



West Midlands
Interchange

Four Ashes Ltd

The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order 201X

Statement of Common Ground between Four Ashes Ltd and Highways England

Transport Methodology and Strategy

4 April 2019

Revision	Date	Author
First draft	3/8/17	Neil Findlay
Revision 1	6/11/17	Neil Findlay / Laura Bazley
Revision 2	19/3/18	Ian Fielding
Revision 3 (HE)	20/03/18	Lee White / Neil Hansen
Revision 4 (HE)	21/03/18	Neil Hansen
Revision 5 (WSP)	30/03/18	Ian Fielding
Revision 6 (WSP)	20/06/18	Ian Fielding
Revision 7	24/07/18	Ian Fielding
Revision 8	13/11/2018	Laura Bazley
Revision 9 (draft)	04/02/2019	Lee White
Revision 10 (draft)	27/2/2019	Ian Fielding
Revision 11 (draft)	27/03/2019	Lee White
Revision 12 (draft)	01/04/2019	Ian Fielding

Revision 13 (draft)	04/04/2019	Derek Jones
Revision 14 (Final)	04/04/2019	Ian Fielding

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Parties and Scope of Statement.....	4
1.2 Development Proposals.....	4
2. RELEVANT DOCUMENTS.....	6
2.2 Transport Assessment (TA).....	6
2.3 Transport Strategies.....	8
3. AREAS OF AGREEMENT ON TRANSPORT METHODOLOGY.....	10
3.1 WMI Traffic Characteristics.....	10
3.2 Transport Assessment Methodology.....	10
4. AREAS OF AGREEMENT ON TRANSPORT STRATEGY	13
Matters Agreed	13
4.1 Highway Strategy and Mitigation	13
Matters Yet to be Agreed.....	15
4.2 Protective Provisions	15
5. AREAS OF AGREEMENT ON HIGHWAY IMPACT	16
Matters Agreed	16
5.2 Departures from Standard.....	17
5.3 Environmental Statement.....	19
5.4 Road Safety Audits.....	19
Matters Yet To Be Agreed.....	19
5.5 Environmental Statement.....	19
5.6 Road Safety Stage 1 Audit.....	20
5.7 Deemed Consent.....	20

5.8	Highway Drainage	20
5.9	Site Wide HGV Management Plan (ES Appendix 15.1 / App 138)	21
5.10	Demolition and Construction Traffic Management Plan (ES Appendix 15.1 / App 143)	21
5.11	Site Wide Travel Plan (ES Appendix 15.1 / App 137)	21

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Parties and Scope of Statement

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) summarises the agreement reached between WSP on behalf of Four Ashes Ltd (FAL) and Highways England (HE) on the methodology for assessing the transport impact of WMI, the associated transport strategies and transport management plans.
- 1.1.2 HE has been consulted alongside Staffordshire County Council (SCC) and Wolverhampton City Council. This has included regular meetings from April 2016 with HE and SCC which has kept the authorities apprised of progress. It has also allowed agreement to be reached in respect of a number of technical aspects relating to the transport implications of the Proposed Development.
- 1.1.3 Where areas of agreement have been reached with HE, this is documented. Where matters have yet to be agreed, these will be the subject of further discussions with HE.

1.2 Development Proposals

- 1.2.1 FAL has made an application to the Secretary of State ('SoS') via the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') for a DCO under the Planning Act 2008 for the development of a new strategic rail freight interchange ('SRFI'), to be known as West Midlands Interchange ('WMI').
- 1.2.2 The Proposed Development comprises:
- An intermodal rail freight terminal with connections to the West Coast Main Line, capable of accommodating up to 10 trains per day and trains of up to 775m long and including container storage, HGV parking, rail control building and staff facilities;
 - Up to 743,200 square metres of rail served warehousing and ancillary service buildings;

- New road infrastructure and works to the existing road infrastructure;
- Demolition of existing structures and structural earthworks to create development plots and landscape zones;
- Reconfiguring and burying of electricity pylons and cables; and
- Strategic landscaping and open space, including alterations to public rights of way and the creation of new ecological enhancement areas and publicly accessible open areas.

