

“Matters” this relates to :

M1 Issue 3 primarily. The Sustainability Appraisal was not prepared properly, it ignored the warnings from CP9 Sustainable Transport monitoring and from B&HCC’s traffic study. It misrepresents and overestimates the Transport Infrastructure’s ability to absorb extra traffic.

M17 Issue 1 Infrastructure (Transport).

M18 Issue 1 is also important. If the widely used monitoring indicators for CP9 Sustainable Transport were ignored from 2017-19, what is to stop them being ignored from 2021-2030?

The proposed development not being sustainable has a pervasive impact which also affects the following Matters **M2** Issue 1.4; **M3** Issue 1.9; **M5/6/7** Q1; **M15** DM33-34.

The Objection / Representation

There is compelling and irrefutable evidence that congestion is far higher than CPP1 forecast (in part because its forecast switch to bus travel did not take place) and that by 2018 B&HCC knew the Transport Infrastructure can not support the development target sustainably (NPPF requirement). CPP2 does not address this, instead its Sustainability Appraisal and Transport Assessment read as if CPP1’s Year 2010 based forecast remains valid, ignoring today’s changed circumstances, in violation of NPPF and other relevant preparation standards.

1. The Authority Monitoring Report AMR¹ for the indicators² selected to monitor the success of CPP1 (CP9 Sustainable Transport), show that CPP1 failed³, for example **1.1m fewer** bus trips were recorded over the past 3 years⁴, whereas CPP1 relies on **2.4m more**.
2. In 2018 BHCC reported⁵ congestion had risen sharply⁶ and planned developments cannot be met without transport interventions⁷. Its application to fund interventions was refused⁸
3. An overarching principle of Sustainability Appraisals is that they must be based on current knowledge⁹. CPP2’s sustainability appraisal is not based on B&HCC's current knowledge of the state of the Transport Infrastructure (1 & 2 above).

CPP2 does not include a Transport Assessment based on traffic measurements more recent than 2010¹⁰, though the DfT says for such assessments to be treated as **realistic** and **sensible**, it is **essential** they are validated with **recent** real world traffic measurements ¹¹.

CPP2 is not “underpinned by **relevant and up-to-date** evidence” (NPPF para 31) nor is it supported by a review of CPP1 **completed** by March 2021 (NPPF para 33)¹².

#####

In terms of “soundness” CPP2 produced no evidence or analysis to justify ignoring CPP1's chosen AMR indicators or to explain how the reported shortfalls would be remedied by 2030. It also ignored a B&HCC recent study that said the development target cannot be met and it presented no evidence that the current state of the Transport Infrastructure would be able to support the development target. It is not evidence based.

Even had B&HCC not known the 2010 based forecasts had seriously overestimated the 2020 and 2030 transport infrastructures' capacity to support the extra traffic, to prepare CPP2 without using current knowledge or recent traffic measurements contravenes NPPF and fundamental rules for Transport Assessments and Sustainability Appraisal preparation.

*With the benefit of hindsight it is obvious why congestion grew more than forecast and **will continue to grow more than forecast**, why bus patronage is falling rather than rising and what can be done to fix the transport infrastructure so the target can be met with sustainable development. It is assumed the Inspector does not require this analysis.*

Details re items 1-3 above

1. CPP1 forecast¹³ that the increase in congestion (traffic delays) above the 2010 base year figure¹⁴ due to growth in the number of trips¹⁵ people make on the transport infrastructure (e.g. the people occupying the extra homes) and due to B&HCC's transport interventions¹⁶ (e.g. 20 mph zones and Lewes Road traffic displacement), would be largely offset by a substantial annual move to greater use of sustainable transport¹⁷ (buses), which would reduce the congestion on the roads.

The primary Authority Monitoring Report AMR¹⁸ indicator for CPP1's transport success was to achieve **800,000 more** bus trips **year on year**, reported by the DfT¹⁹. Since CPP1 was adopted, the DfT has reported **360,000 fewer** bus trips per year.

The second numeric AMR indicator²⁰ was for Transport Carbon Emissions to reduce by **4% per year**, (as would be expected with people's journeys being performed by fewer vehicles, as buses carry more people), but **less than 1% was achieved**.

