

Appendix C: Issues tracker

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_001	1	82	Little mention of walking and cycling within consultation documents. EWR should seriously investigate measures to optimise sustainable access to stations. Sustainable travel options for operatives accessing site compounds should be a key element of the scheme	Traffic - Environmental Statement	This has been considered within the separate Travel Plan Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_002	2	82	EWR will interface with the newly completed Waddesdon Greenway cycleway at Aylesbury Vale Parkway, which runs alongside the far side embankment as shown on sheet 95. The Greenway scheme has been designed to minimise disruption once East West Rail works happen, but the redline boundary needs to be amended.	Traffic - Environmental Statement	The Greenway project didn't have sufficient space to be clear of the EWR2 boundary, as was recognised by the project manager, Jack Mayhew, at the time. The Greenway project did move as far west as it was able to within the limited land parcel it had secured, however this may not be sufficiently far to accommodate necessary works to EWR2. Therefore EWR2 will need to reserve the right to acquire land as indicated, but will seek to not affect the cycleway as installed, or will temporarily relocate the cycleway if this can't be avoided.	BCC: Presumably they will also reconstruct the footway following completion of EWR if they have temporarily relocated it to allow construction.? How is this actually secured. An assurance required? <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> The project is proposing to install 4 way gates that will allow the path to be closed during deliveries but open for normal use at other times; no temporary diversion is proposed. Following completion of the work the path will be reinstated to its current condition (the blacktop will be removed and a concrete pad laid during construction). Article 28 (para 4) of the Order imposes the obligation on NR to reinstate land taken for temporary possession to the reasonable satisfaction of the owner.
OBJ_232_003	3	82	Number of interfaces between EWR and the aspirational Buckinghamshire cycling network within the HS2 Interface Area, subject to ongoing discussion and development with HS2 and contractors - EWR should be mindful of proposals	Traffic - Environmental Statement	EWR will be mindful of ongoing discussions.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_004	4	82	Greater consideration should be given to the impacts of HGV traffic upon safety and attractiveness of sustainable travel. Key areas of concern in need of detailed assessment are: National Cycle Route 51 and key routes within residential areas (Verney Road, Furze Lane, Queen Catherine Road, Verney Junction	Traffic - Environmental Statement	The interaction between HGVs and National Cycle Route 51 has been considered within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_063	63	1	Concerns raised regarding car parking utilisation at stations. Requested for cycle parking utilisation to be provided.	General	Car park and cycle parking utilisation has been provided.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_064	64	2	Highlighted existing parking pressures on the other side of Bourg Walk bridge to the southwest of the line resulting from commuter parking from the train station (Aylesbury)	General	NR will work together with both BCC and the TOC regarding any parking issues at Aylesbury.	BCC: NR Response does not provide any remedy. BCC is of the view that the increased demand at the Station could lead to additional on street parking. BCC seeks a commitment to a financial contribution of £50,000 towards the promotion and implementation of a TRO for additional parking restrictions within 500m of the Station. <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> A mechanism already exists for the recovery of costs associated with Authority activities that support and

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
						complement the project.
OBJ_232_066	66	2	Walking and cycling isochrones do not consider the quality of the routes to and from stations. Request for additional consideration to be given to the quality of the walking and cycling links to the train stations.	General	Information regarding the quality of walking and cycling routes has been provided in a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_067	67	2	Manual Classified Counts undertaken in a neutral month in accordance with WebTAG	General	N/A	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_068	68	2	Manual Classified Counts requested to be cross referenced with the Automatic Traffic Count data to ensure that flows are reflective of a normal day, as typically Highway Authority would request two days of survey data.	General	This has been considered within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_069	69	2	Concerns raised over dates on which surveys were conducted at - Manual Classified Count (2013) – Winslow – A413/Little Horwood Road (this forms part of the HGV construction routing) - Manual Classified Count (2014) – Winslow – A413/Great Horwood Road (this forms part of the LGV construction routing) - Manual Classified Count (2013) – Aylesbury – Griffin Lane/Gatehouse Way	General	Information has been provided.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_070	70	3	Methodology and scope of multi-modal and passenger surveys has been agreed with the Highway Authority. Concluded that there are large differences between multi-model surveys and National Passenger surveys at Aylesbury Station and therefore walking and cycling isn't an attractive option.	General	This has been considered within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_071	71	3	A number of locations (Winslow, Drayton Parslow, Mursley, Charndon, Poundon, Edgcott) have been omitted from the heat maps (Figure 6). Requested for these to be provided to allow a final assessment by Highway Authority.	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_072	72	4	Questioned the methodology adopted for road safety analysis and require justification for how these criteria were chosen and how it has been applied in relation to an area (e.g. 15 or more collisions over 200m or 2 miles).	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_073	73	4	Requested consideration of patterns across links and junctions, in rural roads, to understand if this would be exacerbated by construction traffic.	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_074	74	4	Collision history has not been considered in the assessment of the location of new access points onto the local highway network.	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_075	75	4	Collision trends have not been considered along key construction corridors such as A41, A413 and A421.	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_076	76	4	Construction analysis refers to driver error, and that therefore no mitigation is required. Considered that this approach fails to take into account other factors e.g. speed perception, gradient, failure to look properly etc. Assumption that there is no mitigation to prevent such collisions, whereas, this could be mitigated through colouring of surfaces, vehicle activated signage and relining etc. Provided a list of locations with possible mitigation measures.	General	Further detailed analysis has undertaken for specific areas where driver error has been identified as a common causation factor, provided in a separate Technical Note.	<u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> This can also be agreed. The project will discuss/provide measures as suggested where appropriate and beneficial; detail to be discussed with BCC and provided for in the CTMP covered by condition.