1.2.3 The SRFI will operate 24 hours a day 7 days a week. Vehicle movements to the development site will be a mix of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs), light goods vehicles, employee vehicles and visitors.

2. RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

2.1.1 In assessing the transport implication of the development a number of documents have been produced. These are core documents for the transport case and referred to within this SoCG. A list of these documents is set out below and as further documents are agreed the list will be updated. Details of matters agreed and those yet to be agreed are provided. Work is taking place with HE in order to endeavour to agree those matters yet to be agreed post DCO submission.

2.2 Transport Assessment (TA)

2.2.1 A draft TA dated July 2017 was produced for the Stage 2 Consultation, which was shared by FAL with HE and SCC. Since the Stage 2 Consultation, WSP have continued to engage with both HE and SCC. This has resulted in further information being submitted by FAL to HE and SCC including a revised TA as submitted with the application (Document 6.2 Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1 App-114).

2.2.2 The methodology used in the TA for the derivation of traffic data and to form the transport strategy serving the site is contained in the following technical notes (TN) and supporting documents. These documents formed the basis of the Transport material that accompanied the DCO submission in August 2018:

- WSP TN 5: HGV and Non HGV Trip Generation (20/10/17);
- WSP TN 14: Trip Distribution (23/05/17)
- E-mails: Committed developments to be included in transport models (08/11/16 and 23/11/16);
- Systra TN 001: Base Year 2015/16 Local Model Validation (23/02/17);
- WSP TN 19: Sustainable Transport Strategy (7/5/18);

- Framework Workplace Travel Plan (18/7/18);
- Framework HGV Management Plan (18/7/18).
- Demolition and construction traffic management plan (4/6/18)
- Systra TN - West Midlands Interchange Modelling - Assessment Results (02/10/17);
- Systra TN - West Midlands Interchange Modelling - Assessment Results – Test B Addendum (02/10/17);
- Systra TN West Midlands Interchange: VISSIM Modelling Review (10/10/17);
- WSP TN25: A449 Laybys Revision A (June 2018);
- WSP TN 28: Trip Rates for Phase 1 Assessment (6/10/17);
- WSP TN 29: 2036 Junction Assessments (12/10/17);
- WSP TN 31: Shift Change Junction Assessments (8/12/17); and
- WSP TN33: Pre A449/A5 Link Road Assessment (13/12/17).

2.2.3 Since the DCO submission, further work has been undertaken in respect of the content of the Site Wide Workplace Travel Plan (Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1, App-137), Site Wide HGV Management Plan (Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1, App-138) and Demolition and Construction Traffic Management Plan (Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1, App-143), largely to deal with comments received by SCC.

2.2.4 In addition, two further documents have been produced and circulated to HE in order to identify matters relating to discussions concerning the Stage 1 Road Safety Audits, these being: -

- WSP TN 39: A449 & Gravelly Way pedestrian / Cycle Crossings (5/2/19)
- WSP TN 40: Accidents between Gailey Roundabout and Vicarage Road

2.3 Transport Strategies

2.3.1 The highway access strategy and mitigation is described in the TA and the works are shown on the following general arrangement drawings, which may be subject to change through the Road Safety Audit processes that is being completed. This may involve some changes to the Highway General Arrangement drawings (Documents 2.9 A-K/App-210-221), which will be submitted during the Examination.

