

Timelines for Transport SOCG

26/8/20 – SOCG requested at the stage 8 hearing sessions.

1/9/20 – NCPC identify gaps in the evidence base.

15/9/20 – Information Requested from J Dale at HCC.

28/9/20 – Follow up as no response received.

8/10/20 – Further request for information results in a copy of COMET report.

12/10/20 – WHBC requested dates from HCC to discuss. No response.

22/10/20 – Review of COMET modelling work by NCPC reveals.

- Junction modelling work from HCC was done using COMET LP5.
- Level of information provided by this is insufficient to understand the assumptions made.
- Level of detail is inadequate to determine queues/delays/travel times from the proposed changes.
- Unable to assess if the strategic model (COMET LP5) has allowed for the severe queries as predicted by the 2016 AECOM report.

10/11/20 – No response from HCC to requests for a meeting to start the SOCG discussions so escalated to Herts CC councillor Stephen Boulton.

17/12/20 – Meeting convened with HCC/WHBC/NCPC to discuss the issues with the following output:

- NCPC will commission a detailed study of the junction proposals at Station Road/Plough Hill/Northaw Road East.
- The junction at Cattlegate Road/Northaw Road East/Northaw Road West was not covered with this is it was decided to do the major junction first.
- HCC and NCPC would agree the parameters to the model.
- HCC would provide all data to the model.
- NCPC would produce the model using Junction 5 software.
- HCC approved the approach, all input and model parameters.

22/1/20 – Modelling results produced with the following conclusions.

- **Neither the existing layout or the proposed layout will accommodate the growth of traffic without significant queues and delays.**
- **There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed junction changes offer any significant capacity.**
- **The proposed changes will have some marginal improvement in the early years but will quickly erode as traffic increases and, toward the end of the plan, be considerably worse than the current configuration.**

03/3/20 – Response received from HCC commenting that:

- HGV flows are questioned.
- Queue lengths were questioned.
- Visibility distances were questioned.

5/3/20 – Replies from NCPC to HCC

- *HGV flows are questioned.*
This was considered irrelevant as HGV traffic is low and the respective levels would have little impact on the results.
- *Queue lengths were questioned.*
NCPC did not agree with all these observations were reflective of the real situation but accepted them to avoid future debate.

- *Visibility distances were questioned.*

NCPC did not agree with all these observations were reflective of the real situation but accepted them to avoid future debate.

The model was re-run but these refinements made only superficial changes to the results. The conclusion remains the same:

- **Neither the existing layout or the proposed layout will accommodate the growth of traffic without significant queues and delays.**
- **There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed junction changes offer any significant capacity.**
- **The proposed changes will have some marginal improvement in the early years but will quickly erode as traffic increases and, toward the end of the plan, be considerably worse than the current configuration.**