NOTE OF MEETING

PROJECT: Peel Hall, Warrington

DATE: 12th September 2016

HELD: AECOM, 6th Floor, No.1 New York Street, Manchester @ 14:00.

PRESENT:	Shaun Reynolds	Highways England
	Simon Clarke	Highways England
	Alistair Johnson	AECOM
	Catherine Zoeftig	AECOM
	Richard Flood	Warrington Borough Council
	Andrew Oates	Warrington Borough Council
	Gavin Coupe	Atkins
	Dave Tighe	Highgate Transportation
	Fiona Bennett	Highgate Transportation

DT opened the meeting and explained that the scope of the meeting was to review the VISSIM modelling, but that it would be also useful to discuss the emerging comments on the various technical notes that have been submitted since the spring and from the TA submitted in June 2016.

1. DT also explained that the base AM and PM (2015) VISSIM models would be issued to GC for audit. (GC said that as it is a large model, he would review upon arrival and provide an estimation of timescales for the audit.) It was agreed that GC and AJ were to converse directly over the VISSIM modelling, ensuring that all parties are kept abreast of changes moving forward.

2. CZ explained that we have a good base model that we are comfortable with and that reflects the existing situation on the network.

3. AJ explained that the network is as per that agreed with Warrington following the joint meeting on 19th January 2016.

4. AJ ran the base (2015) AM model, which he confirmed was converged to 100%, and explained the following:

    - Dynamic assignment was used, in which route choice is made within the VISSIM model whilst it is running, and not prescribed by the modeller.
    - The model has had to be coded to represent the aggressive driver behaviours observed on the busy Warrington network.
    - Multiple site visits were carried out, particularly to the signal junctions, to observe on-site timings, traffic build-up and driver behaviour.

- The original base matrices were taken from the 2008 Warrington Borough Council (WBC) VISUM model and calibrated by on-site survey data from 2014, 2015 and 2016 counts.
- The journey times/routes were previously agreed with WBC.
- HGVs were observed on the minor routes throughout the network.
- Base model outputs taken from 5 seeds (seeds 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25).
- AM modelling covers 0700-0930 and 1600-1830 (15 minute intervals).
- Weekday peaks modelled only.
- Very large and complex modelling network.
- Post meeting note: Two of the journey times did not validate (westbound movement on the A50 in the morning peak and southbound movement on the A49 in the afternoon peak period).

5. RF queried the validation of Sandy Lane West junction as on site experience is that queues build up and block back to the Cotswold Road roundabout. AJ explained that he undertook many site visits and that different runs will show slightly different variations, but that queueing back along Sandy Lane West does occur within the modelling; it builds up and dissipates at various times within the base model.

6. GC queried the behaviour of vehicles on the M62 network eastbound. AJ explained that the VISSIM model has been taken from the large HE VISSIM model of the motorway network and SR explained that the slowing traffic was likely due to the M6 merge slip eastbound at Junction 10/Croft Interchange.

7. AJ presented the base (2015) PM model, which also further demonstrated the rise and fall of traffic at the Sandy Lane West arm of its junction with the A49.

8. AJ explained that the AM 2019 scenarios are still not converged due to the level of committed development traffic and growthed traffic.

9. The PM 2019 Do Minimum model was run. GC commented that he noted queueing off the network i.e. at Birchwood (Oakwood Gate) and AJ confirmed that not all vehicles are able to filter through onto the network at this point. AJ also explained that the signal timings in the Do Something mirror those modelled in the Do Minimum. GC suggested lengthening of the links where queueing off the network occurs.

10. GC also raised the possibility that it may be that some of the development traffic and other traffic in the 2019 scenario is outside the model during the peak hours, queueing to get in. This and potential effects will be considered further following audit.

11. AJ then ran the PM 2019 Do Something model. He explained that the development traffic was represented by the small green vehicle markers and that it can be see that there are only a few development vehicles making up each junction queue, with the Sandy Lane West junction having a slightly higher percentage of development vehicles likely due to the proximity to the development as well as to the A49 and M62.

12. AJ explained that costs have been put into the base model on links to reflect current behaviour through residential roads. GC suggested that details of the costs need to be in the LMVR

13. The Cotswold Road link into Poplars Avenue is currently not modelled as a link, but has zones loading to and from the adjacent links and also enables development traffic to load onto it in either direction. AJ confirmed that this is as per the agreed scope. (AECOM modelling scope issued to WBC 1st April 2016 attached for reference). WBC raised concern over the routing of traffic in this location. It is agreed that this would be picked up in the audit process.

14. DT raised concerns over the following:

    - Currently we are not getting a feel for impact of the development on the network.
    - There is a lot of committed development traffic and background growth traffic on the network that is currently prohibiting the VISSIM model from operating in future years.
    - A dialogue needs to be started now to set out sensitivity tests going forward. AO set out that WBC would want to see modelling of phased impact of development over a series of years.

15. In terms of sensitivity testing, RF said that it would be ever so helpful if one of the scenarios to be addressed could be a through route for all traffic across the site, providing a link between the new roundabout on Blackbrook Avenue and Poplars Avenue in the vicinity of the proposed employment access and linking through along Poplars Avenue i.e. removing the existing closure. The existing A49 junction would be modified to include traffic signals. This is understood to be a key issue with Members and therefore if not tested RF will have difficulty persuading Members to accept the impact of the development on the immediate residential network. This will be addressed following the audit of the base model.

