



CABINET

9th NOVEMBER 2016

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR FOR PLACE COMMISSIONING:
TONY CIABURRO**

**DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR PUBLIC
PROTECTION, STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH:
COUNCILLOR ANDRE GONZALEZ DE SAVAGE**

Subject:	A422 Farthinghoe Bypass
Recommendations:	<p>That Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agrees that the A422 Farthinghoe Bypass is added to the County Council’s priority list of major road schemes. 2. Notes the preference of the public consultation referred to in Section 4 of this report for a northern route and agrees that this should form the basis of further work to develop the scheme.

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 To note the results of the recent public consultation for the A422 Farthinghoe Bypass and agree the next steps for delivery of the scheme.

2. How this decision contributes to the Council Plan

The Council’s vision is to make Northamptonshire a great place to live and work. This is achieved through increasing the wellbeing of your county’s communities and/or safeguarding the county’s communities.

<p>This initiative specifically delivers increased wellbeing and/or safeguarding by ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People achieve economic prosperity, in a healthy, low carbon economy which give access to jobs, training and skills development. • Communities thrive in a pleasant and resilient environment, with robust transport and communications infrastructure. • Resources are utilised effectively and efficiently, in coordination with partners and providers.

3. Background

3.1 The village of Farthinghoe (population 413, 2011 census) is located on the A422 between Banbury and Brackley.

3.2 In the 1980s, in anticipation of the forthcoming opening of the M40, the County Council developed a policy of upgrading the A422 to provide a high-quality route for traffic from

the M40 towards Milton Keynes. Middleton Cheney was bypassed in 1991 and a southern bypass for Brackley was opened in 1992. Improvements, jointly with Buckinghamshire County Council, upgraded the A421 to continue the upgrade towards Milton Keynes.

- 3.3 Plans were developed to provide a bypass for Farthinghoe, but difficulties in determining an appropriate route which enjoyed public support, at a time when Government funding for new road construction was being significantly reduced, led to the scheme being discontinued.
- 3.4 This has left Farthinghoe as the only village on the A422/A421 between the M40 and Milton Keynes without a bypass. In the subsequent period the local community has continued to campaign for a bypass. Although current traffic flows of some 11,000 vehicles per day (7.5% HGV) are lower than those experienced by some other villages in the county, there is a pinch-point in the village which prevents two large vehicles passing, and this frequently leads to vehicles mounting the footways.
- 3.5 Local concerns have been heightened by the potential for significant growth at Banbury in the period 2014 to 2031, as proposed in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. This includes proposals for 7,106 new houses and a strategic employment land allocation located east of Banbury adjacent to the M40 and the Northamptonshire border. Inevitably, this level of development will increase current traffic flows on the A422 through Farthinghoe.
- 3.6 There is also concerns that the substantial volume of HS2 construction traffic forecast to use the B4525, which broadly parallels the A422 between the M40 and A43, will lead to much of the traffic from that route switching to the A422 for an extended period.
- 3.7 The report on the Major Road Schemes Review considered by Cabinet in January 2016 included the proposal that subject to support in the village for an affordable alignment the bypass should be added to the County Council's list of priority road schemes.

4. Consultation and Scrutiny

- 4.1 Public consultation on the bypass took place during November and December 2015, including a public exhibition in Farthinghoe Village Hall on 4th and 5th December. The local community was asked for its views on alternative options for a 2.2km route to the south of the village and a 2.3km route to the north.
- 4.2 A more detailed summary of the public consultation results is contained in Appendix 1 of this report, but in summary:
 - 76% of respondents said that Farthinghoe needed a bypass
 - 51% of respondents preferred the northern route, 26% the southern route and 23% expressed no preference.
- 4.3 In addition to this public consultation, initial views have been sought from the following statutory consultees:
 - 4.3.1 Canal and River Trust – made no comments as there are no main rivers or canals in the area affected.