2.3.2 The highway access strategy and mitigation is described in the TA and the works are shown on the following general arrangement drawings, which may be subject to change through the Road Safety Audit processes being conducted (to be submitted during the Examination); such changes will be subject to agreement by HE as the network operator: -

- 70001979-GA-100 Rev I (Document 2.9/App-210)
- 70001979-GA-101 Rev E (Document 2.9A/App-211)
- 70001979-GA-102 Rev E (Document 2.9B/App-212)
- 70001979-GA-103 Rev F (Document 2.9C/App-213)
- 70001979-GA-104 Rev K (Document 2.9D/App-214)
- 70001979-GA-105 Rev E (Document 2.9E/App-215)
- 70001979-GA-106 Rev F (Document 2.9F/App-216)
- 70001979-GA-107 Rev G (Document 2.9G/App-217)

- 70001979-GA-108 Rev F (Document 2.9H/App-218)
- 70001979-GA-109 Rev F (Document 2.9I/App-219)
- 70001979-GA-110 Rev G (Document 2.9J/App-220)
- 70001979-GA-111 Rev F (Document 2.9K/App-221)

2.3.3 Stage 1 Road Safety Audits have been commissioned by WSP in accordance with DMRB standards. The Designers Responses to the Stage 1 Road Safety Audits are currently the subject of discussion between WSP, HE and their Consultants.

3. AREAS OF AGREEMENT ON TRANSPORT METHODOLOGY

3.1 WMI Traffic Characteristics

- 3.1.1 The existing SRFI at Daventry (DIRFT Phases 1 & 2) provides the most comparable SRFI site to estimate traffic generation for this SRFI. The details of the traffic generation are contained in WSP TN5. TN5 also sets out the travel mode share for the employees based on local census data.
- 3.1.2 The distribution of light vehicle trips was based on a gravity model of time and population and the likely employment demographics in the area estimated by Quod, who are the planning advisors acting for the applicant. For HGVs, the distribution was based on DfT freight statistics. The distribution is set out in WSP TN14.

3.2 Transport Assessment Methodology

- 3.2.1 There are two Highways England traffic models which cover the area of WMI, a Saturn strategic traffic model and a more local VISSIM micro-simulation traffic model. These have been updated, amended and agreed for the use of WMI.
- 3.2.2 In the preparation of the models for WMI there were two key parameters to be addressed, namely the assessment years and ensuring that all known committed developments are included.
- 3.2.3 For the purpose of modelling it is programmed that WMI will first open in 2021, although it is acknowledged that it could take up to 15 years to be fully occupied. In these circumstances it was agreed that an assessment of WMI fully occupied in 2021 would be needed to comply with DfT Circular 02/2013 "The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development".
- 3.2.4 An assessment for full occupation in 2036 was also requested by HE but it would need to include the proposed M54/M6 Link Road scheme, as it is anticipated that the M54/M6 Link Road will be provided by 2024. Due to

delays in the M54/M6 Link Road programme, the details of this scheme were not available during the pre-application stage of the WMI DCO application. In these circumstances it was agreed that a fully modelled 2036 scenario was not possible and could not be undertaken. However, a 15 year assessment for the construction of new junctions on the trunk road was agreed as appropriate with HE and these have been undertaken on the basis of applying DfT Tempro forecasts to the 2021 flows and undertaking local junction assessments.

- 3.2.5 Since the submission of the DCO, a preferred route for the M54/M6 Link Road has been announced. The premise of the scheme is that it will reduce traffic flows on the A449 and A5. However to date, the precise detail of the scheme to a level of detail that would allow traffic modelling of the WMI mitigation proposals is not available. This prevents analysis of the forecast traffic changes arising from the M54/M6 Link Road from being obtained. As such, no detailed modelling of the effect of the M54/M6 Link Road scheme on the WMI development can be undertaken.
- 3.2.6 WSP, on behalf of FAL, and HE have liaised on the necessary amendments to the HE models and agreement has been reached on the 2021 results as presented in the Systra Technical Notes dated 2 October 2017 and 10 October 2017.
- 3.2.7 Committed developments in 2021 have been accounted for by consultations with SCC, South Staffordshire District Council, Cannock Chase District Council and other relevant local authorities, cross checking sites already in the relevant transport models and amending as necessary. The emails dated 8 and 23 November 2016 confirmed the necessary committed developments to be included in the transport models and are provided at Appendix A.
- 3.2.8 For 2036 the methodology for assessing the two trunk road access junctions have been accepted by HE, as confirmed by e-mail correspondence with WSP dated 27 November 2017 and provided at Appendix B.
- 3.2.9 It is agreed that no policy requirements exists for the impact of any closures on the M6 in the vicinity of J12 to be assessed.



