

**Barracks Link Road – question 5(l)(v) – Record of oral submission by Andrew Bartlett**

Whether justified

Refer you to City Council’s statement on Matter 5, p4, para 16

Council makes four points on justification – I will address those four points.

**1 – that link road required to make the Howe Barracks development acceptable**

That statement is not justified by evidence. The supporting information provided by the developer as part of the planning application for development of the Barracks site tells a different story. The applicant for permission was very clear that the proposed new link road is not required for the purposes of the development; and that it was only included in the developer’s plans because the link road is favoured by the County Council and City Council.

**2 – that the proposal offers the opportunity to give some of the capacity in Broad St and Military Rd to bus priority as set out in para 7.51 of the CDLP 8.6 Transport Strategy**

This point has no substance to it.

Para 7.51 of the Transport Strategy says nothing at all about extending bus priority.

There are two potentially relevant references in the Transport Strategy – one is at para 5.76 and one is at page 89 item C15. Both are very brief references which provide no explanation and make no specific proposal.

Common-sense suggests that the principal constraint on the amount of bus priority in the Broad Street/Military Road area is the available width of the existing road (A28). This constraint cannot be removed or ameliorated by building a new link road. The A28 will still be the same width that it is now.

This point lacks any real substance. Without a clear explanation and proposal, there is nothing to assess.

**3 – that without the link road, traffic from the new Howe Development would exit onto A257 St Martins Hill and travel on the most congested city centre streets to reach destinations to the east of the city; the link road mitigates this increase in traffic demand.**

This is not a justified point.

There is an existing road through the Barracks site. If the Barracks gates were open today, it would be possible to drive out of the Barracks site in either direction – ie either onto the A257 or onto Military Road.

This is part of the reason why the supporting documents for the planning application said that the new road was not needed for the purposes of the development.

The City Council’s proposal is not for improving the existing roads but for an additional road, situated to the west of the development site, cutting across the AHLV.

The position therefore is:

There is no satisfactory evidence to show that the Air Quality problem would be ameliorated by the Barracks Link or that the Barracks Link would materially reduce congestion.

The concern must be that without an adequate examination and assessment, the likely effect is not known. The problem of new roads attracting additional traffic is well known. Since this link road proposal has not been adequately assessed, for all you can know the proposal might make the traffic and air quality situation worse by attracting additional traffic.

Support for the idea of the Barracks Link Road is based on the hope that it would result in a substantial reduction in congestion. A substantial reduction in congestion is something we would all like to see. The problem is the lack of evidence to support the hope.

We have on the one hand the certainty of the damage to the AHLV and on the other hand the lack of reliable evidence to show you that the link would probably effect a material improvement to congestion or air quality.

Conclusion: at present the proposed Barracks link road across the AHLV is not supported by proportionate evidence sufficient to justify it.

#### **Response to oral comments by Mr Richard Moore and Mr Wraight**

Neither Mr Moore nor Mr Wraight provided an effective answer to any of the points that I made.

Neither was able to say why the link is as shown on the proposals map across the AHLV rather than by improving the existing roads through the Barracks site which could be opened up.

Andrew Bartlett

28.7.15