CPP2's Sustainability Appraisal does not address this evidence of serious failure i.e. why it happened, its impact and how and when any shortfalls will be made up, though one of B&HCC's own studies identified the main causes of the congestion problem³⁵

It mentions²¹ the carbon indicator saying "*Transport based carbon emissions show a downward trend and this is expected to continue*"... implying 1% is now acceptable.

It "*suggests*"²² without explanation or evidence, that the DfT sourced independent bus patronage adverse indicator is just a *suggestion* that will correct itself "*Recent analysis suggests that bus patronage has decreased in the short-term, however longer term trends, including travel to work trends suggest that bus patronage should increase again in the long-term.*"⁵⁰" (its superscript 50 reference is to a 2011 Census summary²³ that makes no such *suggestion* about 2020-2030 or other future trends.)

2. The June 2018 Transforming Cities Fund TCF application⁵ said congestion had risen sharply since 2008²⁴, with bus services seriously affected²⁵ and the development target could not be met²⁶ (without transport interventions).

Annex B²⁷ maps the transport infrastructure's congestion based on measurements

taken in 2017. Vast swathes of the major roads are coloured yellow, red and black, each denoting ranges of congestion greater than CPP1's worst forecast²⁸ for 2030.

Given this measured congestion it is hard to dispute the officers' conclusion that the development target could not be met²⁶ – even ignoring the near certainty that the long bus delays means the necessary growth in bus patronage²⁹ will not happen and also knowing B&HCC plans more interventions³⁰ that will further reduce road capacity.

Note that **Annex A11** shows how much worse the increase in B&HCC's bus delays was versus other cities, while **Annex A14** shows how badly B&HCC was missing the CO2 target, even before the recent record of less than 1% annual improvement.

3. If the long-range weather forecast had predicted a very hot drought but you can see a snow blizzard outside and sub-zero temperatures, will you walk to your local shop in a sun hat and sunglasses, or will you dress on the basis of your **current knowledge**?

This is analogous to CPP2 acting as if CPP1's forecasts were realistic while knowing the AMR indicators and the 2018 study said they were not, contrary to the requirement for a sustainability appraisal to be based on **current knowledge**³¹

Similarly the DfT³² warns forecasts are uncertain and subject to human and other errors³³, so to have any confidence in a forecast it should be validated with **recent** real traffic measurements.

That NPPF expects plans to be based on current circumstances rather than old estimates is clear enough as is the expectation that forecasts should be monitored. It is not clear if B&HCC investigated why CPP1's AMR reported such major deviations or if they appreciated the need to complete a review within 5 years.

To plan transport in 2020 relying on 2010 traffic measurements is unforgivable, doubly so when the 2010 based forecast is known to be unrealistic and to seriously overestimate the infrastructure's capacity available to handle planned extra traffic.

*Note also that CPP2 **ignores** planned transport interventions that will further reduce transport capacity such as Valley Gardens Phase 3 and the Car Free City Centre, in much the way that CPP1 ignored the 2014 reassignment of road space to pedestrians in North Street, the busiest bus hub³⁴, which was later found to be the largest single cause of the current congestion³⁵.*

Notes.

Documents are referred to by their document list Id. Ones I added are referred to as REPRESENTxxxx, using the reference assigned by the Programme Officer.

1	CD13e - Authority Monitoring Report 2019/20 Appendices
---	--

	CP9 Sustainable Transport ... pages 30/31
2 Local Bus Journeys per annum +800k target, +500k trigger Reduction in Transport CO2 per annum 4%
3 Local Bus Journeys: 3 year actual 49.7 => 48.6 (-1.1m) i.e. losing 360,000 passengers per annum instead of gaining 800,000. Reduction in Transport CO2: 3 year actual 297.5 => 290.4 (7.1kt) 3 year target $297.5 * 3 * 4\% = 35.7$ i.e. met less than 20% of the target (7.1/35.7%)
4	Using the most recent 3 years avoids a single rogue datum distorting the picture and ensures the data are collected under reasonably current traffic conditions.
5	REPRESENT03a – Connected Coastal City Expression of Interest TCF BHCC final June 2018 TCF Application This document, submitted for Greater Brighton by the B&HCC Head of Transport Policy and Strategy provides recent evidence about the state of our transport infrastructure and the impact of the high congestion on bus services
6 Section A Reduced levels of reliability and punctuality for public transport passengers ...
7	... Section B Who and Where ... Para 5
8	REPRESENT03c – BHCC Transforming Cities Fund webpage
9	REPRESENT02b ... LA 101 - Introduction to environmental assessment - DMRB - Standards for Highways 2. Overarching principles of environmental assessment Paras 2.2, 2.3
10	ED09a City Plan Part 1 Strategic Transport Assessment, 1.3, 1.12, 7.18 and especially 7.26 This STA, though published in 2013, is based on earlier modelling which in its turn was based on 2010 traffic measurements, hence 2010 being its base year . ED09b .. this 2014 Addendum does not include further traffic measurements. No other traffic measurements were submitted subsequently.

