

UTT/25/2786/OP – potential flaw in baseline transport modelling arising from UTT/25/2814/DOV

Dear planning dept,

We are writing in relation to UTT/25/2786/OP to raise a material concern regarding the transport baseline relied upon by the applicant.

It appears that the transport modelling for the Land North of Taylors Farm proposal may rely, directly or indirectly, on an assumed future layout at M11 Junction 8 which includes the Northside mitigation scheme's proposed 4th lane on the south-eastern quadrant of the gyratory, between the B1256 entry arm and the southbound on-slip.

That is significant because this 4th lane does not currently exist, and a separate live application, UTT/25/2814/DOV, now seeks to vary the Northside Section 106 arrangements in a way that appears to remove this element of mitigation.

This creates an obvious problem. If the applicant's modelling is based on a future baseline that assumes delivery of this 4th lane, when in fact that element of the scheme has not been delivered and is now the subject of a live application seeking its removal, then the baseline and cumulative modelling relied upon may be incorrect or, at the very least, premature.

The recent A120 Link Road Feasibility Study states that the Stansted Northside "Interim-Plus" scheme at M11 Junction 8 would *"involve the widening of the circulatory carriageway to four lanes between the B1256 entry arm and southbound on slip on the southeastern quadrant of the gyratory"*. It further states that, although the M11 Junction 8 and Priory Wood Roundabout improvement schemes had not yet been delivered, both were nevertheless incorporated into the A120 corridor model Reference Case scenario for the Local Plan modelling because the Northside application had received planning consent during the Local Plan process.

If the applicant's assessment similarly depends on that same assumed Reference Case, then the Council should be aware that the applicant's baseline transport assumptions may not reflect a secure or deliverable highway scenario.

At the very least, the applicant should be required to confirm whether their modelling assumes completion of the 4th lane and, if so, provide re-modelling or sensitivity testing against the existing 3-lane arrangement.

More broadly, the applicant should not be permitted to proceed on the basis of this assumed mitigation unless and until the relevant Junction 8 works have actually been completed and are available to be relied upon in practice. If the Council is minded to proceed regardless, then a condition should be imposed preventing commencement of development until that specific mitigation has been delivered.

Please place this email on the planning file for UTT/25/2786/OP.

Takeley Street Action Group.