OBJ_232_077	77	6	Principles for routing of construction traffic need to be adequately secured in the Construction Traffic Management Plan, as part of the TWAO.	General	The CTMP submitted as part of the TWAO is a framework which to indicate how the plan would be developed into further detail.	<p>BCC: An assurance/condition is required that clearly lists the principles to be included and addressed in the detailed CTMP including the matters listed in this spreadsheet</p> <p><u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> We have proposed a new highways condition that is intended to address BCC's (and other highway authorities) concerns over an authorities ability to approve details relating to highways and traffic management during construction. The condition affords the authority the ability to approve CTMP's and also the design of highway works as a pre-commencement condition. Proposed changes to the new highways condition as currently drafted (and you've seen?) would have the effect that no works shall be carried out except in accordance with the CTMP as approved.</p> <p>The Project has set out its approach to managing construction traffic firstly in the Code of Construction Practice (ES, Vol 3, Appendix 2.1, Section 12) and further in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (ES, Vol 3, Appendix 2.2). The CoCP and FCTMP give an overview of the information/detail that the Construction Traffic Management Plan would contain as a "minimum" and is not intended to be an exhaustive list. As the approving authority BCC can request detail on specific areas is included in the CTMP.</p> <p>The scheme will be subject to the same controls as any development authorised by permission under the TCPA. Planning conditions form part of the deemed planning permission for the Order scheme, confirmation of discharge of which will lie with each local authority, as will the power to take any enforcement action as a result of any breach of conditions. BCC will have the same level of influence and control over traffic associated with the construction of EWR2 as it would over any other development approved under a planning permission.</p>

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_078	78	7	Clarification required as to why vehicle park is only proposed on M1 approach, and not all approaches, given proposed routing and location of compounds, nothing that there are approximately six times the number of vehicles approaching the A413 from the west as from the M1. It is considered that if a compound to be suitable for the M1 junction, then the M40 should be provided with a vehicle park taking into account the fact that they identify greater pressure on this route	General	A vehicle holding area has been located only within this Section of the works as it is here that our structures works are possession driven. As a consequence we have provided the facility to pre-stack vehicles into the locale to then 'draw down' upon once the possession is granted on the night. The other Sections of the site are significantly less possession driven and, as such, a more 'just in time' approach can be accommodated as the consequence of overrun is vastly reduced.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_079	79	7	Concerns regarding access to Compound B2 has been raised due to the ability to provide safe and suitable access in accordance with NPPF. Relating to poor forward visibility on Verney Road, inadequate highway boundary to provide sufficient passing place and widening.	General	Detailed design is currently underway and further details will be available in due course.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_080	80	7	Concerns regarding the lack of provision of a haul route between compounds B1 and B4. Asked to re-consider provision of a haul route or more radical options such as part closures, shuttle one way working and holding areas.	General	Haul roads parallel with railway were removed from the project following discussions between the Consortium, Alliance and Dft.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_081	81	7	Concerns regarding use of Furze Lane, asked to re-consider provision of a haul route in this location or more radical options such as part closures, shuttle one way working and holding areas for HGVs, taking into consideration highway constraints and land under third party control. If achievable, Winslow Town Council seek revision to refurbishment of railway bridge to deliver deck carrying 5.5m two-way carriageway and single 1.8m footway on eastern side.	General	Work to address issues at Furze Lane is ongoing.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_082	82	8	Concerns regarding stacking of vehicles on the highway for Compound B5. Further details on the operation of this area are required and should form part of Framework CTMP.	General	No vehicles will be stacked or parked on Local Highways, all compounds have been detailed with sufficient room to allow vehicles to pull completely off the highway	BCC: This again feeds in to a more general comment about the suitability of each compound and its ability to accommodate a suitable number of delivery vehicles clear of the highway. The requirement to submit additional information to satisfy the concerns of the highway authority in terms of space within the site alongside a comprehensive logistics management system should form part of the CTMP obligations <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077 we will spell this out in the condition relating to prohibition of parking.
OBJ_232_083	83	8	Safe method of control required for access into compound B6 to manage wide range of vehicle types accessing this compound. Further details on the operation of this area required and should form part of Framework CTMP.	General	Detailed design is currently underway and further details will be available in due course.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_084	84	8	Noted that construction routes have not been able to be agreed prior to submission of TWAO due to lack of information.	General	n/a	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_085	85	8	Agreed that haul routes are used to save on overall scheme costs, however unclear why haul routes have been proposed in certain areas but not others for example, Verney Junction.	General	Local constraints dictate where hauls can be used whilst maintaining ability to delivery project	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_086	86	9	Haul route and main compound entrance at Newton Longville do not appear to be aligned. These should be aligned to allow simple movement without turning movements, and facilitate efficient deployment of temporary or semi-permanent traffic signals.	General	Incorrect, compound entrance separate from highway / haul road crossing. Crossing points to ONLY allow perpendicular crossing of the highway and not access off the highway into the project.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_087	87	9	Concerns regarding how daily profile of construction activity will be controlled due to absence of layover points or stacking areas. It has been advised that EWR has looked to implement a Logistics Management System, which would provide a level of assurance regarding the accuracy of assessment. Request information on how this will operate, which needs to be secured in the Framework CTMP.	General	Looking to use a system called Voyage Control to manage our delivery traffic into site. I'll try and obtain pertinent information to clarify functionality etc.	BCC: Details required. This a management issue and something that is possible to control and agree. The mechanism for approval of this should be included as part of the CTMP process or a separate assurance/condition. <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077 and our intention is that details of the management system are included in the CTMP.
