

Hemel Garden Communities (HGC) Transport Working Sub-Group Workshop

Thursday, 19 December 2024, 9.30am – 12.30pm

Teams Meeting

DRAFT MINUTES

Name		Name	
Simon Willison (SW)	Aecom (HGC)	David Bird (DB)	SLR Vectos (TCE)
Simon Richardson (SR)	Aecom (HGC)	Luke Garrett (LG)	TCE
Sue Jackson (SJ)	HCC	Peter Blake (PB)	Savills (TCE)
Russell Monck (RM)	HCC	Ryan Bruty (RB)	Pigeon
Emma Turner (ET)	HCC	David Joseph (DJ)	Bloor
Jonathan Wellstead (JW)	HCC	Jason Wooliscroft (JW)	Bloor
Pennie Rayner (PR)	DBC	Neil Marshall (NM)	i-Transport (Bloor / Pigeon)
Phillipa Zieba (PZ)	HGC	Tom Haslam (TH)	i-Transport (Bloor / Pigeon)
Nathalie Bateman (NB)	HGC	Sara Sweeney (SS)	Kitewood
Selma Hooley (SH)	DBC/HGC	Mark Kirby (MK)	Velocity (Kitewood)
Jonathan Hale (JH)	Jacobs (HCC)	Matthew Lewis (ML)	National Highways
Chris Briggs (CB)	SADC	Sophie Waggett (SW)	Homes England
Ronan Leydon (RL)	DBC	Fionnuala Lennon (FL)	Homes England
Wendy Frost (WF)	SADC	Barney Newbould (BN)	SLR Vectos
Issy Spence (IS)	SADC/HGC	Annika Fowle (AF)	SLR Vectos
Vanessa Cooper (VC)	HGC	Helen Harding (HH)	WSP/Homes England
Adam Wood (AW)	Hertfordshire Futures	Roger Flowerday (RF)	HCC

Apologies:

Shalini Jayasinghe (DBC), Izzy Grigg (TCE), Jon Sandford (Homes England), Aaron Peate (WSP/Homes England), Bev Coupe (WSP/Homes England), Marcus Della Croce (SLR/TCE) Vectos), Rob Snowling (Pigeon), Philip van Reyk (Kitewood), Jennifer Searle (National Highways), Kelly Milburn (National Highways), Chris Bearton (Homes England)

1.	<p>Welcome</p> <p>SJ welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p>
2.	<p>Introductions and Purpose of the workshop</p> <p>Those new to the group introduced themselves.</p> <p>SJ shared the purpose of the workshops including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an opportunity for information sharing, • to generate discussions, • check and challenge where necessary, • to obtain a consensus on tackling transport proposals, • workshop format.
3.	<p>Transport Modelling</p> <p>SJ advised that HCC has just had the results of the joint SADC and DBC option test (Options 4a and 4b) and are currently carrying out a deep dive. Another Transport workshop will take place on 30 January 2025 in person, where SJ will share more detail of the results.</p> <p>SJ provided an overview of the test assumptions and advised her presentation slides will be shared after the meeting.</p> <p>SJ confirmed option 4b includes the Breakspear improvements (M1 J8).</p> <p>SJ gave a reminder of the delivery schemes noting the main scheme in SADC is the A414 Breakspear Way / Green Lane signal junction and associated E Hemel link road. The IDP schemes in Hemel have been taken from Aecom's Hemel Hempstead Transport Study (HHTS).</p> <p>SJ talked through slides on mode shift assumptions on trip reductions and distribution and noted these should answer an earlier question from DB on mode shift.</p> <p>SJ queried if anyone had any questions on the assumptions presented.</p> <p>DB queried the access to North West Hemel site. SJ confirmed that an additional signalised access had been assumed onto the link road to the west of the Marchmont Farm access noting there may be some feasibility issues linked to land ownership and topography</p> <p>MK queried the assumption of a bus only link through North Hemel and suggested it seems ambitious that all the traffic to and from the Kitewood development would pass through the eastern parcel down to the Redbourn Road – there is a lot of development in the East with no link to the West without going through the Hemel Hempstead centre. A new through vehicle link would solve this issue.</p>

SJ advised that NE Hemel would need a secondary access point given the number of homes when combined with DBC and SADC development sites. The vision for HGC has high sustainable mode shares. There would be a danger if the link is open to all traffic with no advantage to buses or active travel as it becomes difficult to get the mode shift targets. Earlier modelling work showed that providing a through traffic route would attract strategic traffic causing severance in the developments and rat running through the rural areas to the west of Hemel.

