

[REDACTED]

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 20 May 2019 11:31
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

From: Michael Eastham
Sent: 16 May 2019 17:21
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

[REDACTED]

Thanks,

Michael

From: Ian Gledhill [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 May 2019 15:03
To: Tony Chapman
Cc: Arfon Hughes; Mr Will Marsh; Michael Eastham; Keith Sarchett; Lorna Randall
Subject: RE: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Tony, thanks for the additional information.

At the outset, I do fully acknowledge the fall-back position in terms of permitted development and the work previously accepted. As advised though, issues were identified with flows used in the Transport Assessment for the current application in light of the Arun DC Local Plan having been adopted. It was also identified that the development as proposed would conflict with the mitigation for the A29/A259 Felpham Relief Road Roundabout in the Enterprise Bognor Regis Transport Review 2017; this Review having been prepared to identify the highway capacity mitigation required to enable the housing and employment growth within the made Arun Local Plan to come forward. These issues were such that warranted further assessment.

For the A29/A259 Felpham Relief Road Roundabout, the Arun Local Plan Transport Study 2016 identifies a scheme of mitigation comprising the widening on the north, south and west bound arms. EBR Review builds upon this initial mitigation by including the widening on the north, south and west bound arms, but also the relocation of the Salt Box Farm access northwards away from the roundabout. The proposed development at Salt Box Farm conflicts with the EBR Review it proposed to retain an access arm onto the Felpham Relief Road Roundabout.

To support the proposed development, an additional modelling scenario (based on 2031 + Arun Local Plan Allocations + Salt Box development + initial mitigation (as included in the ALP Transport Study 2016)) has now undertaken. This scenario specifically includes the Salt Box development as proposed (including an access arm from the Felpham Relief Road Roundabout) rather than using the assumed employment uses and floor areas included in the ATS 2016 and EBR Transport Review 2017.

From the modelling (using the One Hour profile), it is acknowledged that the A29(S) arm operates close to capacity in the modelled AM peak. The queues and delays are not considered to be severe and clear quickly within the modelled time frame. In the PM peak, the A259 Felpham Relief Road is nearing capacity. The queue and delays are not especially significant, and clear within the modelled peak. Quite significant delays and queues are forecast for the Oldland Farm arm. This arm serves a private access road and employment use. Any queuing would take place within the site and not onto the public highway. The queues are significant but again are forecast to clear over the modelled period.

The conclusions from the additional modelling are accepted as demonstrating that the majority of the arms from the roundabout would work within capacity with the initial mitigation in the ALP TS 2016 and as based on the as proposed development at Salt Box Farm. The additional mitigation within the EBR Transport Review for the Felpham Relief Road Roundabout is acknowledged but it is accepted that the development as proposed would not unduly prejudice a future scheme that would enable the mitigation of Arun Local Plan traffic growth. It is also recognised that the Salt Box development will contribute financially towards a scheme of mitigation for the Felpham Relief Road Roundabout.

I would confirm that there would be no objection to the proposed development in its current format.

Michael, please take these as the further formal views of WSCC Highways.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

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

From: Tony Chapman [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 May 2019 12:00
To: Ian Gledhill
Cc: Arfon Hughes; Mr Will Marsh; Michael.Eastham [REDACTED]; Keith Sarchett; Lorna Randall
Subject: RE: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Ian

Further to my email yesterday I have checked the operation of the Felpham Relief Road roundabout in 2031 with the base flows you provided plus the current development with access to the site from a new arm with the mitigation measures suggested by Systra.

The results show that the roundabout will operate well during the morning peak period with a maximum RFC of 0.96 with a maximum queue of 18 pcus split over three lanes on the A29 South. The main arms of the roundabout work well in the PM peak with a maximum RFC of 0.95 with a queue of 12 pcus on the Felpham Relief Road. There is an issue on Oldlands Farm Access as traffic in the model is being blocked by southbound traffic on the A29 and left turning traffic from the A249.

Applying a flat profile shows that there would still be queuing on the Oldlands Farm access but the RFC is 1.07 with a queue of 38 pcus while the junction as a whole works fine.

The problem could be solved by further mitigation works to provide a dedicated left turn from Oldlands Farm on to the A29 southbound carriageway. The queuing on this arm of the roundabout is, in my opinion due the high volume

of traffic predicted on the A29 south and the A249 during the evening peak due to the expansion of the development proposed in the Local Plan and while the Salt Box development has agreed to contribute towards future capacity further mitigation would be unreasonable.

I trust that you can now advise Michael Eastham that the current application will not have a severe impact on the local highway network in the 2031 scenario taking into account the Arun Local Plan proposals and that the site access from the Felpham Relief Road is acceptable..

Regards Tony

Tony Chapman BSc, C.Eng, MICE, MCIHT, MCIWEM
Director
ADL Traffic and Highways Engineering Ltd
ADL House, The Oaklands Business Park
Armstrong Way, Yate, BS37 5NA.

From: Tony Chapman
Sent: 15 May 2019 17:05
To: 'Ian Gledhill' [redacted]
Cc: 'Arfon Hughes' [redacted]; Mr Will Marsh <[redacted]>
'Michael.Eastham' [redacted] Michael.Eastham [redacted]
Subject: RE: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Ian

I appreciate your position but as the consented scheme has been approved with access from the Felpham Road Roundabout then surely this is the baseline position as it was consented after the Arun Local Plan was adopted. I consider it to be unreasonable to change the agreed parameters at this late stage in the planning process. The traffic flows and the impact of the consented scheme on the local highway network including the proposed access arrangements were all agreed with West Sussex County Council and Arun District Council were advised accordingly.