	<p>https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/transport-and-travel-background-evidence-documents</p> <hr/> <p>TP03 - Transport Technical Paper - May 2021</p> <hr/> <p>This assesses impacts on Highways England’s A27 junctions due to changes in the development Plan. It does not address the main transport infrastructure or update the 2010 based modelling or take more recent traffic measurements.</p>
11	<p>REPRESENT02a. DfT Unit M1 Principles of Forecasting and Modelling</p> <p>See 2.3 and particularly 2.3.4 re need for validation to be current / recent</p>
12	<p>NPPF paragraphs 7, 8a, 20b, 32 are also relevant to the duty to ensure the transport infrastructure is not overloaded.</p>
13	<p>ED09a City Plan Part 1 Strategic Transport Assessment</p> <p>.... the 2030 forecasts are set out in Appendix F as congestion maps for various scenarios, which are easy to contrast with REPRESENT03b Annex B2</p>
14	<p>.... 7.26</p>
15	<p>.... Section 6 a standard trip generation methodology</p>
16	<p>.... Section 6 City wide interventions <i>Note North Street not mentioned.</i></p> <p>6.5 Lewes Road</p> <p>6.9 Seven Dials</p> <p>6.13 Edward Street</p> <p>6.16 Valley Gardens <i>note 6.18 re unrealistic 2030 impacts</i></p> <p>6.21 Brighton Station Gateway</p> <p>6.25 20 mph zones</p>
17	<p>..... 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 8.13, 10.11, 10.14</p> <p>8.13 Assuming that buses would be less affected by congestion than cars seems particularly puzzling in retrospect, as they cannot circumvent congestion. Also, “how much less” is unquantified.</p>
18	<p>CD13e. B&HCC Authority Monitoring Report 2019/20 Appendices</p> <p>CP9 Sustainable Transport Page 30</p>
19	<p>..... 2nd row</p>
20	<p>..... 3rd row</p>

21	<p>SD05a 3.5 Air quality and transport</p> <p>3rd of Final 4 bullet points re CO2</p>
22	<p>.....</p> <hr/> <p>1st of Final 4 bullet points</p>
23	<p>REPRESENT01e</p> <p>CPP2's suggestion that the required upward trend in bus patronage will happen and we are just having a blip, refers to this 2011 census briefing as if it had some relevance. Maybe the wrong reference was given?</p>
24	<p>REPRESENT02 – Connected Coastal City Expression of Interest TCF BHCC final</p> <p>June 2018 TCF Application</p>
25	<p>.... Page 4 A4 Discussion of key transport challenges: Reduced levels of reliability and punctuality for public transport passengers</p>
26	<p>..... Page 5 SECTION B: Who & Where Paras 3 & 5</p>
27	<p>REPRESENT03b Connected Coastal City – Annexes BHCC final Annex B2 Existing Congestion ...</p>
28	<p>ED09a Brighton and Hove City Plan Strategic Transport Assessment May 2013. (ED09b does not update the traffic base year).</p> <p>Appendix F contains the 2030 predicted congestion maps and colour code key.</p>
29	<p>REPRESENT01c The impact of congestion on bus passengers.</p> <p>Numerous studies show rising bus delays result in losing passengers (and conversely). Professor Begg's often quoted paper summarises this "elasticity" quite well, with good references. Pages 20 & 26 are the most relevant.</p> <p>The Hove to Marina bus taking 31% longer and the morning coastal commute 65% longer than in 2010 (CPP1's base year) can be checked on historic bus timetables. (No 7 and No 12 available on request).</p> <p>It is assumed this is not disputed as the deterioration in bus journey times is admitted to in the TCF⁶ application and the 2018 bus review³⁵.</p> <p>It is unlikely that bus patronage will recover without reducing bus delays (there is no evidence suggesting otherwise) ... continued deterioration is more likely.</p>

