

RESPONSE TO WSP FORECASTING REPORT REVIEW

PROJECT: Peel Hall, Warrington

REVIEW DATE: 27 November 2017

REF.: APP/M0655/W/17/3178530

Land at Peel Hall, Warrington

Outline application for a new residential neighbourhood including C2 and C3 uses; local employment (B1 uses); local centre including food store up to 2,000m², A1-A5 (inclusive) and D1 use class units of up to 600m² total (with no single unit of more than 200m²) and family restaurant/pub of up to 800m² (A3/A4 use); site for primary school; open space including sports pitches with ancillary facilities; means of access and supporting infrastructure at Peel Hall, Warrington.

Future Year Highway Networks

1. Provide detail regarding the level of development represented by the three zones along the through route. The location of the trip loading point may have an influence on where it accesses onto the existing highway network.?

This will be provided for information. AECOM have split the loading points up into three sections over the through route.

2. Can confirmation be made that signal timings are consistent between Do Minimum and Do Something options and signal optimisation has not been applied?

Signal timing are not optimised in any of the future year scenarios and remain consistent between the Do Something and the Do Minimum.

Future Year Trip Matrix Development

Background Growth

3. What is the benefit for over predicting the background growth? If anything this may dilute the impact of the development trips?

This is as per previous agreements from 2016, and was reduced twice; once in terms of committed developments and once in terms of updated NTEM data.

4. The forecasting methodology, specifically the use of the NTM function, is not normally applied when forecasting from a strategic model. Typically TEMPRO OD factors for each trip type would be used for the fully observed trips and NTM for trips that have an origin or destination in the external area.

Data used as per previously agreed strategy.

5. TEMPRO and NTM will only provide growth factors for cars. How has LGV and HGV growth been defined?

Scope agreed early 2016.

6. Are these developments small enough to exclude from explicit modelling?

This is as per agreement with WBC and HE, and set out in HTP/TN/07/Addendum.

7. Comparison of the number of jobs each site will create and the growth predicted by TEMPRO for the relevant MSOA should be provided. Then a decision should be made on whether they are accounted for within TEMPRO.

Previous methodology agreed.

8. Neither of these sites are in Warrington 006. The current forecasting methodology will not model any changes in trip patterns brought about by these developments.

Previous methodology agreed.

Trip Generation

9. The re-distribution of the traffic may change the turning proportions at the junction which may affect the operation of Poplars Avenue. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate no impact due to pass-by trips. Are these pass by trips modelled in the SATURN model?

Pass-by as per previous agreed strategy.

Our stand alone site access modelling to account for impact of pass-by trips.

Awaiting confirmation from AECOM regarding pass-by trips in SATURN model.

10. The 30% by-pass trip rate has been derived by assuming the same trip reduction as the Omega development. Can a justification for the 30% reduction be provided based on current best practice? 'TRICS Research Report 14/1: Pass-By & Diverted Trips Report' states that a standard trip rate reduction for pass-by and converted trips is no longer considered applicable and that a first principles approach should be undertaken. No evidence has been provided to suggest this is the case.

As per agreed strategy dating from 2016.

11. No account for has been provided for transferred or diverted trips. For example traffic may divert from the A49 which may impact upon the operation of the local network. Can more information be provided to explain why these trip types have not been included in the analysis?

Approach already agreed.

12. Technical Note HTP/1107/TN/13 which is the applicant's response to the HE contradicts this and states that 30% of trips will be pass-by (Table 6-1). More information should be provided to explain the inconsistencies between the

discounting rates between the applicant's response to the HE and Technical Note HTP/1107/TN/19.

HTp/TN/13 dated July 2016 was superseded by responding to WBC December 2016 consultation comments on trip discounting.

13. More information should be provided on the rationale for the 50% value as there appears to be no evidence submitted to substantiate this proportion.

Response in HTP/TN/13.

14. Are trips from the 330 dwellings accessed via Poplars Avenue to the west of the site included in the internalisation discount? Access to the primary school from these 330 dwellings will be restricted due to the proposed bus gate and the vehicle trips will have to travel on the local highway network to access the school. Has this been accounted for in the modelling?

The local centre car park can be reached from both the Poplars Avenue central access junction and the Birchwood Avenue/Mill Lane main site access junction. It was agreed with highway officers at WBC in March 2016 meeting that this was acceptable.

15. Table 4.3 represents undiscounted trips from 2030 scenario without through route. The discounted trips should be shown as this is the number of trips that are loaded onto the network. The correct tables are Table 5.2 (HTp/1107/TN/19, without through route) and Table 3.10 (HTp/1107/TN/21, with through route).

AECOM to check and update the report.

16. At this stage of the report, it would be beneficial to present some matrix totals. This would show base year and forecast years with and without developments.

This can be provided going forward.