OBJ_232_088	88	9	Daily profile of staff and operatives needs to be secured in the Framework CTMP or as a requirement of the TWA0.	General	Not possible to make this commitment, the provided numbers are based on current programme and assumptions	BCC: Details to be provided and approved as part of CTMP. <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> Details to be provided and approved as part of CTMP.
OBJ_232_089	89	9	Impact of structure closures on HGV construction routes need to be undertaken, especially through Marsh Gibbon to Poundon. Agreed that this impact is only temporary, however high impact in terms of safety due to nature of roads and proximity to school.	General	Temporary management structure closures will be considered within the CTMP, as it developed going forward. Closures would typically be outside of peak periods to minimise disruption.	BCC: Again this is a matter that should be listed as needing explicit approval of the LHA in progressing the CTMP <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_090	90	9	Require certainty that structure closures will not result in a diversion of HGVs and LGVs on unsuitable parts of the network. This needs to be secured in the Framework CTMP.	General	This will be reviewed with the LHA and diversions routes agreed for each	BCC: As above <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_091	91	9	No objection in principle to closures for engineering delivery, diversions and programming would be subject to applications through Network Management team at earliest opportunity through ETON. Expectation that works would be coordinated with HS2 to avoid unnecessary disruption to travelling public.	General	Correct	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_092	92	9	Diversion routes for road closures have not been assessed by the Highway Authority as these have not been submitted. These routes will be assessed at the point of application if not submitted before. The Highway Authority expects that EWR will apply the principles that have been set out through the TA and Framework CTMP when planning these routes	General	Something that needs to be reviewed with LHA and diversions routes agreed for each	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_093	93	10	Public Transport team have no concerns to raise. Noted that any closures that will be in place for extended duration may well present a requirement for further mitigation.	General	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_094	94	10	High Speed 2 - not all information is readily available and is being developed in detail by individual main work contractors, including HGV routes and vehicle numbers.	General	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_095	95	10	Raised concerns regarding approach which assumes EWR vehicles will use existing highway until HS2 associated highway works come online at A418 Oxford Road Overbridge, A41 Bicester Road Overbridge and Blackgrove Road and West Street and School Hill Overbridges.	General	Coordination with HS2 is ongoing and their programme is still to be finalised, current EWR routing is based on the available HS2 information and will be reviewed following further information with HS2	BCC: We need an assurance to working with HS2 and BCC to minimise highways disruption. This should include the ability for HGV construction routes to be reactive to avoid sections that are subject to traffic management. <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> We have acknowledged the need to work closely with BCC and HS2 and accept that there may be a need to react to changing circumstances. We are content to offer an assurance to working collaboratively with BCC and HS2 to minimise traffic impacts.
OBJ_232_096	96	10	Station Road, Quainton, is diverted across a new bridge. This has not been considered in cumulative assessment, and this point should be addressed in Framework CTMP.	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_097	97	10	Temporary routing or mitigation may be required and agreed by the Highway Authority, if proposed works associated with HS2 fail to be completed before EWR commences. This would need to be secured in the Framework CTMP or as a separate requirement of TWAO.	General	Agreed	BCC: CTMP issue again. There should be a list of matters for inclusion in a CTMP which needs to be submitted and approved by the LHA <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_098	98	10	Would like to see a commitments for EWR to engage with HS2 around possibility of sharing haul road for construction purposes. This needs to be secured in framework CTMP or as a separate requirement of TWAO.	General	NR will closely with HS2 with a view to minimising disruption during construction.	BCC: Need a commitment as this will most certainly reduce highway impacts <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to OBJ_232_095. The proposal for EWR to share haul roads with HS2 is one that has been previously reviewed and rejected. HS2 runs predominantly north-south in alignment whilst EWR is predominantly east-west. As such, HS2's haul roads run north-south offering no benefit to the construction of the OXD line (east-west) element of the Order Scheme. For the works to the MCJ line (north-south) element of the Order Scheme, in the integration area HS2 are responsible for delivery of the main Civil Engineering works to the route with EWR responsible for construction of the Rail Systems works (Track and Signalling Systems). As such, in this area, EWR would not benefit from a haul road in this area. For the MCJ line (north-south) element south of the integration area in Section 2E of the Order Scheme the works are separated from HS2 works and again there would be no benefit to sharing of HS2 haul roads. It was considered whether the HS2 north-south haul road along the MCJ line could be utilised by EWR to facilitate

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
						<p>vehicle access to the eastern end of Section 2A but this route is very heavily used by HS2 and runs the HS2 main works area in a cutting. To reach the eastern end of EWR Section 2A the haul road would have to be extended west from the HS2 trace directly through HS2's embankment works to the OXD line, it is highly impractical to deliver these two works at the same time; one would preclude the other from being completed and vice versa.</p> <p>The EWR utilisation of HS2 haul roads would also link the two delivery programmes at a greater level of detail. The current strategic programmes are linked by high level 'Give' / 'Get' programme milestones. Any further linkage of the programmes, such as prescribed haul road utilisation, would impact one or both of the delivery programmes resulting in delay. For this reason, EWR utilisation of HS2 haul roads has not been assumed. The projects are however committed to integrating and coordinating their combined effects on the local road network. EWR will work with both HS2 and BCC Highways to minimise the impact of the scheme on the local road network wherever possible.</p>
OBJ_232_099	99	11	Further explanation of Insert 10.1 requested. It appears that both scenarios are showing the cumulative future baseline for construction and operation scenarios however they have been derived through different methodology (e.g. strategic model data vs survey data/TEMPRO).	General	Given the limitations of strategic model data (in terms of geographic coverage) for the construction phase, and to initially assess impacts against a consistent set of flows across the whole transport construction study area, the construction phase impacts were assessed against the 2020 construction assessment year flows derived using TEMPRO. Full details are provided in App J.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_100	100	11	TRICs trip generation provided by business park use and privately owned housing units. Information requested as to how trip rates are derived.	General	<p>Trip rates, where available, have been taken from Transport Assessments for each of the included developments. Appendix J identifies four sites (PA4, PC2, PC3, PA3) for inclusion in the cumulative assessment. Of these, two were identified to be operational during the EWR2 Construction Stage - PA4 (110 residential dwellings) and PA3 (585 residential dwellings). As planning applications for these sites have not been submitted for these sites, TRICs (v7.4.3) was interrogated to extract trip rates for privately owned houses (03-Residential/A - houses privately owned) for the AM peak (08:00 - 09:00) and PM peak (17:00 - 18:00) per dwelling. These were then utilised to calculate peak hour trip generation for these two sites. The trip rates are provided in Appendix J.</p> <p>TRICs was also utilised to extract daily trip rates for privately owned houses (03-Residential/A - houses privately owned) and business parks (02-Employment-B-Business Park) to convert the peak hour trips to daily rates, required in the ES assessment. In some cases, daily trip rates were provided in the Transport Assessment, therefore, TRICs was only used for AV2, AV6, CH1,</p>	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
					PA4 and PA3. The trip rates are provided in Appendix J.	