	REPRESENT01bi, REPRESENT01bii Buses Timetables (extracts ... available on request) as well as a statement from the bus operator about No. 7.
30	It is hard to give a reference to an absence of something, but much as ED09a overlooked the major 2014 reassignment of road space to pedestrians in the main bus hub, so it also assumed Valley Gardens would have no impact and SD05a fails to correct this using B&HCC's later estimates of serious extra traffic delays or to include other relevant plans that have come into play since 2013, such as displacement of general traffic from the city centre.
32	REPRESENT02a. DfT Unit M1 Principles of Forecasting and Modelling
33 paras 2.2.9; 2.3.2-2.3.6
34	OD59 Detailed Air Quality Assessment 2020 Page 17 Table 3 shows North Street as the busiest bus hub having 2779 bus journeys per day, more than twice the bus activity of the next busiest street.
35	REPRESENT01a. 2018 Brighton Bus Network Review Traffic conditions 1.1.18, 1.1.19, North Street bus hub, bus-on-bus congestion 4.1.16, 4.1.17, 5.1.15 Row C19, 6.1.5 Row C19, 7.1.14-17

The following references are present in case they are needed in responding to questions from the inspector.

REPRESENT01di REPRESENT01. DfT Bus0109 Passenger journeys on local bus services by local authority: England

REPRESENT04xx various annual trend statistics from the DfT

The 3 diagrams below relate to (1) Authority Monitoring Report (REPRESENT04), (2) the study into the state of the main roads in 2017 (REPRESENT03) and (3) CPP1's predictions about the state of these roads in 2030 (**ED09a** City Plan Part 1 Strategic Transport Assessment) and are provided to simplify reading this paper.

CP9 - Sustainable Transport		Strategic Objectives: SO1, SO3, SO11, SO14	
Indicator Reference / Indicator	Target / Timescale	Trigger and Actions to be taken if target not being achieved	2019/20 Data and update
LOI/LTP Delivery of bus priority infrastructure improvements on the following corridors	Delivery of improvements by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2024, dependent on funding and democratic approval (A259 Seafront and London Road schemes) 	Lewes Road: works already commenced and due for completion in 2013. No trigger/action necessary.	Lewes Road Scheme completed in September 2013. Vogue Gyatory Complete December 2014 Edward Street completed 2015

- 29 -

CP9 - Sustainable Transport		Strategic Objectives: SO1, SO3, SO11, SO14	
Indicator Reference / Indicator	Target / Timescale	Trigger and Actions to be taken if target not being achieved	2019/20 Data and update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A259 Seafront London Road 	(Source: Planning and Local Highway Authority) Authority)	Edward Street: Trigger: Traffic orders not started by end of July 2014 (due to go to Committee mid Oct 2013). Action: review work programme and funding sources (LTP3; regional and national sources) Seafront, London Road: Long-term targets. Progress to be reviewed in 2020 AMR; appropriate trigger/action to be added.	Arches under A259 Regency Square subway to the Metropole Hotel completed 2017 Work to reconstruct the former West Street Shelter Hall completed in 2020
LOI/LTP Local bus journeys originating in the Local Authority Area	Average increase of 800,000 passenger journeys per year (annual check based on 5-year average) (Source: BHCC)	Trigger: Average annual increase in journeys is below 500,000 Action: review transport strategy; review targets in LTP4	2019/20: 48.6 million 2018/19: 49.9 million 2017/18: 49.0 million 2016/17: 49.7 million 2015/16: 45.6 million 2014/15: 46.1 million 2013/14: 46.4 million (DoT)
LOI Reduction in CO ₂ emissions from transport within Brighton and Hove	Reduction of 4% per year in transport related CO ₂ emissions throughout plan period.	Trigger: no reduction by 2016 Action: review measures in Air Quality Action Plan	2018: 290.4 kt CO ₂ 2017: 300.4 kt CO ₂ 2016: 301.3 kt CO ₂ 2015: 297.5 kt CO ₂

B2 – Existing traffic congestion