Trip Distribution

17. Can the trips groupings be defined? Are they:
- a. Residential – all trips to/from a residential property (including commuting)
 - b. Employment – employers business trips (non-home based only?)
 - c. Other – other trips (non-home based only?)

This is confirmed; the trips have been split out in SATURN to provide an improved response to routing within the model.

18. Do the parent zones provide a realistic distribution? Looking at Fig 4 (AM from PH), Fig 8 (AM to PH), Fig 12 (PM from PH) and Fig 16 (PM to PH) it can be seen that roughly 20% of the trips stay within Hulme and Orford (original model zones 67, 69, 70 and 152).

The distribution was carried through from the WS VISUM model, into the VISSIM and subsequently the SATURN model. Zone locations from the VISSIM model remain in the same locations, but where required have been disaggregated.

19. Census JTW information for Warrington 006 and 007 (included in Appendix A) shows largest proportions are to Warrington town centre, Birchwood and Woolston Grange industrial park? The AM Residential from PH and PM Employment to PH distribution plots should reflect this.

The approach and gravity model has already been agreed back in 2016; however consideration can be given to updating this and providing a sensitivity test in a future run of the SATURN model.

20. Zone 405 (land north of M62 bounded by Winwick Link) shows trips in Fig 13 Residential trips to Peel Hall. Is this correct? There are no development trips at any other time period or trip type.

Trip distribution Taken from the gravity model.

21. The distributions are taken from the multi modal model with full zone structure. Has any change in routing for forecast Do Minimum scenarios been taken in to account? There are quite a number of routes to Warrington town centre, the distribution may change, e.g. increase of traffic on A49 transferring trips to A50.

No change in routing for forecast Do Minimum scenarios has been taken into account.

22. Can the convergence statistics be provided, in line with DfT WebTAG Unit M3.1 Table 4.

Yes, this will be provided by AECOM and we will forward once received.

23. Provide explanation for omission of M62 journey route from analysis.

An explanation will be provide by AECOM.

24. Analysis of the residential access roads, e.g. Poplars Avenue, would have been useful especially with regard to through route analysis.

This can be provided going forward.

25. Can a narrative be provided to explain why the journey times are changing, e.g. is it link capacity, green times, opposing turning movements etc. How are the development trips and their distribution impacting on journey times?

AECOM to review.

26. The through route decreases journey time NB on A49, this seems counter intuitive as a new signalised junction will add delay. Can this be explained?

AECOM to check.

Impacts on Delay

27. As with the journey times section, can a narrative be provided explaining the increases and how development trips influence changes in link delay? The same junctions are mentioned for each scenario yet there are other links with increases in delay greater than 40 seconds that are not discussed.

AECOM to review.

28. The total delay plots provided for the through route assessment reveal very large delays entering the model at Oakwood Gate (AM and PM), Birchwood Way (PM) and M62 J9 EB off slip (PM). This could have an effect on model stability and result in trips not being able to enter the network. The calibration and coding in these areas should be reviewed.

AECOM recognise the junction was forecast to experience large queues within the VISSIM model also, which were confirmed by observations made during site visits. As the traffic flows increase in the forecast years, the queues increase.

We consider the model is more than adequate to assess the development impact.

Are further details available in relation to the WBC pinch-point scheme that was recently awarded funding, in order to assist with coding into a future SATURN run?

29. The total delay in the PM models is about 50% higher than the AM models. Is this solely due to the delay identified above at Oakwood Gate / Birchwood Way junction. It would be expected that the models carry similar amounts of delay.

AECOM to clarify.

30. The introduction of the through route increases delay in the AM model but reduces delay in the PM when compared to the Do Something models without the link road. Can a narrative be provided to explain this?

AECOM to review.

Queuing

31. As with journey times and delay can an explanatory narrative be provided?

AECOM to review.

32. The through route total queue length plots show large queues (greater than 100 pcus) in the PM on the approaches to Oakwood Gate roundabout, M6 J9 EB off slip and A49 NB approach to Long Lane junction? Are these realistic? Is all traffic getting through the network? Total queue length plots would be useful for Do Minimum and Do Something without through route.

AECOM to review.

Assessment of Impact of Volume over Capacity

33. Again can a narrative be provided?

AECOM to review.

34. What is the capacity of each link? Is it appropriate for the link type? No flows have been provided so cannot infer what increase in 13% V/C on Poplars Avenue means for flow.

AECOM to provide flows.

35. Large V/C occur M62 WB after J9 merge, M62 J9 EB off slip, and the approaches to Oakwood Gate roundabout. Coding should be checked in these areas.

AECOM to review coding.

36. The difference plots are difficult to read with many labels overlapping especially around multi-node junctions. Can there appearance be improved? Also all plots are labelled Volume of Capacity, should be Volume over Capacity.

This will be taken into account going forward.

Other

37. It would be beneficial to see some flow plots, both total and difference. Also select link analysis plots to show the routing to and from the developments, and also to identify the non-development traffic using the through route.

AECOM to provide.