OBJ_232_101	101	11	Various points of clarification for cumulative developments including derivation of construction traffic flows, distribution of traffic, inclusion in model flows etc.	General	<p>Construction trip generation for the cumulative developments with a residential element is based on the following rates for comparable schemes: One-way trip rate of 10.6 vehicles (HGVs) per dwelling; Period of construction activity proportional to the size of the site with vehicle trip generation split equally across this period. Where provided, information from planning documents and Local Plans have informed this distribution; 251 working weekdays per year, working 8 hours per day; Average of 0.26 vehicle trips per dwelling associated with construction workers; All construction workers arrive and depart in the AM peak and PM peak hours; Construction trip assignment based on assumptions set out in TA/CTMP (if available), or distributed using existing traffic movements on local highway network.</p> <p>AV1 - construction period of one year has been assumed (2020). AV2 - construction period of three years has been assumed (2018 - 2020). Construction trip generation distributed across the existing highway network based on existing traffic movements at nearest junctions. AV6 - construction period of 16 years has been assumed (2018 - 2033). MK7 - construction period of 1 year has been assumed (2020). PA4 - a construction period of 1 year has been assumed (2020). PC2 - a construction period of 10 years has been assumed (2018 - 2027). PC3 - a construction period of 3 years has been assumed (2018 - 2020). The model includes this development and associated operational trip generation. PA3 - a construction period of 1 year has been assumed (2020).</p>	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_102	102	13	Both Buckinghamshire County Council and Oxfordshire County Council have requested that HGV trip generation by fully evidenced and justified. Paragraph 11.3 of the Transport Assessment now sets out how the HGV trip generation has been derived, with further	General	n/a	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
			evidence provided in Appendix I.			
OBJ_232_103	103	13	Requested calculations used to determine the number of HGVs although Highway Authority are broadly satisfied with the proposed methodology.	General	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_104	104	13	Some detail should be provided on how the information from Stafford Area Improvement Project and resourced construction programme should be provided on how this information was used and the result of the analysis	General	Further information to be provided	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_105	105	13	Query raised that development construction traffic peak hour does not occur at the same time as network peak hour. Therefore, consideration should be given as to the impact during the development peak hours.	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_106	106	13	LGV trips has been estimated on basis of number of HGV and staff/operative trips. Information requested setting out how the analysis was undertaken.	General	The LGV trips have been estimated using the same methodology as the HGVs but not based on the number of HGVs.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_107	107	14	Sensitivity test using TRICs data for Bletchley compound requested.	General	Given the very specific operation and location of the compound, it is not considered any sites in TRICs would be representative and the methodology used provides the most accurate trip rates for the compound.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_108	108	14	Clarification of content presented in Appendix I.	General	The spreadsheets presented in Appendix I outline the daily/peak hour trip generation, distribution and assignment of construction traffic. The vehicle type is presented in the footer of each page, and also on the cover page. The content presented in each table is provided in the header of each page.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_109	109	14	Clarification of why staff trips are shown to structures.	General	Appendix I shows staff trips to the following structures: 91.7, 79.7 and 79.4. Although generally, staff are travelling to compounds and then being shuttled to respective structures, in these cases, they operate as standalone structures with no nearby compound. Therefore, staff travel directly to the structure.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_110	110	14	No planned HGV trips between compounds and local access points needs to be secured in Framework CTMP, as a requirement of the TWAO.	General	There will be negligible inter-site HGV movements – these would not affect the max daily movements and would follow the HGV routes	BCC: This needs to be a commitment in the CTMP as that is what is stated. <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_111	111	15	Number of concerns raised regarding LGV routing, and it is noted that these routes have not been agreed by the Highway Authority. Requested that these routes are reviewed. Assurance sought that routing will be agreed with BCC.	General	LGV routing (>7.5t) has previously been tabled at LHA meeting and not raised as a major concern due to the smaller nature of these types of vehicles	BCC: To avoid impacts on unsuitable roads, BCC is seeking an assurance that the routing of LGV's to the compounds listed on Page 15 will be routed on the HGV routes <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> LGV routes have been assessed for suitability. Not all LGV destinations are supported by an HGV route. Aligning HGV and LGV routes saturates HGV routes further; splitting them

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
						results in wider distribution of traffic. Combining HGV and LGV routes results in significantly longer (time and distance) journeys for LGV traffic as these vehicles would need to travel out to the wider road network then back in on the next HGV route; in the main LGV routes are intended to allow LGV's to "leap frog" along the route. LGV construction routes will be included for approval by BCC in the CTMP.
