

Environmental Information Regulations – Response - 26734

Follow-on request to 26579

To clarify, this follow-up request does not seek disclosure of any pre-application correspondence, developer advice, or commercially confidential material relating to specific landowners or schemes. Instead, it seeks information about the methodology, assumptions and evidential framework used by Suffolk County Council and its consultants when preparing and assessing the A12 MRN scheme itself.

This request is therefore focused on how the modelling and assessment were constructed, rather than on who supplied any confidential information.

Follow-up request under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004

Please provide the following information held by Suffolk County Council in relation to the A12 MRN scheme (Seven Hills to Woods Lane), including material prepared internally or by consultants on behalf of SCC.

1. Scenario lists and development assumptions

Copies of any documents, tables, schedules or appendices that set out:

- *The list of development sites, growth locations or land-use assumptions included in:*
 - o *the “Do Minimum” scenario;*
 - o *the “Do Something / With Scheme” scenario; and*
 - o *any alternative or sensitivity scenarios used in modelling.*
- *The basis on which individual developments were included or excluded.*
- *Any distinction made between:*
 - o *consented development,*
 - o *allocated Local Plan sites,*
 - o *emerging or unallocated sites,*
 - o *employment land,*
 - o *infrastructure-led or strategic growth assumptions.*

(This includes, but is not limited to, material referenced in the Transport Assessment, EIA scoping discussions, or modelling documentation.)

2. Transport modelling methodology and assumptions

Documents describing or defining:

- *The transport models used (including SCTM and any microsimulation models), their versions, and base years.*
- *How peak-hour modelling was expanded or factored to represent 24-hour flows.*
- *Assumptions relating to:*
 - o *background traffic growth,*
 - o *induced demand,*

- o construction traffic,*
- o cumulative construction effects,*
- o interaction with other major infrastructure projects.*
- Any guidance, technical notes, or internal instructions governing how modelling assumptions were selected or applied.

3. Uncertainty logs, risk registers and sensitivity testing

Copies of any:

- *uncertainty logs,*
- *risk registers,*
- *sensitivity test schedules,*
- *option comparison matrices,*
- *or similar documents*

used to capture uncertainty around:

- *development delivery assumptions;*
- *timing and phasing of growth;*
- *dependency on third-party schemes;*
- *interaction with other infrastructure projects;*
- *alternative growth or traffic scenarios.*

(This includes the “Uncertainty Log” referenced in meetings relating to the MRN scheme.)

The answers to questions 1-3 are contained in the publicly accessible information that we previously supplied, for the A12 MRN Project Planning Application, on the Suffolk County Council (SCC) website.

The information requested is in the Transport Assessment or in the following appendices to the Transport Assessment, Appendix C – Strategic Model Validation Report or Appendix P – Strategic Model Uncertainty Log.

4. Records of scenario testing and option refinement

Documents showing:

- *which modelling scenarios were tested, amended or discarded;*
- *reasons for inclusion or exclusion of particular assumptions;*
- *any changes made to scenarios following officer, consultant or stakeholder review;*
- *internal summaries or briefing notes explaining the rationale for the final modelling approach.*

Other than the previously stated documents, neither SCC nor our consultants WSP hold this specific information.

5. Governance and assurance

Documents setting out:

- *internal governance arrangements for agreeing modelling assumptions;*
- *sign-off processes for scenario selection;*
- *roles of Suffolk County Council officers versus external consultants in approving modelling inputs;*
- *any methodological guidance used to ensure consistency with DfT, National Highways*

or EIA practice.

Scope and clarification

Other than the previously stated documents, neither SCC nor our consultants WSP hold this specific information.

Due to the complexity of the information requested, SCC would be prepared to meet with the requester to discuss their technical requests to see if additional information could be extracted from our Traffic Model to assist the requester. However, additional transport modelling and analysis is a service that SCC usually charges for.

If this is something you would like to discuss this with SCC, please contact us via:
customer.services@suffolk.gov.uk