- 3.2.10** It is agreed that the level and timings of events at Weston Park do not require further analysis or sensitivity testing given that they largely take place outside of peak travel times at weekends. Any events at Weston Park of sufficient scale to require traffic management on the SRN is subject to a bespoke event traffic management plan.

4. AREAS OF AGREEMENT ON TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Matters Agreed

4.1 Highway Strategy and Mitigation

4.1.1 The highway strategy around the Site, shown in the general arrangement drawings, has been agreed in principle subject to completion of the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit process and includes (but not exclusively) the following measures:

- a new roundabout on the A5 to access the site;
- a new roundabout on the A449 at Gravelly Way to access the site;
- a new public highway within the site linking the A5 and A449 roundabouts;
- altering Crateford Lane at the new A449 roundabout to one way eastbound;
- implementing a right turn ban at the existing A449/Station Drive traffic signal junction for all A449 northbound traffic;
- a new roundabout on Vicarage Road to access the site;
- relocation of two laybys from the A5 to A449;
- amendment to south bound bus bay on A449;
- relocation of north bound A449 bus bay to the south of junction with Gravelly Way;

- an enhanced footway/cycleway on the north side of the A5 from the site access roundabout to the roundabout of the A5 and A449 (Gailey roundabout);
- an enhanced footway/cycleway on the east side of the A449 from the roundabout of the A5 and A449 (Gailey roundabout) to the junction with Station Drive; and
- a new footway/cycleway on Vicarage Road to the new site access roundabout.

4.1.2 The areas of land to be adopted as public highway in order to accommodate the highway revisions recorded in paragraph 4.1.1 are shown on Document 2.10A - C/App-223-225) "Future Highway Maintenance Plan".

4.1.3 Following the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, it has been agreed that a traffic signal controlled crossing to serve pedestrians and cyclists will need to be provided for the southern arm of the proposed A449 roundabout. The exact form that this facility will take is the subject of ongoing discussions between WSP, HE and their Consultants. This will involve some amendments to the Highway General Arrangement drawings (Documents 2.9A-K/App-211-221) that will be submitted during the Examination.

4.1.4 Work is ongoing in respect of the form of crossing that should be provided across the A449/A5 link road (Gravelly Way) arm of the junction. This may in due course require revision of the Highway General Arrangement drawings (Documents 2.9A-K/App-211-221) and the Future Highway Maintenance Plans (Documents 2.10A-C/App-223-225) "", which if necessary, will be submitted during the Examination.

4.1.5 The approval in principle of the above mitigation scheme is on the basis that the modelled impacts on the Strategic Road Network are severe and require mitigation. The traffic modelling used to assist in the development of the Strategic Road Network mitigation proposals has been based on the quantum and type of development quoted in the DCO. In particular it is agreed that the mitigation proposals are based on the totality of the development set out in para 1.2.2, above and should the type and quantum



of development change a reassessment of the mitigation will be necessary.

- 4.1.6 The design principles in the general arrangement drawings have been agreed subject to completion of Stage 1 Road Safety Audits and a Designers Response and final approval of the RSA1 from HE as the network operator.
- 4.1.7 In accordance with Circular 02/2013, paragraph 39, it is agreed that WMI does not constitute "planned" development as it is not an allocated site within the Development Plan. Therefore as set out in paragraph 40 of Circular 02/2013, it is agreed that it is not possible to provide either a new junction with the motorway network or a direct access in order to serve WMI. Therefore, it is agreed that access to the Motorway network must be via existing junctions with all-purpose trunk roads, in this case M6 Junction 12 via the A5 and M54 Junction 2 via the A449. It is also agreed that it is not in engineering terms, possible to deliver a new junction with the motorway network due to insufficient space being available between M6 Junction 11 and 12.