OBJ_232_112	112	15	Noted that re-routing LGVs will not have a significant effect on capacity assessments that have been carried out, due to relatively low numbers.	General	n/a	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_113	113	15	Methodology for staff and operative trip generation is accepted for all compounds apart from Newton Longville, where sensitivity test should be undertaken using TRICs.	General	Given the very specific operation and location of the compound, it is not considered any sites in TRICs would be representative and the methodology used provides the most accurate trip rates for the compound.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_114	114	17	Requested full multi-modal assessment of passenger demand increase.	General	This has been provided within a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_115	115	17	TA has failed to consider the impact of car parking on the highway network and within existing car parks in the town centre. Expectation for EWR to fund a review of parking in the area and implementation of necessary mitigation such as a residents parking scheme.	General	On and off street parking are outside the scope of the Project and therefore are not being considered. Network Rail would be happy to work with BCC and AVDC with regards to these matters outside of the scope of TWAO.	BCC: This is a matter that directly relates to the TWAO and needs to be resolved now. The remedy for this is set out in Row 8 ((OBJ_232_064) <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to item number (OBJ_232_064)
OBJ_232_116	116	18	If it is considered that more passengers would be encouraged to use sustainable transport, it is considered necessary to improve quality of walking and cycling routes to/from the station (Aylesbury)	General	Improvement of walking and cycle routes to Aylesbury Station is outside of the scope of the Project and therefore is not considered. Network Rail would be happy to work with BCC and AVDC with regards to these matters outside of the scope of TWAO.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_117	117	18	At Aylesbury Vale Station the increase in passengers is considered negligible and so no further assessment is considered necessary.	General	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_118	118	18	It should be noted that the Highway Authority has not agreed to discount locations where there are fewer than 30 or 50 peak hour construction trips. In rural areas, local increases in traffic could be considered significant	General	We do not consider that fewer than 50 construction trips in the peak hour could be considered significant or have a severe impact. Without prejudice, additional junctions have been considered as requested and results are provided in a Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_119	119	18	Concerned that strategic model data has not been used in assessment of construction impact. Request for sensitivity test using Aylesbury model data as a comparison.	General	Aylesbury model data was not used as the construction routes were not included in the model.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_120	120	18	Further information required in relation to process undertaken to investigate staff and operative trips and refinement process on a junction by junction basis.	General	Clarification regarding process to investigate staff and operative trips in a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_121	121	19	15 junctions identified for junction capacity assessment	General	It is considered that all junctions where there is a material impact have been assessed. Without prejudice, additional junctions have been assessed as requested and results are provided in a Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_122	122	22	Statement that site accesses are controlled needs to be clarified, as no signals have been proposed.	General	Section 8.2.11 of the Transport Assessment states that 'vehicular access to each of the construction compounds from the local highway network is proposed to be gained via priority controlled site access junctions'. The site accesses are proposed to be	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
					priority junctions.	
OBJ_232_123	123	22	Provision of additional data to review junction capacity assessment - junction layout plans, raw traffic survey data, queue length survey data.	General	Junction layout drawings with geometries have been provided. Survey data to be provided.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_124	124	23	Site access junctions work well within theoretical and practical capacity.	General	n/a	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_125	125	23	Compound B5 model - incorrect flows for 2020 cumulative scenario and visibility conditions have not been entered. Model should be updated to take account of this.	General	Amended junction model result provided in a separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_126	126	23	Installation of temporary signals for compound B5 haul route crossing need to be considered further in Framework CTMP.	General	Noted	BCC: There are lots of comments that BCC have made about matters that need to be covered in the CTMP. We need a note that brings all these together and forms the basis of a legal commitment to resolve them <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_127	127	23	Considered that haul route crossing points with temporary four way signals should be considered on individual merits. Each location should be assessed to determine the most appropriate method of control for operation duration and local traffic volumes, based on additional comments in response.	General	Noted, but not four way signals. Only expect two phases manually controlled (Haul route and public highway with default being green for public highway)	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_128	128	24	Compound B6 - considered that as this location is going to be heavily used for the duration of the construction period a permanent signals installation should be considered.	General	Noted	BCC: Commitment required <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_129	129	24	If signals are considered the most appropriate form of control, the Highway Authority expects that they will be operational during working hours only, and then removed to a secure location in hours when the site is not open.	General	Noted	BCC: CTMP principle required <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_130	130	24	Impact not considered to be acceptable in a number of off-site locations. Further work requested to address this.	General	Comment addressed in separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_131	131	27	J108 Blackgrove Road/A41 - details of improvements as part of HS2 construction works required to be provided and demonstrated that they can accommodate the construction traffic.	General	Agreed & Noted. We will work with HS2 to ensure that the works required for both projects at the same junction are aligned and suitable whilst minimising disruption to the road user.	BCC: Enforceable commitment required <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to OBJ_232_095
OBJ_232_132	132	28	J108 Blackgrove Road/A41 - information required relating to timing of HS2 improvements and when construction traffic is likely to be using the junction.	General	See response above.	BCC: Comment as above <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to OBJ_232_095