- 4.3.2 Environment Agency – indicated a preference for the northern route as it had limited impact on aquifers; however they would not find a southern route unacceptable providing suitable mitigation was incorporated in the road drainage.
 - 4.3.3 Historic England – had concerns about the impact of either route on the heritage assets in the village.
 - 4.3.4 Natural England – commented that the proposal was unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.
 - 4.3.5 South Northamptonshire Council – welcomed the principal of a bypass and expressed an initial preference for the northern route as it lay at a greater distance from the properties in the village than the southern option.
- 4.4 As expected, given the limited amount of appraisal work undertaken on the bypass options to date, the statutory consultees made reference to the need to carry out further environmental assessment work as the scheme is developed further.

5. Next steps

- 5.1 The results of the consultation referred to in Section 4 have indicated strong support for a bypass for Farthinghoe, with a preference being shown for the northern route option. It is considered that the support in the village for an affordable alignment has been demonstrated and that the scheme should be added to the County Council's priority list of major road schemes.
- 5.2 Further technical work, including environmental assessment, will now progress on generating a preferred route for the scheme. The pace of this work will depend on the availability of finance and resources.

6. Equality Screening

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken and currently does not highlight any positive or negative equalities implications arising from the proposed schemes. However, this should be kept under review as the schemes are developed.

The Assessment can be found at:

<http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/en/councilservices/Council/equalities/Pages/egceia.aspx>

7. Alternative Options Considered

- 7.1 As noted in Section 4, alternative bypass routes north and south of the village were presented at the public consultation. The southern option has been rejected because it was favoured by less of the responding consultees.
- 7.2 A number of respondents suggested an alternative solution of downgrading the A422 and instituting a weight limit. This alternative has been previously considered and rejected due to the lack of suitable alternative routes and the difficulty of policing a weight limit.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 There are no financial implications of this decision as funding for the further work described in Section 5 will be sourced from existing highways budgets as other projects progress.

8.2 Further funding will be required to take the scheme forward beyond identification of the preferred route stage and approval for such funding will be sought at the appropriate time through the Council's normal capital governance arrangements.

9. Risk and Business Continuity Management

a) Risk(s) associated with the proposal

Risk	Mitigation	Residual Risk
Further work does not allow a preferred route to be identified.	Consultation responses to date indicate that this is unlikely.	Amber
Preferred route is not acceptable in planning terms or supported at Public Inquiry	Further work includes consideration of constraints so that routes are more likely to be acceptable.	Amber

b) Risk(s) associated with not undertaking the proposal

Risk	Risk Rating
Development of the scheme cannot progress.	Red
A preferred route is chosen which is rejected at planning or public inquiry.	Red

10. List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Summary of Public Consultation responses

Appendix 2: Public consultation leaflet

Author:	Name: Chris Wragg Team: Northamptonshire Highways
Contact details:	Tel: 01604 364411 Email: cwragg@northamptonshire.gov.uk
Background Papers:	Major Road Schemes Review Cabinet Report, 12 th January 2016 Agenda No 11
Does the report propose a key decision is taken?	YES
If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan?	YES
Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here	YES. Preferred route date tbc.
Does the report include delegated decisions? If so, please outline the timetable here	No
Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework?	NO

Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)? Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Capital Investment Board (CIB)?	YES Name of SFM: Rosemary Pallot N/A
Has the report been cleared by the relevant Director?	YES Name of Director: Tony Ciaburro
Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted?	YES Cabinet Member: Andre Gonzalez de Savage
Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted?	NO Scrutiny Committee: Environment, Development & Transport
Has the report been cleared by Legal Services?	YES Name of solicitor: Debbie Carter-Hughes Solicitor's comments:
Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing?	YES Name of officer: Liam Beasley
Have any property issues been cleared by Property and Asset Management?	N/A
Are there any community safety implications?	None apparent.
Are there any environmental implications:	Some potential environmental impacts are referred to in section 4. Further detailed environmental assessment will be undertaken as scheme development progresses.
Are there any Health & Safety Implications:	There are expected to be road safety benefits from construction of a bypass. This will be assessed further as scheme development progresses.
Are there any Human Resources Implications:	NO
Are there any human rights implications:	NO
Constituency Interest:	Middleton Cheney – Councillor Ron Sawbridge