RF referred to the links through the North Hemel development and that we need to note the results of the previous strategic modelling work but at this stage of the Local Plan options need to be retained.

JH queried if the mode shift figures were based on peak periods. SJ confirmed they were. JH noted that mode shift assumptions are based on the potential to shift but in reality, not all these journeys will shift. The attractiveness to shift to walk/bus/bike -v- car could change the assumptions so in reality we wouldn't get the degree of shift and there would still be the cars on the road. There is still a gap in evidence relating to the measure required to encourage this modal shift.

SJ agreed that the mode shift assumptions are optimistic, but these are what we should be aiming for to meet the vision in the HGC Transport Vision and Strategy. Transport measures are needed to support this behaviour e.g. active travel improvements /travel planning.

PB referred to the two thirds of North Hemel houses (1000) using the western side and one third of North Hemel houses (500 homes) using the eastern side and queried if the rationale should be assumed as the local plan number and also queried the need for a bus link. RL confirmed that this split was a conscious decision in the modelling work and this was appropriate for this stage of plan making.

RF advised there are roughly equal numbers in each direction. The bus link doesn't have an impact on vehicle movements and the expectation of a bus link being in place when there are 2000 homes is a reasonable assumption.

PB noted TCE have set out in the reps to the DBC local plan that we can deliver an access onto Leighton Buzzard Road. However, need to understand when access to the Link Road is required as there is 3rd party land going down to Link Road so they had assumed that an access could be provided via Marchmont Farm.

SJ confirmed that the assumption of one or two accesses onto the Link Road would not have a material impact on the wider modelling results.

MK queried when the infrastructure is coming forward. SJ advised the modelling is based on the end point of the local plans (ie 2041) and referred to the Aecom North Hemel Transport Study - Phase 2 work for post plan infrastructure (see later presentation item).

SJ referred to her presentation slides on Trip Distribution for Options 4a and 4b and talked through the key traffic routes from the main development areas and resulting traffic flows comparison and impact of Local Plans, IDP schemes and Opportunity to shift mode (OSM) at a high level. There are pressure points on the network particularly around the M1 J8 Northbound off slip, A414 / Green Lanes junction, Redbourn Road / Three Cherry Trees Lane junction.

SJ advised that Option 4b has tested the previous proposals for an upgrade of M1 J8 however, she would not be discussing those findings today. The main benefit of the scheme is that it provides an alternative route for East Hemel Development to the South, bypassing the busy A414/Green Lanes signal junction.

SJ advised an issue that has shown up she would like to discuss further with DB is that one lane has been assumed on the circulatory at Junction 8, causing blocking back on both A414 Eastbound and circulating lane. SJ advised it would be useful to the assumptions behind this design.

Action: SJ and DB to have a discussion on design work and assumptions on Junction 8 improvements

SJ advised on the next steps which includes a deep dive, further checking of the results, what's been assumed, some potential sensitivity tests and summarising the information into a report. Also, there is the need to think longer term on how HERT may be accommodated and looking at 2050 Option Tests.

DB queried how far it is logical to go to COMET modelling compared to local Paramics modelling. SJ advised that the benefit of using COMET is the modelling shows a much wider area and therefore strategic rerouting impacts. The main use of more local modelling is to check the proposed infrastructure designs work with the levels of traffic in the developments.

SJ advised that she needs intelligence from DB's evidence, and this can be fed in. Modelling is expensive so would want to limit how many runs are carried out. SJ and DB to discuss further outside of the meeting what information to share.

Action: SJ/DB to have a discussion on information sharing.

JH referred to the pressure points on the network and queried whether it is being suggested that those impacts are unacceptable. *SJ advised it is too early to say whether impacts were severe or not i.e. more analysis of the results is needed to come to a conclusion either way.*

DB noted that he has looked at the Cherry Tree junction and it is difficult to resolve. SJ advised that she is happy to have a follow up meeting and is still looking at the detailed results. SJ to have a discussion with CB and RL on what level of detail can be shared at this moment.

Action: SJ to liaise with CB and RL on what information regarding modelling test outputs can be shared.