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_133	133	30	It is noted that due to the location of the line a number of the construction routes directly impact on villages and are along routes that are not designed or constructed to accommodate HGV traffic	General	No further action - point agreed. Hence, mitigations and localised improvements are proposed.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_134	134	30	No detailed mitigation provided at this stage along Construction Routes. Highway Authority therefore unable to comment on the acceptability of the mitigation in terms of design and whether the works are achievable on the ground and reserves its position. The Highway Authority is of the view that the measures proposed do not go far enough to meet the above imperative. Appendix H shows that there are lengths of highway with up to 500m between passing places, with identified conflict points between HGV and cars. These drawings need amending to include additional mitigation sites to comply with the methodology set out in the Transport Assessment. Require passing bays and widening to be designed in order to allow HGVs to pass farm vehicles.	General	Detailed design is currently underway and further details will be available in due course.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_135	135	31	It is proposed to install temporary traffic lights on narrow bridges and structures. It is not specified where this will be proposed, nor has it been identified on the scheme drawings. Clarification on which locations are proposed to have temporary signals to enable an assessment of the suitability of this mitigation to be undertaken and included in the Framework CTMP.	General	Detailed design is currently underway and further details will be available in due course.	BCC: When? This is potentially a CTMP matter? Core principles to be included in CTMP assurance or some other form of commitment <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077
OBJ_232_136	136	31	It is not considered that the tracking provided shows a sufficient level of detail. There are a number of locations at which expanded sections of tracking is required.	General	The vehicle tracking exercise has been undertaken against the available survey data (OS). A refinement of the tracking will be carried during the detailed design, which is currently underway.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_137	137	32	Clarification requested as to size of vehicles used for construction phase	General	This information was as shown on the tracking drawings and the Construction Route Assessment Report, which was submitted as part of the TWAO submission.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_138	138	32	Amended tracking showing tracking for 2 HGVs based on correct dimensions for the construction routes within Buckinghamshire and appropriate mitigation identified.	General	A refinement of the tracking will be carried during the detailed design, which is currently underway. This will use the same vehicles as for the OS background.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_139	139	38	Highway Authority expect that EWR will provide mitigation to protect the condition of the highway structures from wear to the fabric and damage to the above ground elements.	General	Network Rail will discuss further with the Highway Authority	BCC: Commitment to undertake condition surveys prior to commencement and at regular intervals during construction with an obligation to repair damage <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> _See response to Obj_232_077. Proposals for survey, monitoring and repair of damage can be spelt out in the Highways condition (and approved through the CTMP).

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_140	140	39	Framework CTMP should be updated to reflect principles for highway structures, and secured as part of the TWA0	General	Network Rail will discuss further with the Highway Authority	BCC: As above NR Updated Response Jan 19 See response to OBJ_232_139
OBJ_232_141	141	41	Framework CTMP should be updated to reflect principles for highway asset management` and secured as part of the TWA0	General	Network Rail will discuss further with the Highway Authority	BCC: Comment as above NR Updated Response Jan 19 See response to OBJ_232_139
OBJ_232_142	142	42	Access points are considered to be unacceptable to the Highway Authority and additional design work and mitigation is required	General	An appropriate technical approval process will be agreed with the Highway Authority.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_143	143	42	Currently the access arrangements are considered to be unacceptable and so additional design work and mitigation is required.	General	An appropriate technical approval process will be agreed with the Highway Authority.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_144	144	43	Highway Authority is satisfied that Winslow Train Station has already been assessed	General	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_145	145	43	Consideration has not been given as to the potential for additional car parking to occur on nearby residential roads, nor of non-car modes of travel.	General	Network Rail would be happy to work with BCC with regards to these matters outside of the scope of TWA0.	BCC: This relates back again to Row 8 (OBJ_232_064) NR Updated Response Jan 19 See response to OBJ_232_064
OBJ_232_146	146	43	Not considered that traffic data sources reliably assess the traffic levels on the network - not taking into consideration changes to development and strategic infrastructure.	General	Traffic levels have been determined from strategic models made available by the highway authority, taking into account Local Plan development and infrastructure.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_147	147	44	Junction layout plans have not been provided, and therefore it is not possible to undertake a detailed check of the geometry.	General	Geometry plans provided in separate Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_148	148	44	Not considered that junction modelling of A41/ Station Way is representative of current known conditions at the junction. Queue length surveys should be undertaken to ensure the model is validated.	General	This is being considered further and results will be provided in a Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_149	149	44	Additional four junctions highlighted to expand scope of operational assessment. Also require validation of these models through queue length surveys.	General	This is being considered further and results will be provided in a Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_150	150	45	Request for revised cumulative assessment to be undertaken at A41/Station Way junction.	General	This is being considered further and results will be provided in a Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_151	151	46	The detailed design of the permanent works needs to be undertaken in consultation with the Highway Authority and secured by way of condition as part of the TWA0.	General	The Design of the permanent works reflects the design included in the Form 006's which were submitted as an AIP doc and subsequently commented on by the LHA. The comments have been addressed as is practicable and it is the intention to go back during detailed design for another round of consultations.	BCC: The mechanism for HA approval needs to be subject to an assurance/condition NR Updated Response Jan 19 See response to Obj_232_077.