Matters Yet to be Agreed

4.2 Protective Provisions

- 4.2.1 The wording on the Protective Provisions is still in discussion and as yet not agreed.

5. AREAS OF AGREEMENT ON HIGHWAY IMPACT

Matters Agreed

- 5.1.1 Systra Technical Note West Midlands Interchange: VISSIM Modelling Review, dated 10 October 2017 includes a conclusion and agreement on the highway impact in 2021 with the development.
- 5.1.2 The results of the 2036 junction assessments are agreed and documented in TN29.
- 5.1.3 It has been agreed that the impact of the Proposed Development can be accommodated at M6 Junction 12 in capacity terms. Accordingly, in capacity terms, no amendments are necessary to the existing merge and diverge lanes to / from the mainline M6 at M6 Junction 12. This is subject to the findings of the RSA Stage 1.
- 5.1.4 It is also agreed that it is not practical from a highway operational perspective to provide a dedicated junction with the M6 in order to serve the Proposed Development.
- 5.1.5 Assessments have been carried out to assess the impact of the shift change period for the two midday periods (1300 to 1400 and 1400 to 1500 hours) on the internal link, including the risk of traffic queuing back onto the A449. These are documented in TN31, and the conclusions set out therein have been agreed.
- 5.1.6 The implications of the assessment of highway conditions at 2021 relating to the position pre-opening of the A449 / A5 Link Road and quantum of operational floor space that could be developed prior to the link road opening, as set out in TN33, have been agreed by HE, as confirmed by way of the e-mail dated 21 March 2018.
- 5.1.7 It has been agreed that the A5 / A449 Link Road must be constructed and available for use by no later than 5 years after the occupation of more than 46,000 sqm (0.5m sq ft) floor space or prior to the occupation of more than

186,000 sqm (2m sq ft) of the rail served warehousing, whichever is sooner.

5.1.8 It is agreed that the proposed relocation of the A5 laybys can be provided on the basis of the position set out in TN25: A449 Laybys Revision A (June 2018), as confirmed by the e-mail received from HE dated 16 July 2018. The requirements of the departure from standard No ID 81075 must be adhered to.

5.1.9 It is agreed that the A449 / Gravelly Way / Crateford Lane Roundabout must be open and operational before the right turn ban from the A449 into Station Road can be implemented.

5.2 Departures from Standard

5.2.1 Departures from DMRB standards identified at the proposed relocated bus stop on the A449, the proposed A449 laybys and the proposed A5 roundabout have been submitted to and reviewed by the relevant HE department. Confirmation has been received that these Departures from DMRB standards in respect of geometric design only are acceptable. Details of the specific Departures from Design Standard that have been approved and conditions applied are set out below in Table 1: -



Table 1: Obtained Departures from Design Standard

Approved Departure Reference	Nature of Departure	Conditions Applied	Date Approved
81075	Separation of proposed A449 rest laybys from upstream junction (Gailey Roundabout)	No specific mitigation required, other than careful consideration of signage	08/01/19
81076	Separation of proposed A449 bus laybys from upstream junction (proposed A449 roundabout)	None applied	17/09/18
81077	Exit visibility for westbound traffic from proposed A5 roundabout	Provision of street lighting from proposed A5 roundabout up to and beyond Gailey marina access and adjacent residential property	17/09/18
82663	Visibility for traffic exiting Gaily Marina and adjacent residential property to the east	Provision of street lighting from proposed A5 roundabout up to and beyond Gailey marina access and adjacent residential property	17/09/18

- 5.2.2 It is further agreed that the detailed design process in respect of the vertical profiles of the highway works may require further Departures from Standard to be secured. However, work is ongoing in order to identify whether these will be necessary.