4. **Employment Types and Assumptions**

CB advised that the SADC Reg 19 local plan assumes approximately 53 ha of employment land between the A414 and Redbourn Road with a focus on research and innovation. This is the single largest scale opportunity for South West Hertfordshire for the next 20 years for new green belt employment allocation. The unique opportunity has two parts:

- The southern part in the Plan has 17 hectares. It is looking at a very modern research campus. The TCE and Herts IQ are doing a lot of work on this and would include high quality jobs linked to research and development included colocated small businesses.
- The northern two thirds would be mostly logistic driven with a mix of uses. The focus/aspiration is to look at opportunities for parts of the market e.g. offsite manufacturing, modular construction, startup businesses, large format uses where possible linked to R and D.

8000 jobs were included in the Regulation 18 plan in 2023. This has been moderated down to 6000 jobs. DB's team have done some work and there have been conversations with National Highways. National Highways colleagues are now accepting those approaches.

DB gave an update on what his team have been doing. The northern logistics focus has been assumed with 750-1000 jobs (calculated from floorspace assumptions). The southern area would have more of a mix of land uses. SJ and DB to discuss the outcomes of the National Highways discussions outside of the meeting.

Action: SJ and DB to discuss the National Highways discussions and feedback on modelling assumptions.

DB advised that the other factor that needs consideration is on car parking numbers. Whilst there is an aspiration to reduce numbers to encourage modal shift this needs to be balanced with the commercial aspects. DB queried if SLR Vectos trip generation assumptions have been used. SJ confirmed that the trip generation figures used were those provided by Marcus Della Croce and queried if they are current and up to date. DB advised that they have not been changed and it would be down to National Highways and HCC on whether they are happy with the trip generation assumption, noting he is not aware of any objections. SJ advised that the approach used is the best information available at this stage, recognises there are inherent uncertainties, and more testing will need to be carried out further down the line with alternative assumptions

AW advised that with regards to the northern side, he doesn't disagree with the 750-1000 logistic related jobs. It could be a challenge to deliver an additional 5000 jobs on the southern part of the site given the constraints. Rothamsted are looking to grow and need space for research and early-stage companies. The TCE land makes great sense although it is a distance from the railway station.

SJ noted that this is one employment scenario and queried what the next steps/actions would be suggested at this point. DB advised that this would come out as part of the East Hemel PPA meetings.

JH queried whether what is tested would be a reasonable worst case in terms of trip generation or is there another type of viable employment that could generate more trips. DB suggested that if there were 5000 jobs with standard car parking ratios then there may be the need for the Phase 3 of Project Breakspear (M1 Jct 8 improvements). The alternative is to put a cap on car parking numbers. Earlier phases of development could have higher car parking ratios with the opportunity to cut these down over time.

RF stated that there needed to be enough employment to enable local trips and internalisation from adjacent developments.

ML queried if National Highways colleagues involved in SADC been invited to the Transport workshops. SJ advised that Janice Burgess has been in previous sessions. She will be invited to the next meeting and National Highways invitees will be reviewed.

Action: HGC to review National Highways invitees to Transport sub-group.

The next steps would be ongoing discussions and a potential need for sensitivity testing on employment assumptions.

5. **Hemel Hempstead Transport Study & HGC IDP**

SW provided an overview on the latest phase of the North Hemel Transport Study which is an enhancement of the Hemel Hempstead Transport Study (HHTS) (carried out earlier in the year identifying a suite of transport interventions in line with the Local Plan period to 2041).

The new North Hemel transport study commission is broken down into two blocks:

Block A: The form and function of the Northern Sustainable Transport Corridor and local connections – informed by lots of evidence including from developers. Output will include high level interim and end state network plans (Task A1), typologies, cross sections and precedent images (Task A2), potential to use existing county lanes to overcome land ownership constraints (Task A3) Links to Leighton Buzzard Road, the Link Road, active travel network and consideration of emergency access points (Task A4 and A5) Block B: Update of the wider transport study. Outputs include: annotated plans showing potential bus connections into North and East Hemel in both the early years and the ultimate end point.(Task B1), a narrative about how the HHTS contributes to the HGC TV & S and which routes to focus on first and the linkages with the LCWIP (Task B3), additional post 2041 transport interventions and review of phasing assumptions (Task B4), These run in a logical sequence, with some later tasks informing earlier tasks. It is not the intention to duplicate or repeat any work that has been done before by other consultants.

SW provided an overview of each task within the blocks and advised that the programme started a couple of weeks ago.

SW requested that to avoid any duplicates, if any developers or consultants have any information they think Aecom doesn't have to please provide to him.

