

# D62

## **Proposed wording by NHG to add to SALP SA6 to reflect HRI traffic concerns**

This is NHG's note on the agreed need to make an addition to SA6 as a general requirement. The proposed additional wording to the policy is in bold

Add general criterion (B) to SA6 (before the site specific criteria) to reflect HRI traffic concerns notwithstanding that at this stage the impacts of the SALP allocations are not known since they have not been identified and assessed in terms of the HRI by Aecom on behalf of the Council in the light of the most up to date traffic data:

**(B) The impact of each proposal (including indirect and cumulative impacts) on the HRI, together with other impacts on other users of the highway, should be rigorously assessed (i) to determine whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of such impact (having regard to DM48) and (ii) to identify any necessary mitigation including contributions to upgrading horse crossings and other facilities for the HRI and other highway users where appropriate.**

### Note by NHG:

This amendment is to ensure proper assessment of the impact of specific proposals on the allocated sites and to identify appropriate mitigation notwithstanding the allocation on this key economic and cultural activity. Indirect and cumulative impacts would include impacts on the local and regional economy and would require proposals to be considered in the light of other development built, proposed or underway.

For the avoidance of doubt, the amendment does not resolve concerns with the overall points concerning the need to identify and assess the impact of the SALP proposals generally on the HRI in the light of updated growth figures and the proper assessment of viability (given the £500 contribution noted by FHDC is based on a superseded figure for one proposal based on old traffic data).

David Elvin QC for NGH 18.10.17