The difference in traffic generation between the consented scheme and the current proposal is relatively small and hence the additional impact on the Felpham Road roundabout is also relatively small. The Systra report was produced to predict the impact of the Local Plan proposals on the highway network and in while we agreed to look at the development proposal, in the context of the study, has a relatively impact especially when the consented scheme is taken into account.

The 2031 base flows you provided in the spreadsheet seem much higher than were agreed in the original TA for the consented scheme and the subsequent Sensitivity Test and this seems to be the main issue with the modelling. There was a scheme showing the mitigation works to the roundabout to which the developer is contributing and the new arm on the roundabout doesn't prejudice these improvements.

Moving the access further north on the A29 isn't an option as it would effectively blight the approved development and the current proposal putting the investment in new jobs at risk.

I would be grateful if you can call me back when you have had a chance to consider the above.

Regards Tony

Tony Chapman BSc, C.Eng, MICE, MCIHT, MCIWEM
Director

[REDACTED]

From: Ian Gledhill [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 May 2019 16:01
To: Tony Chapman [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Hello Tony, thanks for this.

What I should perhaps have advised is why I'm asking for this information. As I'm sure you're aware and as I'm sure we've discussed, the 'Systra Enterprise Bognor Regis Transport Review 2017 Report' that supports the Arun Local Plan includes various highway mitigation measures. At the Felpham Relief Road Roundabout, one of these mitigation measures is the closure of the access arm into the Salt Box development. Clearly the development as proposed conflicts with this highway mitigation. I acknowledge the permitted scheme includes access although that was permitted prior to the Arun LP being adopted.

What needs to be established is whether the Salt Box development can proceed on the base of the scheme as shown (i.e. with access from the Felpham RR Roundabout). What I was hoping was that the additional modelling would provide a means of determining the capacity impact of the as proposed development that could then be compared to the results in the Systra Report. This is possible to a point but the model outputs are such that this lends further weight to the need for the mitigation in the Systra Report. I'm also being pushed by Arun DC for comments on this aspect and I'll have to advise them of the current position.

To move this forward, it would need to be quite clearly demonstrated that the development can come forward without prejudicing the Arun LP; quite specifically that the closure of the development access arm is not required. The alternative is that it is demonstrated that the access can be closed and alternate access achieved. I'm happy to agree what additional work might be required.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

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

From: Tony Chapman [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 May 2019 16:01
To: Ian Gledhill
Subject: RE: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Ian

I have run the 2031 Base + Development + Arun Local Plan using the base flows that you provided and the results for the am and pm peak periods using a One Hour profile show that the highway network will be above the theoretical design capacity.

In practice the likelihood is that peak spreading will occur with a flat profile as these junctions approach capacity.

Regards Tony

Tony Chapman BSc, C.Eng, MICE, MCIHT, MCIWEM
Director
ADL Traffic and Highways Engineering Ltd
ADL House, The Oaklands Business Park
Armstrong Way, Yate, BS37 5NA.

[REDACTED]

From: Ian Gledhill [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 April 2019 16:13
To: Tony Chapman [REDACTED]
Cc: Nia Russel [REDACTED]; Will Marsh [REDACTED]; Michael Eastham [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Hello Tony, sorry for the delay in coming back to you on this.

I've had another look at the flows used in the TA (2031 base). I'd ask for these flows to be reviewed as these don't appear to match the flow data provided to Amol as part of the previous application. To assist, I've attached the email that includes the 2031 flows taken from the Arun LP transport model and an explanation as to how these have been derived.

In summary though, tab 3/'Salt Box and Rowan Park Only' of the spreadsheet includes 2031 flows with all LP allocations (referenced as 'All Traffic'). The flows for Salt Box and the adjacent Rowan Park are then deducted from these to produce the LP flows but minus these developments. The flows within columns Q and V should be used as the 2031 base data and to create the without Salt Box development scenario. The actual proposed development traffic for the now proposed Salt Box development should then be added in to create the with development scenario.

I'd ask that the modelling is revised so as to use the flows in the spreadsheet and of course the TA. I'd ask also that a one hour/ODTAB profile is used in the Arcady. This should then allow a comparison between the outputs within the 2017 Systra EBR Review.

As ever happy to discuss.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

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

From: Tony Chapman [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 April 2019 13:28
To: Ian Gledhill

Cc: Nia Russell; Will Marsh
Subject: RE: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Hi Ian

The 2031 am and pm base flows were derived from the Arun District Local Plan Study that was prepared by Systra in 2017 and it is my understanding that the 2017 base flows included the committed developments in both the Arun and Chichester Local Plans.

Amol extracted the data from the Systra Study to use in the TA for the approved hybrid planning application and the 2031 base flows were then also used in the TA for the current application for the Aldi store and the car showroom.

I trust this answers your query.

Regards Tony

Tony Chapman BSc, C.Eng, MICE, MCIHT, MCIWEM
Director
ADL Traffic and Highways Engineering Ltd
ADL House, The Oaklands Business Park
Armstrong Way, Yate, BS37 5NA.

From: Ian Gledhill [redacted]
Sent: 16 April 2019 13:06
To: Tony Chapman [redacted]
Subject: Salt Box 2031 Traffic Assumptions

Hello Tony, a point has come up regarding the Salt Box development. Can I confirm what growth is counted within the weekday 2031 base modelling in the TA? Does this include traffic arising from the made Arun Local Plan? My understanding is that the base does, however this isn't categorically stated within the TA.

I look forward to your confirmation.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

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

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.

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.