Action: Sub-group attendees to share information with Simon to inform Hemel Hempstead Transport study.

The main outputs will be coming through in January so SW will have some inputs to share at the Transport Workshop in January. Most of the tasks will be in the new year and supporting finalising the HGC IDP such as cost phasing.

Action: SW to share outputs from Aecom work at the next meeting.

JH flagged that a meeting held on Friday with DB and other Developers had a key action that Developers will provide an information pack with Aecom.

JH referred to the potential need for a wider town bus strategy given the increase in residents from 100,000 to 150,000 residents and the 40% mode share target extending current services is unlikely to be sufficient. This should be done later on following Task B1 and further HERT development work. DB advised that his team are putting together a document of work that has been done over the past year (including work on accesses from N Hemel and work on transport interventions and will send that across to SW. DB noted that most documents have already been shared such as the Framework Master Plan. DB requested that SW provides a list of existing information he already has to support identifying any gaps on what information is still needed.

Action: SW to provide DB with a list of existing information already obtained. DB to identify gaps and provide any missing documents / information.

DB advised that the Bus Service Improvement Plan is a useful document as it sets out aspirations on bus frequency.

SJ queried how far to go with the bus work at this stage. E.g. with it is difficult to go too far with the specification for the Sustainable Transport Corridor until the area is masterplanned. DB advised that there was a useful written spec of the STC from Gilston which provided guidance whilst retaining a level of flexibility

Action: DB to circulate Gilston STC specification.

DB advised that they were looking at bus priority where the E Hemel STC meets Hemel Hempstead Road and further work will be undertaken to incorporate bus priority in Project Breakspear as part of ongoing masterplanning work in the New Year. A bus only link to Spencers Park is also being investigated. Bus priority is also incorporated in the signalised junction onto Leighton Buzzard Road and buses could be routed through Marchmont Farm. The next stage of their work is to start looking at bus frequencies and then develop an illustrative bus strategy.

A lot of time has been spent on looking at key routes and marrying these up to the normal bus routes in residential areas and identifying ways of providing better

	<p>frequency and speed to key destinations including the railway station. This is still in its early stages. It was noted that this will likely look different in 5 years' time.</p> <p>SJ noted it is key that DB had a conversation with Aecom on who is doing what to avoid duplication.</p> <p>MK noted that there has been a lot of chat about a meeting held last Friday. MK wasn't at that meeting and asked if Velocity could also have access to the information being shared. DB advised he would need to check with TCE and others on what information can be shared with whom.</p> <p>Action: DB and SW to have a conversation on who is doing what re: buses.</p> <p>Action: DB to check what information can be shared wider, ahead of sharing.</p>
6.	<p>Update on DBC LCWIP</p> <p>PR provided an update on the DBC LCWIP. DBC are preparing for 6-weeks consultation starting from 10 February 2025. Everyone in the stakeholder list will get the information when it goes live.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made since the last meeting on the detailed infrastructure plan. For example labels have been added on the Link Road / Redbourn Road and Leighton Buzzard Road corridors flagging that they have also been identified as bus priority corridors.</p> <p>Piccotts End Lane has been added in as a route following discussions with the Marchmont Farm team.</p> <p>There have been some discussions on the Nickey Line which aligns with SADC's LCWIP. This is shown as a shared use path and will be labelled more clearly for the public consultation.</p> <p>SJ queried if the potential route extension of the Nickey Line to the town centre and station has been made clearer. PR referred to her slides and advised that it has with solid orange lines for the routes.</p> <p>DB referred to the Queensway as an example route and queried if that plan would go out to consultation. PR confirmed that proposals on it will be shown at a high conceptual level.</p> <p>DB advised that there are some tricky routes and there may be the need to move some parking to provide cycle facilities. PR advised that consultation is focussed on the high-level concept.</p> <p>SJ noted that people are comfortable that the routes being flagged are aspirational for infrastructure. The next stage would be to take through the design stage and feasibility and looking at issues such as parking.</p> <p>DB referred to the route down the Leighton Buzzard Road, a green dotted line that goes through a park and queried what it is and who owns the wide verge of hedge</p>

