original matters, other issues were discussed yesterday to which we also require a written response from you:

Firstly, we need you to set out the exact timelines proposed for the delivery of both the COMET model and the VISION.

Secondly, we need to understand exactly what the implications of these timescales are on moving potential mitigation measures forward (i.e. the timeline for progressing off-line solutions to Hertford A414 constraints e.g. via a bypass).

Thirdly, if it were to appear unlikely that satisfactory mitigation measures for the levels of development currently proposed could be delivered within the Plan period, what your Council's stance would be likely to be at Examination.

Yesterday, you promised to respond with answers to these issues within the week. I therefore look forward to receiving your written reply within this timescale.

Kind regards,

Kay

Kay Mead (Mrs), BA (Hons), Dip TP, MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer, Planning Policy