16. CZ proposed moving forward with the good base model (further to audit) and adding development traffic, then add growth incrementally.

17. A discussion was held over the OMEGA traffic flows and why it was not originally included within the VISSIM modelling as a committed development. In summary:

    - The OMEGA January TA showed only 0.2% of traffic coming off M62 at Junction 9 and travelling south.
    - The use of high motorway growth rates on all links within the model is considered to include any OMEGA traffic that would potentially flow through the network modelled, and the level of committed development trips added onto the network is very high in any event.
    - Committed developments were confirmed in WBC meeting of 8th March 2016 and previous correspondence with Michelle Zenner and Mike Davies from 9th and 10th February 2016.

18. Overall it was agreed that it would be prudent to review the acceptable growth rates to be used. CZ to provide latest OMEGA development traffic flows from the OMEGA VISSIM output files (i.e. the 0.2% to/from Winwick Road South as shown in the OMEGA January 2016 TA, or most recent figures if applicable) so that the OMEGA flows can be considered in more detail by all. The actual vehicle numbers generated by OMEGA to/from the M62 East would also be helpful (shown as 19.6% in the OMEGA January 2016 TA).

19. SR set out that there should be realistic levels of growth within the model and that the HE would be happy to look at discounting growth. GC asked to assist in process.

20. RF specified that any assumptions used in discounting growth would need to be justified.

21. SR advised that HE will look at sensitivity tests and it is understood that they would instruct Atkins to carry these out.

22. DT recalled the comments from the planning officer at the OMEGA committee meeting that it was not for the development to solve existing highway problems but to mitigate its own impact.

23. Trip rates were discussed, and the methodology adopted by HTp in setting out development trip rates was put forward. DT set out that the general approach was to follow the OMEGA process and parameters wherever possible/appropriate. HTp stated that overall they are putting comparably more trips on network than the OMEGA application did e.g. the difference in the actual number of trips assumed for the food store and local centre.

24. DT reiterated that the masterplan is illustrative. HTp will provide an example sketch of the proposed local centre car park layout (ref: 140367-D-003/C - attached). The Design and Access statement also shows the intention of a no-vehicular through route through the local centre car park on page 35 (Section 8 – Access). DT explained that the client would be happy to accept a condition to secure this.

25. It was discussed that the school is likely to be a single form entry, but HTp have modelled for a two-form entry to ensure robustness. DT explained that we are not getting a response from the education departments at WBC as to what level of primary school provision they need. It was agreed that DT would ask Satnam for the latest email correspondence with the education authority and provide this to RF so that RF can apply pressure to bottom-out the primary school provision on site and inform the trip rates and discounting process. (Post meeting note: Agreed between DT and RF 15/09/16)

26. AO stated that the discounting of trips associated with the school and local centre was a vital element that needed to be supported with evidence. It was agreed that this would be looked at by HTp in more detail as a sensitivity test.

27. Winwick B&Q was discussed. HTp set out that the previous agreement with WBC to not include it within the committed development assessment was based on a review of the application's TA, WBC highways response to that application and discussions with WBC held at the meeting on 8th March 2016. The evidence for this was also supplied in TN/10

on committed developments (attached). HTp to ensure all supporting text/technical notes contained with the October TA submission.

28. The bus gate design was discussed and it was agreed that cycle and NMU needs will be considered in the design. DT explained that it is an outline application. RF explained that as it will be adopted by the highways authority it needs to be agreed with them – WBC would be looking to use ANPR and therefore physical measures would be unlikely. RF to send through further thoughts on bus gate design. DT said happy to accept a condition to secure this.

29. HTp to send HE a hard copy of the June TA.

30. Going forward, hard copies of TA addendum to be issued as follows:

    - 1x HE (SR)
    - 2x WBC (RF)
    - 1x ATKINS (GC)

31. GC to email comments on gravity model to AJ copying in FB.

32. RF to supply WBC comments on the 14th October deadline for TA addendum in light of current modelling situation.

33. AO response to TA to be submitted to Mike Davies and likely sent out by end of this week.

34. Further to the meeting RF suggested that the OMEGA application was different in that the development traffic did not all filter through a constrained residential network; they had new infrastructure to tie-into within the OMEGA site. DT said that in principle the developments were very similar in terms of content, but as always the impact is specific to the sites specific location.

35. In terms of summarising the modelling strategy moving forward:

    - HE want 2019 (all development - to assess the proposals) and 2029 (all development for their own benefit in terms of forward programming). This is what was agreed at our January meeting. This will need an agreed constrained level of growth. Mitigation would only be based on 2019 modelling outputs.
    - WBC would like phased modelling to represent the phases of development build-out. This is to be agreed on moving forward.

36. Further points:

    - AO to provide refuse vehicle dimensions for tracking.
    - AO/RF to confirm the availability of Saturday traffic flow data.
    - RF to check if there are any further phases planned for the Birchwood pinch-point junction (Oakwood Gate). (Post meeting note: RF supplied details 15/09/16)