OBJ_232_152	152	46	The detailed design of the permanent works needs to be undertaken in consultation with the Highway Authority and adequately address the issue of fly tipping. The council considers it appropriate in the absence of any mitigation, for EWR to fund an additional surveillance camera to allow for effective enforcement of fly tipping in areas where there is historically not been an issue.	General	Fly tipping is subject to ongoing discussions	BCC: This is a detailed design matter that should be capable of being dealt with by Condition/Assurance NR Updated Response Jan 19 Specifically Queen Catherine Road and Station Road, Launton.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
						As per response to the request for a financial contribution towards imposition of parking restrictions NR believes that this too would qualify as a recoverable cost under the WiK arrangement
OBJ_232_153	153	47	It is considered that the Code of Construction Practice Framework lacks substance and does not offer any certainty with regard to mitigation. Further work needs to be undertaken at this stage. Further details of comments provided in response file.	General	Both the COCP and CTMP are Framework documents which will be developed into more detail as the project progresses.	BCC: Details to be approved by BCC <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077.
OBJ_232_154	154	47	It is considered that the CTMP Framework lacks substance and does not offer any certainty with regard to mitigation. Further work needs to be undertaken at this stage. Ultimately, the Highway Authority would seek a condition in relation to the submission and approval of the final CTMP and its implementation. Further details of comments provided in response file.	General	Both the COCP and CTMP are Framework documents which will be developed into more detail as the project progresses.	BCC: See other comments about the need to expand the principles to be considered in the CTMP for approval of BCC <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to Obj_232_077.
OBJ_232_155	155	55	TA does not provide for physical junction improvements during the construction basis, however it is considered that impacts are still considered to be significant enough to warrant mitigation. Requests for more detailed monitoring surveys to be conducted.	General	Monitoring surveys will be undertaken through out the construction. Further details will be provided in the CTMP and agreed with the highway authority.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_156	156	56	Concerns have been raised regarding junction capacity assessments, and so further mitigation may be required once the Highway Authority's comments have been addressed.	General	N/A	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_157	157	56	No mitigation has been proposed to overcome highway safety concerns. Highway Authority has raised a number of concerns with the safety assessment and has provided a number of potential mitigation measures.	General	Further analysis provided in separate Technical Note.	<u>NR Updated Response April 19</u> See response to OBJ_232_064
OBJ_232_158	158	58	A41 / Station Way - Highway Authority are of the view that mitigation will be required at this location	General	This is being considered further and results will be provided in a Technical Note.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_289	289	1	National and Local Policies related to CTPs not included in report (paragraph 1.61)	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_290	290	1	No information is provided on the duration of the construction period and operation period of each of the strategic compounds. This needs to be included in the CTP.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_291	291	1	We would like a firm commitment that subcontractors will sign up to the CTP and have quarterly meetings with the TPC to discuss the CTP and any parking issues (paragraph 2.1.5)	Travel Plan	Agreed	BCC: Needs to be included in CTP. Can the document be updated and then conditioned? If not then an assurance that it will be updated and agreed with BCC is required <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u>

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
						The CoCP will spell out the commitment for sub contractors to sign up to the CTP and participate in quarterly meeting in close liaison with BCC.
OBJ_232_292	292	1	Information on commuting patterns is provided but it is not clear where this information comes from as no source has been included.	Travel Plan	Appendix I of the TA provides details of how this information has been derived. Commuting patterns are based on a gravity model of residential areas within 50 miles of Claydon Junction, taken as the nominal centre point for the Project. It is assumed that the majority of the workforce will limit their daily commute to less than 1 hour, and where their home is further they will lodge in the local area. Source information will be provided in updated CTPs and individual TPs.	BCC: There needs to be a commitment to update and expand this to take in to account actual locations in the CTP principles <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to OBJ_232_291
OBJ_232_293	293	2	The objectives of the CTP are considered acceptable.	Travel Plan	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_294	294	2	It is considered that in order to provide sustainable access to the compounds, the minibus service should connect to local PT hubs in addition to, or even instead of, the strategic compounds. Links to Aylesbury Vale Parkway, Kempston Hardwick, Bicester and Bletchley are suitable locations.	Travel Plan	Mini bus service will connect to local PT hubs such as the rail stations and park n ride sites	BCC: There needs to be a commitment to update and this in the CTP <u>NR Updated Response Jan 19</u> See response to OBJ_232_291 and the TP's will include this and can be spelt out as a commitment in the CoCP.