5.3 Environmental Statement

- 5.3.1 Highways England holds certain statutory environmental responsibilities for the strategic road network. As recorded in section 5.5 below, the Environmental Statement is not agreed.

5.4 Road Safety Audits

- 5.4.1 The RSA1 has been commissioned and completed by WSP. The safety audit brief, audit extent and audit content has been agreed with Highways England as network operator and project sponsor. As recorded below the RSA1 is not agreed.

Matters Yet To Be Agreed

- 5.4.2 Provided below are details of those items yet to be agreed by Highways England.

5.5 Environmental Statement

- 5.5.1 The Environmental Statement is subject to review by Highways England in accordance with paragraphs 45 to 48 of DfT Circular 02/2013 "The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development". Highways England have raised fundamental concern in regard to Chapter 16 "Drainage" (Environmental Statement 6.2/App-055) where Highways England does not agree that the proposed drainage strategy complies with the requirements of DfT Circular 02/2013.

- 5.5.2 Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Environmental Statement 6.2/App-046) in regard to Noise and Vibration Impacts has also recently been reviewed by Highways England to which it can be concluded that the

assessment illustrates there is significant residual impact on properties adjacent to the A5 as a result of development traffic on Highways England's network. With reference to DfT Circular 02/2013 para. 45, as explained in Highways England's document entitled "Planning for the Future – A Guide to Working with Highways England on Planning Matters" para. 48 and 49, Highways England expects to see measures implemented that fully mitigate any and all environmental impacts arising from and relating to the interaction between developments and the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Consequently, Highways England raises a policy compliance objection at this time and these matters are not agreed.

5.5.3 These matters will be subject to further discussions between the applicant and Highways England.

5.6 Road Safety Stage 1 Audit

5.6.1 Although the safety audit brief, extent and content has been agreed with Highways England as network operator and project sponsor, discussions regarding the designer's responses are ongoing.

5.7 Deemed Consent

5.7.1 Highways England and FAL do not agree the question of whether 'deemed consent' for the SRN highways works is acceptable.

5.7.2 Highways England has made representations on the safety implications of deemed consent.

5.8 Highway Drainage

5.8.1 HE still require evidence that the site drainage system will not interface with the SRN highway drainage system. Highways England do not agree that the requirements of DfT Circular 02/2013 have been satisfied. Discussions are ongoing to allow a resolution on this matter.

5.8.2 It is anticipated that a separate Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and HE may need to be prepared dealing with drainage matters.

5.9 Site Wide HGV Management Plan (ES Appendix 15.1 / App 138)

5.9.1 There are still outstanding amendments to this document that Highways England are seeking. The amendments required are relatively minor and are in the process of being accommodated.

5.10 Demolition and Construction Traffic Management Plan (ES Appendix 15.1 / App 143)

5.10.1 There are still outstanding amendments to this document that Highways England are seeking. The amendments required are relatively minor and are in the process of being accommodated.

5.11 Site Wide Travel Plan (ES Appendix 15.1 / App 137)

5.11.1 There are still outstanding amendments to this document that Highways England are seeking. The amendments required are relatively minor and are in the process of being accommodated.

Appendix A

Fielding, Ian

From: Fielding, Ian
Sent: 08 November 2016 14:05
To: 'Derek Jones'
Cc: Neil.Hansen@highwaysengland.co.uk; Lee White; Findlay, Neil; Bazley, Laura
Subject: WMI - Committed Development
Attachments: Growth Factors comparison.xlsx; B2 Trip Rate.pdf; B8 Trip Rate.pdf; WMI Committed Development Including Buffer Update Figure 2.pdf; 161104 committed development peak period traffic WMI.pdf

Derek

Thanks for your time on the phone on 20 October following the issue of your Technical Note dated 17 October dealing with Committed Development. Apologies for the delayed response but there has been some debate with South Staffs as to the approach to committed development which has now been resolved.

