

[REDACTED]

From: Ian Gledhill [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 November 2017 09:35
To: Amol Pisal
Cc: Tony Chapman; Guy Parfect; Michael Eastham
Subject: RE: Saltbox

Amol, I'd ask that you use the flows within tab 3 of the spreadsheet. These include all Local Plan traffic growth except that at the EBR (i.e. Saltbox and the adjoining Rowan Park). The flows from your development should be added into this data so as to create a with proposed development scenario.

This would then enable a comparison between the assumptions within the Arun LP and the actual development now proposed; the issue here being that the Arun LP model is overly robust in assuming a B1/B2 type developments, whereas the proposed development is much more B8 orientated and thereby generating less traffic.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

Ian Gledhill| BSc MIHE MCIHT| Principal Planner – County Highways - Planning Services - Economy, Planning, and Place Directorate, West Sussex County Council | Location: Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH
[REDACTED]

From: Amol Pisal [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 November 2017 09:20
To: Ian Gledhill
Cc: Tony Chapman; Guy Parfect; Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Saltbox

Good Morning Ian

Thank you for the information.

We will be using the following scenari flows from your spreadsheet and add our development flows to test the Felpham Relief Road Roundabout and Rowan Way Roundabout:

2031 Reference Case – 2031 forecast flows with no development at EBR (other than Rolls Royce) or on Arun Local Plan strategic sites (other than existing consents)

Kind regards

Amol Pisal MSc MCIHT

Principal Traffic Engineer

ADL Traffic and Highways Engineering Ltd

ADL House, Oaklands Business Park, Armstrong Way, Yate, Bristol BS37 5NA

From: Ian Gledhill
Sent: 14 November 2017 08:46

To: Amol Pisal

Cc: Tony Chapman <[REDACTED]>
Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk

Subject: RE: Saltbox

Amol, find attached the 2031 flows that exclude the development assumptions for Salt Box Farm included within the Arun Local Plan model. Due to the way in which the ALP model is zoned, this hasn't been a straightforward process. The following is an explanation from Guy as to how the flows in the spreadsheet have been derived.

For the Salt Box flows from the Final Mitigation strategy the access has been moved to the north. Unfortunately it has not proved possible to completely isolate the Salt Box, as it is modelled together in one zone with Rowan Park, which shares the same access. Having now seen Systra's revised model coding, the new access position on the A29 is in my view too far to the north, which may have assisted the trip assignment in sending some trips via alternative routes avoiding the A259.

I've used three model scenarios:

- 1. 2031 Reference Case – 2031 forecast flows with no development at EBR (other than Rolls Royce) or on Arun Local Plan strategic sites (other than existing consents).*
- 2. 2031 No Mitigation – 2031 forecast flows with full EBR and Arun Local Plan but no highway capacity mitigation schemes offsite.*
- 3. 2031 Final Mitigation – 2031 forecast flows with full EBR and Arun Local Plan and final mitigation strategy*

I've attached a spreadsheet of the turning flows at the two A29/A259 roundabouts. The roundabouts are shown on separate tables, so it doesn't provide an O-D matrix following trips through the complete double junction system, just the turns at each roundabout.

There are three tabs on the spreadsheet. The third tab is probably of the most interest.

- The first tab shows 1 and 2 and the net difference*
- The second tab shows 1and 3 and the net difference*
- The third tab shows Salt Box+Rowan Way and 3 and the net difference. This net difference will effectively equal the 2031 forecast flows without Salt Box or Rowan*

Park, but with all other EBR and Local Plan sites and the full mitigation strategy. It won't be quite the same as if a new model run was made to show that, due to trip reassignment caused by changed travel conditions.

This data should now enable you to complete the sensitivity test as previously discussed, and allow for a comparison between the assumptions for Salt Box as included within the ALP model.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

Ian Gledhill BSc MIHE MCIHT | Principal Planner – County Highways - Planning Services - Economy, Planning, and Place Directorate, West Sussex County Council | Location: Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH

From: Amol Pisal [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 November 2017 15:58
To: Guy Parfect
Cc: Ian Gledhill; Tony Chapman
Subject: Saltbox

Hi Guy and Ian

Following my discussion with Guy, I understand that you are in receipt of the traffic data from Systra. Is the data (2031 Reference flows) ready?

The client has been in touch with Systra and I understand that they have provided you with the data week ago? As you know the timing is very crucial due to the committee deadline.

Ian, the client is getting really anxious; understandably; so please could or Guy provide us with the 2031 reference flows (minus Salt Box flows) so that we can undertake the sensitivity test that we volunteered to do.

Thank you

Regards

Amol

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.