

THE PLANNING ACT 2008

**M4 (JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12) (SMART MOTORWAY) DEVELOPMENT CONSENT
ORDER APPLICATION**

TR010019

**Response to Written Representation - London
Borough of Hillingdon**

Appendix A - Telephone Conference Minutes

Deadline VIII - 29 February 2016

M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway

Conference Call Minutes – London Borough of Hillingdon re Traffic Modelling for Statement of Common Grounds

10:00 AM, Monday, 15th February 2016

Document Reference: 514451-MUH-00-ZZ-MI-TR-400166

Attendees:

London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH): Mandip Malhotra(MM), Syed Shah (SS), Ian Thynne (IT), Bob Castelijn (BC), David Knowles (DK), James Rodger (JR), Sarah White (SW)

Highways England: Brian Weavin (BW), David Whittle (DW),

Apologies: None

Distribution

Attendees, Lynne Stinson, Chris Tooth and M4 Management team

Ref	Issue	Owner	Action By
1.0	Introductions and Background		
	The attendees from London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH) and Highways England (HE) provided their individual details and role relating to the scheme and apologies were given for Lynne Stinson.		
2.0	Overview of Current Position		
2.1	Traffic impacts on local roads		
	<p>DW commenced by summarising the information provided to LBH to assist and inform their deliberations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GIS-based plot of traffic flows for both with and without the M4 scheme • Detailed turning movement plots for M4 junction 3 and junction 4 • Detailed responses to LBH representations on the assessment of development proposals within the Borough. <p>DW advised that to assist LBH understand the forecast model flows on the local road network he has provided the interactive model of the primary local road network within the LBH area. This interactive model provides visibility of the traffic model flow changes for each time period on each of the LBH roads</p>		

	<p>within the model. This can be provided to LBH for use by LBH to independently interrogate the flow changes in each of the primary local routes to satisfy themselves of the traffic impact of the scheme and the proposed developments.</p>		
2.2	<p>SS summarised LBH concerns explaining that high growth is occurring in Hayes and therefore there was a need to consider development related growth in addition to background growth. LBH consider that sensitivity testing is required to assess the effects without traffic re-routeing, of induced traffic, redevelopment and a different mix of traffic.</p>		
2.3	<p>DW explained that Highways England’s assessments had been undertaken in full accordance with the requirements set out in TAG. As had been explained in the responses to LBH written representations submitted to the Examining Authority, account had been taken of the collective development proposals in LBH. Developments had been researched and some of the larger schemes such as the former Southall Gas Works and the former National Air Traffic Services sites had been incorporated by the inclusion of new traffic zones. Where not explicitly modelled the inclusion in the model had been undertaken through the application of growth factors to the respective zones in the traffic model.</p>		
2.4	<p>SS sought clarification on whether the level of trip generations allowed for in the model represented net or gross levels. SS explained that as some of the development sites were vacant prior to redevelopment, gross levels of additional traffic should be applied.</p> <p>DW undertook to check and provide clarification.</p>	HE	DW
3.0	Way Forward		
3.1	<p>SS summarised LBH position where a development project is considered, it is required to bring forward mitigation proposals. SS advised that the LBH approach is to require developers to treat NTEM growth as background growth and add the specific development growth together with other committed development on top and not to net the traffic forecast. The M4 scheme will result in changes on the local network and LBH are not persuaded that there is not an impact, therefore assessment is required to identify any mitigation.</p> <p>MM concluded that this was an area where the two parties</p>		

	would agree to disagree.		
3.2	BW explained that like LBH, HE was not a developer but a government owned strategic asset operator. This provided a long term relationship and an opportunity to work together to resolve future growth impacts which at present the traffic model was not forecasting.		
3.3	BW explained that DW has reviewed the traffic model loadings in each of the model areas containing major developments identified by LBH and confirmed that in all these areas the growth within the model exceeded the applicant's forecast traffic loadings as a consequence of the developments. In the case of some developments, the M4 traffic model has twice the number of forecast traffic journeys than the development would create, however the extra capacity being provided by the M4 Scheme, whilst in some cases relieving the local network could increase the traffic on some of the junction feeder roads. So BW explored how Highways England could assist LBH in this matter with a view to heading off the problem, perhaps in the form of verification surveys.		
3.4	MM queried whether this was the same approach as had been agreed with Buckinghamshire CC. BW confirmed this was the approach with BCC.		
3.5	BW suggested that in the light of the earlier discussion, LBH's concerns appeared to be focused on Stockley Road and Bulls Bridge roundabout. BW enquired as to whether LBH had recent survey data for these locations?		
3.6	SS advised that LBH did not have any suitable data however as TfL had an interest in Bulls Bridge roundabout, Dave Condon at TfL would be an appropriate point of contact that may be able to assist. DW undertook to make contact with TfL to establish what traffic data they had available.	HE	DW
3.7	DW advised that he had received an approach from WSP for M4 traffic forecasts in relation to their assessment of proposals for Stockley Park Phase 3. DW proposed that this could provide an opportunity for HE to work jointly with WSP on the traffic forecasts related to their respective overlapping interests. LBH agreed that this would be very helpful.		
3.8	DW stated that once agreement had been confirmed on prospective survey locations, Highways England would come forward with a draft survey specification for consultation with		

	LBH. DW then sought confirmation of LBH's key areas of interest.		
3.9	SS stated that development pressure was centred on Hayes and consideration needed to be given to the High Street through to Station Road and North Hyde Road. SS enquired how Highways England proposed to differentiate between the impacts arising from the M4 scheme and that from the other developments. SS suggested the need for some form of regular monitoring.		
3.10	BW enquired about the existing liaison arrangements between Highways England and the Boroughs, how that worked and whether liaison through the Area team was the best way to work together in the future. LBH explained that the stronger link at present was with TfL rather than Highways England.		
4.0	Conclusion		
4.1	MM sought confirmation on how the suggested way forward could be secured – via the DCO or the SoCG? It was concluded that the SoCG would appear to be the more appropriate. LBH and Highways England undertook to consult their respective legal teams.	LBH HE	MM BW
4.2	In the interim, it was agreed Highways England would prepare a draft proposal for inclusion in the SoCG.	HE	BW
5.0	Meeting end		