OBJ_232_295	295	1	Include source of information for commuting patterns	Travel Plan	Appendix I of the TA provides details of how this information has been derived. Commuting patterns are based on a gravity model of residential areas within 50 miles of Claydon Junction, taken as the nominal centre point for the Project. It is assumed that the majority of the workforce will limit their daily commute to less than 1 hour, and where their home is further they will lodge in the local area. Source information will be provided in updated CTPs and individual TPs.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_296	296	2	Clarity on car parking strategy with subcontractors and TPC - will have to agree strategy with TPC, who is ultimately responsible to ensure no overspill onto the public highway	Travel Plan	sufficient parking within compounds and space to extend if needed	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_297	297	3	Clarity on facilities/information provided for walking and cycling at satellite compounds	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_298	298	2	The report states that initial workforce travel surveys will be conducted within one month of the construction sites commencing operation. This is considered satisfactory as is the information that will be obtained with the surveys. A commitment to conduct an initial workforce travel survey within one month of the construction sites commencing operation is required.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_299	299	2	Informal car sharing should be organised and encouraged more via the Travel Plan Coordinator. All operatives interested in car sharing should be able to register interest with the TPC and contact details should be exchanged if there are operatives with similar destinations. This informal car share scheme should also be promoted via the travel information pack.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_300	300	2	BCC welcomes local recruitment and lodging strategy	Travel Plan	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_301	301	2	Provision of information, welcome packs and starter inductions is considered very useful to encourage staff to use Construction Access Routes	Travel Plan	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_302	302	3	Commitment to minibus service to nearby Public Transport hubs or bus stops is required	Travel Plan	Mini bus service will connect to local PT hubs such as the rail stations and park n ride sites	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_303	303	3	Commitment to Employee Travel Information pack should be included in the CTP (initiatives section)	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_304	304	3	Request to include plans for each compound showing the site location, the nearest bus stops, 2km and 5km isochrones and pedestrian and cycle routes in the vicinity of the site.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_305	305	3	Request for commitment to quarterly Contractor meetings with TPC to discuss the CTP and parking issues	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_306	306	3	Numerical targets for staff and contractor employees are required and will need to be agreed with BCC following the baseline surveys.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_307	307	4	Annual reviews, including annual travel surveys, during the operation of the sites are required.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_308	308	4	Overall, there is not enough commitment to effectively reduce staff and operatives travel to and from the strategic compounds and control on-site parking. A number of changes are therefore required before we are able to approve the plan.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_309	309	1	Assurance is required that a mini bus service will ferry staff from transport hubs mentioned in report	Travel Plan	Mini bus service will connect to local PT hubs such as the rail stations and park n ride sites	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_310	310	0	Firm commitment that a minibus service will be provided for staff travelling to Green Lane and Little Horward from the nearest railway station	Travel Plan	Mini bus service will connect to local PT hubs such as the rail stations and park n ride sites	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_311	311	0	A minibus service between the Bicester Park & Ride Site and Strategic Compound A1 will be discussed with Oxfordshire County Council.	Travel Plan	Mini bus service will connect to local PT hubs such as the rail stations and park n ride sites	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_312	312	0	Assurance that cycle storage facilities, changing rooms, showers, lockers, maps and leaflets will be made available on-site is required in the CTP.	Travel Plan	Noted	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_313	313	2	The site access descriptions of A4, Poundon, and B4, Little Horwood, suggest these sites are completely inaccessible by all modes apart from private vehicle. No solutions have been provided.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_314	314	52	It should be noted in the Framework CTMP that the travel plans have not been approved and will need to be submitted for agreement by the Highway Authority.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_315	315	54	The Highway Authority would seek that a condition be imposed on the TWAO in relation to the submission, approval, implementation and monitoring of the Travel Plans.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_316	316	8	Bletchley Compound B6 – It is proposed that this compound will be EWR headquarters for the duration of the Project. Due to the high number of staff the Highway Authority requires a specific Travel Plan for this site with agreed access routes.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_317	317	16	Through the Construction Workforce Travel Plan, regular surveying of compounds should be undertaken to understand the home location of staff and operatives for future projects.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_318	318	16	EWR will need to minimise the impact of construction personnel through rural village communities through the Construction Workforce Travel Plan. It is expected by the Highway Authority that all movements associated with this proposal should be encouraged to use the agreed construction routes. Routing and control of staff and operative traffic needs to be discussed and agreed with the Highway Authority as part of the Construction Workforce Travel Plan.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_320	320	2	Paragraph 2.3.3 states that “Appendix A provides a summary of site access by various transport modes. The walking, cycling and public transport options have been provided “. However, only bus timetables have been included in Appendix A.	Travel Plan	It is acknowledged that Appendix A only includes bus services. A description of access for each of the strategic compounds is included in Section 2 of the Strategic Compound Travel Plan, which covers walking, cycling and public transport options. Plans have been produced of each compound in response to OBJ_232_304, which show walking and cycling routes, 2km and 5km isochrones and the nearest public transport interchanges. Plans will be provided in updated CTPs and individual TPs submitted once the TWAO is approved.	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_321	321	2	Section 2.3 provides information on accessibility by all modes of transport to the compounds. However, without a plan showing the site location, bus stops, walking and cycling routes and catchment areas, this is extremely difficult to follow. These plans will need to be included in the CTP.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_322	322	3	The report should be clearer on the fact that all subcontractors will have to agree their parking strategy with the Travel Plan Coordinator and that the Travel Plan Coordinator is ultimately responsible that no overspill parking on the public highway takes place.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_323	323	3	More commitment is required in the CTP with regards to the walking and cycling promotion. We need to be confident that the information will be available at the strategic compounds, therefore an assurance that cycle storage facilities, changing rooms, showers, lockers, maps and leaflets will be made available on-site is required in the CTP.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.

Transport						
Response ID	Item Number	Page No	BCC Objection/Comment	Section	NR Response	Point resolved?
OBJ_232_324	324	3	Within the monitoring section, a commitment to conduct initial workforce travel surveys within one month of the construction sites commencing operation is required.	Travel Plan	Additional information provided in separate Technical Note	See SoCG.
OBJ_232_325	325	45	Paragraph 16.2.1 suggests that these contain Local Plan development site traffic trips. It should be noted that the data provided from the Aylesbury Strategic Model only included committed developments and strategic infrastructure projects.	General	Atkins, on behalf of EWR Alliance, emailed Buckinghamshire County Council on 10th October 2017 to request that they provide full local plan traffic flows for the interim assessment year and on 31st January 2018 to provide future year traffic flows for 2034. Jacobs, on behalf of BCC, provided 2022 Do Minimum traffic flows on 15th December 2017 and 2034 Do Minimum traffic flows on 13th March 2018. The 'Aylesbury Transport Model - Traffic Forecasting and Assumptions' report clearly states that the Do-Minimum scenario consists of committed Local Plan sites and a number of developments that have yet to be determined. The outputs provided by Jacobs were then adopted in the TA report. Based on the above correspondence, the traffic flows provided represent the Do Minimum scenario, which included the full local plan sites, as requested by EWR Alliance.	See SoCG.