As discussed, I thought it would be useful if I provided a response setting out the agreed approach following your comments. Using the number setting out within your Note of 17 October 2016

Paragraph 6 – you suggested that an overall matrix check of the SATURN model could be undertaken. We will discuss with Atkins whether this is possible.

However we provide by way of the attached, a comparison of the Tempro growth rates assuming Tempro 6.2 and 7 between the years 2012 – 2021 and 2036 for the following

- West Midlands
- Staffordshire
- South Staffordshire
- Walsall
- Wolverhampton

This comparison shows that generally, traffic growth using Tempro 7 generally shows a decrease to values provided by Tempro 6.2. Any increases shown by Tempro 7 are not shown to result in material change to Tempro 6.2. Therefore generally the use of Tempro 6.2 within the model would remain valid in our judgement.

Paragraph 7, 1st bullet point – we note your requirement that any application that benefits from a current consent should be included in the 2021 analysis. Any Local Plan Allocations not currently included within the Saturn modelling would need to be added to the 2036 analysis.

Paragraph 7 2nd bullet point – we note that specific trips from sites 3 and 4 of the committed development schedule could be included if decisions are made within the relevant timeframe.

Para 7 4th bullet point – we will add all developments to the schedule if not already included within the SATURN model. In respect of those sites benefiting from a consent, you require these to be added in as specific sites within the SATURN model with trips obtained wherever possible from the relevant Transport Assessments. In respect of the South Staffs Allocated sites included within Codsall, you require that these are included within the SATURN model as specific sites for the 2036 assessment. Trips could be based upon the TA's from the already approved site at Watery Lane if available. Having reviewed this, it would appear that site allocations only amount to up to 70 dwellings as the Watery Lane site already benefits from a consent for 180 dwellings. We would therefore suggest that it is more expedient & accurate to rely upon Tempro for the remaining site allocations with the Codsall allocations

Sites within Wolverhampton would be dealt with by way of TEMPRO growth, but specifically referred to within the overall schedule.

In addition to your Note, we discussed that Atkins require details of trips in order to allow them to deal with ROF Featherstone at 2036. This site has an allocation for 36 hectares of B1/B2/B8 floor space with a preferred new access route from the south. We discussed that of this 36 hectares, it could be assumed that there would be some 40% development coverage which would equate to development floor area of 144,000 sqm. Having taken commercial advice, we understand that there is no demand for B1 office floor space at the site and the anticipated split of floor area would be 70% B8 and 30% B2 . We would provide trip generation using TRICS data to reflect this and this is attached.

We have identified details of all trips for inclusion within the Saturn model assuming the specific sites you have requested be considered and these are attached. Atkins have requested details of trips during peak periods are provided which are also attached. These reflect average values during the peak periods as requested by Atkins. These further sites have been added to the location diagram attached.

Finally, we have also been advised that South Staffs require that we assess the implications of the delivery of a further 1100 dwellings beyond the Tempro 7 assumptions which would take housing numbers within this District to 4900.

An important point to make is that we would require that Tempro rates would need to be adjusted to reflect any changes in household and employment parameters within the specific Local Authority zones and then capped.

All other allocated sites would be dealt with by Tempro for the 2036 assessment.

I trust that this clarifies the position and the way forward.

Regards

Ian



Ian Fielding
Technical Director
Mountbatten House, Basing View, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4HJ
Tel: +44 (0)1256 318745

Website: www.wspgroup.co.uk

Website: www.pbworld.com

Follow us on [Twitter](#)

Fielding, Ian

From: Derek Jones <Derek.Jones@jmp.co.uk>
Sent: 23 November 2016 11:13
To: Fielding, Ian
Cc: Hansen, Neil
Subject: Four Ashes WMI - Committed and Local Plan Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Ian,

Thanks for your email of 8 November 2016. This is reproduced below, with responses shown in blue type and underlined.

I hope this is helpful.

Regards,

Derek

Derek

Thanks for your time on the phone on 20 October following the issue of your Technical Note dated 17 October dealing with Committed Development. Apologies for the delayed response but there has been some debate with South Staffs as to the approach to committed development which has now been resolved.

