

**Redbourn Parish Council
Matter 10 – Transport**

Issue 1 – Transport Strategy – Policies SP8 and TRA1

- Q1 Is it sufficiently clear when proposals will be required to submit Travel Plans, assess air quality impacts and provide mobility hubs under Policy SP8? Is it effective?**

RPC Response:

Policy SP8 requires all “high trip generating uses” above thresholds set in Hertfordshire County Council’s Travel Plan Guidance to prepare, submit and implement Travel Plans. That gives a workable trigger. Notwithstanding this, the supporting text of policy SP8 (paragraph 8.5) suggests that Travel Plans are only required for major development. Either the policy or supporting text should be clarified for certainty and effectiveness.

On air quality, SP8 requires proposals to assess future transport-related air quality impacts “where necessary” and to fund wider mitigation schemes where appropriate. The duty is clear in principle, but the phrase “where necessary” would benefit from a short signpost (in supporting text) to the Council’s threshold so applicants can tell at an early stage, even before pre-application stage, whether an Air Quality Assessment is expected for new development. For sites in Redbourn, such as M6 and B3, which are near transport corridors, Air Quality Assessment would be expected.

- Q2 What is the justification for the separate requirements under Policy TRA1 based on size?**

RPC Response:

This is a question for SACDC to answer to.

- Q3 Are the requirements under Policy TRA1 consistent with the Framework, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe?**

RPC Response:

This is a question for SACDC to answer to.

Issue 2 – Major Transport Schemes – Policies TRA2 and TRA3

- Q1** Is it sufficiently clear what the ‘package of measures’ are for the M1 Junction 8 improvements and how they will be delivered under Policy TRA2? Is the policy effective?

RPC Response:

No response.

- Q2** What are the transport schemes ‘identified in the IDP’ for the purposes of Policy TRA2? If a major transport scheme is necessary to support the growth proposed in the Plan, should it be listed in the policy?

RPC Response:

In short, yes. TRA2(a)(iv) quite properly refers to “schemes identified in the IDPs”, which preserves flexibility across multiple, evolving IDPs (HGC, SADC and Dacorum). However, RPC considers it helpful for the Local Plan itself to include a reference list of the already-identified major transport schemes, acknowledging that this list will evolve dynamically as the IDPs are updated. The list should be maintained via the AMR and, ideally, cross-referenced to the relevant site allocations (so applicants can see the link between growth and specific interventions).

- Q3** What is the justification for Policy TRA2(d)? What does it require from development proposals?

RPC Response:

This is a question for SACDC to answer to.

Issue 3 – Parking Standards – Policy TRA4 and Appendix 1

- Q1** How has the Council considered accessibility, the type, mix and use of development, the availability and opportunities for public transport, local car ownership levels and the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles when determining the car parking standards in Policy TRA4 and Appendix 1?

RPC Response:

No response.

- Q2** What is the justification for taking a different approach with the ‘broad locations’ under Policy TRA4? Are the policy requirements justified and

effective?

RPC Response:

No response.

Q3 What is the justification for referring to Hertfordshire County Council guidance in Policy TRA4(h) and (i)? To be effective, should any requirements be contained in the Plan?

RPC Response:

No response.