

Ellen Callaghan

From: Ewan Nelson [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 July 2019 21:18
To: Risborough Expansion
Subject: Re: Princes Risborough Expansion SPD and Phasing Tests consultation - Phasing Tests

Hello, I live in Shootacre Lane and I am a member of BANG. I would firstly like to say that I agree with all of the points made in BANG's excellent and comprehensive group response.

The specialist report from cTc which accompanies the BANG response also makes a convincing case. The substantial cost of this report was paid by contributions from the Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane community.

In addition I would just make the following individual points:

1. There are errors in the consultation materials, first identified in my emails with John Callaghan below.
2. The existing infrastructure on Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane is already sub-standard and sending more traffic along here will clearly make the situation worse. Many of the existing safety issues have been identified in the BANG group response but I would just add the following points.
 - (a) The pavement on Shootacre Lane stops several metres short of the railway bridge. When travelling NW down Shootacre Lane and straight over the railway bridge there is no option but to join the main carriageway at this point. The road is narrow at this point with a give way junction opposite - pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians are therefore in conflict with fast moving motorised traffic - it is clearly not safe. The same point applies when travelling in the opposite direction and is equally dangerous.
 - (b) The public footpath from the railway station also emerges at the edge of the railway bridge and this is already a hazardous crossing, particularly after dark.
 - (c) The pedestrian route along Picts Lane over "The Green" area of grassland is very narrow. It is barely wide enough to accommodate the wheels on my child's pushchair. It is not wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs. As a result, these modes of pedestrian transport are already often in conflict with traffic on the main carriageway. This is clearly dangerous.
 - (d) The Princes Risborough community bus is timetabled to serve Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane. This is a hail/dial and ride service. It is a lifeline for very young, elderly and disabled residents to get to and from Princes Risborough town centre. The lack of pavements along much of both lanes mean that boarding and alighting from this bus is already dangerous. Also the nature of the stops means that it is in effect a rolling roadblock - this is not really an issue with the current traffic levels but will cause a problem with higher traffic.
3. The problems above (and those identified in the BANG and cTc reports) would be made worse if the delivery plan proposals are implemented. This would conflict with the NPPF and LTP4 policy guidelines which promote safety and use of sustainable transport.
4. There is an obvious answer to all of these problems: build the Culverton Link at phase 1 of the Delivery Plan.

Yours faithfully

Ewan Nelson
[REDACTED]

On Tue, 16 Jul 2019 at 16:19, John Callaghan <John.Callaghan@wycombe.gov.uk> wrote:

Ewan,

Thanks for your email raising these important issues. We do want to get to the bottom of this so will review the traffic consultants report and if necessary ask for their further input before we get back to you. I would of course agree that few roads are blessed with 0 traffic movements!

I will meantime log a summary of your response as: concern that traffic modelling data for Shootacre Lane is incorrect, and/or ambiguous, and risks understating the level of traffic that will occur along Shootacre Lane before the Culverton link is completed.

Regards

John Callaghan

From: Ewan Nelson [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 10 July 2019 23:46
To: John Callaghan <John.Callaghan@wycombe.gov.uk>
Cc: Rosie Brake <Rosie.Brake@wycombe.gov.uk>
Subject: Princes Risborough Expansion SPD and Phasing Tests consultation - errors in the Phasing Tests

John

I am a resident on Shootacre Lane. I believe I may have identified some important errors in the Phasing Tests in the materials currently under consultation.

Error 1

One of the key initial facts that I wanted to establish in relation to the proposals in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) currently under consultation is the anticipated increase in traffic volume along Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane.

My starting point was to look at the 2013 baseline figures, which are shown in the Princes Risborough Area Transport Study prepared by Jacobs dated January 2014 (attached for ease of reference). Pages 12 and 13 show that the 2013 AM peak traffic volume on Shootacre Lane was 39/55 and the PM peak was 53/70; the 2013 AM peak traffic volume on Picts Lane was 122/135 and the PM peak was 114/131.

However the report which accompanied the SPD dated 28 May 2019 "Princes Risborough Phasing Tests", prepared by Jacobs for Transport for Buckinghamshire contains substantially different figures as follows: the 2013 AM peak traffic volume on Shootacre Lane is shown as 0/5 and the PM peak is 0/0; the 2013 AM peak traffic volume on Picts Lane was 87/100 and the PM peak was 86/99 (see page 2 and 3 of Appendix H, attached for ease of reference).

There must be an error here as the 2013 baseline figures in the 2014 and 2019 reports (both prepared by Jacobs) should surely be the same, or at least substantially similar?

In the case of Shootacre Lane, the figures in Appendix H of the 2019 Phasing Tests are manifestly incorrect. While Shootacre Lane is generally a quiet, rural lane, as a resident here I can assure you that it has more than 0 traffic volume at peak times.

Error 2

The diagrams on page 29 of the 2019 Phasing Tests purport to show (a) on the left hand side, "AM Flows (without Culverton Link) and (b) on the right hand side, " PM Flows (without Culverton Link)".

The left hand side diagram has a footnote stating that although the Culverton Link appears in the diagram, the link is closed and has 0 flow. The right hand side diagram has no such footnote and the diagram shows that the Culverton Link has a flow of 203/126. Clearly there is an error here, as if the right hand side diagram really did show "PM Flows (without Culverton Link)" as it labelled, then there would also be 0 flow along the Culverton Link.

It is impossible to know how to interpret the diagrams on page 29 as clearly one or both of them are incorrect, or at least labelled incorrectly.

Error 3

One would expect Fig 11. Modified Scenario 3 (without Culverton Link) to show additional traffic flow along Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane when compared with the 2013 baseline, as there would be more traffic associated with the 1,110 new houses. The diagram on the left hand side of page 29 of the 2019 Phasing Reports which shows "AM Flows (without Culverton Link)" has an AM peak of 54/88. This appears to be a modest increase on the 2013 baseline of 39/55 in the Princes Risborough Area Transport Study prepared by Jacobs dated January 2014.

However, when one looks at page 4 of Appendix C of the Phasing Tests ,the AM peak flow for Modified Scenario 3 (Without Culverton Link) is instead shown to be 60/170, substantially higher than what is presented on page 29 in the main report.

At least one of these is incorrect - is the diagram on the left hand side of page 29 incorrect or page 4 of Appendix C?

Next steps

I would be grateful if you would provide me with a response as soon as you can. If I am correct about the errors above, this means there are serious problems with the consultation, as it is impossible to form a clear or accurate view of the proposals so far as they relate to Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane from the information presented. If that is indeed the case, I would ask that the consultation materials are corrected and re-issued and the consultation period is re-started or at least substantially extended.

Regards

Ewan Nelson

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

***** HELP US TO REDUCE PAPER USE *****
***** DO NOT PRINT THIS EMAIL UNLESS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY *****
***** DISCLAIMER *****

Any opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and are not necessarily those of Wycombe District Council.

This email and any files transmitted within it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. If you do receive this email in error please contact the sender as soon as possible and delete the email and any attachments.

Wycombe District Council may monitor the contents of email sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures.

Wycombe District Council has scanned this email and attachments for viruses but does not accept any responsibilities for viruses once this email has been transmitted. The recipient is responsible for scanning emails and any attachments for viruses themselves.

Two councils instead of five - the best solution for the people of Bucks

There is currently a debate in Buckinghamshire about the future of local government. The district councils' proposal is for two new unitary councils for Bucks. We believe this is the best solution for the people who live and work here. Find out more at www.modernisingbucks.org

This message has been scanned for viruses by MailControl, a service from BlackSpider Technologies.