	<p>land. PR advised that the green dotted line is the Green Loop. The wide verge is not Highways land. RL was looking into this; IS will check with RL outside of the meeting. Action: HGC to liaise with RL on who owns the wide verge of hedging along Leighton Buzzard Road.</p>
7.	<p>Monitoring and Evaluation approach</p> <p>SJ stated that given the ambitious mode shift targets there is a need to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation plan for HGC and there is a need to start thinking about collecting baseline information before development starts . HCC is looking at a framework for monitoring and evaluation and the types of data it could use.</p> <p>SJ talked through an example framework which includes the desired outcomes based on the HGC TV&S, potential KPIs and data collection methods. There are a number of monitoring and evaluation challenges, and these were discussed.</p> <p>HCC are preparing to undertake the triennial County Travel Survey in Spring 2025 and noted the potential for a booster survey focussing on Hemel to make best use of resources. The travel survey is a key means for picking up information on individuals access to transport including their daily travel patterns. The main survey targets 300 responses across Dacorum (100 responses for Hemel). SJ suggested that a booster sample could be looked at with a target of 900 responses in Hemel.</p> <p>SJ queried if there would be any significant difficulties with this timing (e.g. potential mixed messages, any local elections / community activities) for a booster sample to be carried out in Spring 2025, noting the next chance after would be Spring 2028.</p> <p>CB advised he is not aware of any issues for SADC and would update SJ if there were any.</p> <p>PZ advised the outcome of the NPPF could mean DBC will submit their local plan on 12 March but couldn't see that causing a specific conflict. TCE are doing their next consultation at the end of January through to March. PZ is only aware of 3 dates in January.</p> <p>JH raised an observation that the survey focuses on residents and suggested there could be a gap for business surveys, particularly to check the employment internalisation assumptions in the existing Maylands Business Park.</p> <p>SJ queried if AW had any data. AW advised that Hertfordshire Futures has just commissioned some data on metrics but it isn't specifically asking for information on employee travel. This could be tweaked so they can get this data. SJ queried who would be the best person to liaise with. AW advised either himself or Steve McAteer at Deyton Bell.</p> <p>Action: SJ to follow up on business journey information held by Hertfordshire Futures - Adam Wood / Steve McAteer.</p> <p>NB advised that Prologis was leading on some travel data. PR will follow up on this. Action: PR to follow up on travel data from Prologis.</p>

	<p>HH advised that as part of Marchmont Farm, they are doing a refresh of the application document and will be doing some traffic I surveys in the new year. SJ requested that HH share the location of those surveys and likewise if anyone else is carrying out surveys, so everyone is working effectively and making best use of what is available.</p> <p>Action: HH to provide information on Homes England upcoming surveys (Marchmont Farm)</p> <p>DB advised that he had no surveys planned.</p> <p>In summary, SJ advised that they are continuing to develop the framework and noted the group haven't identified any issues with going out for a booster in the Spring.</p>
8.	<p>Stakeholder updates</p> <p>a. <u>SLR Vectos</u></p> <p>DB advised there was nothing further to add. Next for him is the East Hemel Transport and Movement PPA meeting on 14 January. The focus over the past few months has been on the master plan for East Hemel. TCE are keen to be involved in the HGC IDP process.</p> <p>b. <u>National Highways</u></p> <p>ML reiterated if Janice Burgess or someone from her Area 5 (south) team can be involved with the HGC Transport Sub-Group. SJ noted this.</p> <p>c. <u>Homes England</u></p> <p>HH advised that WSP were refreshing the transport assessment and undertaking new traffic surveys for Marchmont Farm.</p> <p>Intention is to get information submitted mid-February and will be keeping local residents updated. SANG is progressing nicely with Dacorum.</p> <p>d. <u>iTransport</u></p> <p>TH advised they are working with David and SLR on the Paramics modelling work and would be interested to hear from David Joseph on the IDP. Bloor and Pigeon are meeting with the LPAs on the 14th January to discuss the North Hemel PPA.</p> <p>e. <u>Other</u></p> <p>SS (Kitewood) advised there were no further updates at this stage.</p>

	<p>IS (HGC) advised that a meeting took place the day before with the Arup team and Aecom regarding the IDP. They are looking to hold a workshop from January onwards on Highways matters. IS will review if there are any existing meetings that can be repurposed for this and will be in touch in the new year.</p> <p>Action: HGC to share dates for HGC IDP workshop</p>
9.	<p>AOB - (5 mins)</p> <p>Next meeting – in person at The Forum, Hemel – 30th January 2025</p> <p>ML advised that he can't attend the next meeting in person and requested access online. PZ confirmed this can be accommodated.</p> <p>The presentations will be shared by HGC.</p> <p>Action: VC to share the presentations.</p>