As discussed, I thought it would be useful if I provided a response setting out the agreed approach following your comments. Using the number setting out within your Note of 17 October 2016

Paragraph 6 – you suggested that an overall matrix check of the SATURN model could be undertaken. We will discuss with Atkins whether this is possible. Noted, and look forward to hearing further in relation to this in due course.

However we provide by way of the attached, a comparison of the Tempro growth rates assuming Tempro 6.2 and 7 between the years 2012 – 2021 and 2036 for the following

- West Midlands
- Staffordshire
- South Staffordshire
- Walsall
- Wolverhampton

This comparison shows that generally, traffic growth using Tempro 7 generally shows a decrease to values provided by Tempro 6.2. Any increases shown by Tempro 7 are not shown to result in material change to Tempro 6.2. Therefore generally the use of Tempro 6.2 within the model would remain valid in our judgement. Agreed that this is likely to be the case as it will be a worst case approach. Use of Tempro 6.2 is therefore accepted.

Paragraph 7, 1st bullet point – we note your requirement that any application that benefits from a current consent should be included in the 2021 analysis. Any Local Plan Allocations not currently included within the Saturn modelling would need to be added to the 2036 analysis. Noted.

Paragraph 7 2nd bullet point – we note that specific trips from sites 3 and 4 of the committed development schedule could be included if decisions are made within the relevant timeframe. Noted.

Para 7 4th bullet point – we will add all developments to the schedule if not already included within the SATURN model. In respect of those sites benefiting from a consent, you require these to be added in as specific sites within the SATURN model with trips obtained wherever possible from the relevant Transport Assessments. In respect of the South Staffs Allocated sites included within Codsall, you require that these are included within the SATURN model as specific sites for the 2036 assessment. Trips could be based upon the TA's from the already approved site at Watery Lane if available. Having reviewed this, it would appear that site allocations only amount to up to 70 dwellings as the Watery Lane site already benefits from a consent for 180 dwellings. We would therefore suggest that it is more expedient & accurate to rely upon Temprow for the remaining site allocations with the Codsall allocations. As discussed at the meeting of 9th November 2016, the traffic for the remaining dwellings is to be added to the relevant zone.

Sites within Wolverhampton would be dealt with by way of TEMPRO growth, but specifically referred to within the overall schedule. It has previously been discussed during a telephone call of 27th October 2016 that where possible the relevant TA's will need to be obtained for these sites. It is understood that not all of these TA's are available. Where they are not available, it was previously agreed that TRICS analysis would be carried out and submitted for review. The specific traffic flows are then to be added to the model.

In addition to your Note, we discussed that Atkins require details of trips in order to allow them to deal with ROF Featherstone at 2036. This site has an allocation for 36 hectares of B1/B2/B8 floor space with a preferred new access route from the south. We discussed that of this 36 hectares, it could be assumed that there would be some 40% development coverage which would equate to development floor area of 144,000 sqm. Having taken commercial advice, we understand that there is no demand for B1 office floor space at the site and the anticipated split of floor area would be 70% B8 and 30% B2. We would provide trip generation using TRICS data to reflect this and this is attached. As discussed at the meeting of 9th November 2016, it is understood that in relation to ROF Featherstone, SCC are already carrying out analysis for this site. This is to be provided to WSP|Parsons Brinckerhoff to ensure consistency of analysis. Therefore the assumptions within the above paragraph will be superseded. Please advise whether the SCC analysis has been forthcoming.

We have identified details of all trips for inclusion within the Saturn model assuming the specific sites you have requested be considered and these are attached. Atkins have requested details of trips during peak periods are provided which are also attached. These reflect average values during the peak periods as requested by Atkins. These further sites have been added to the location diagram attached. This has been examined. This is largely accepted, however the remarks noted above in relation to Codsall, Wolverhampton and ROF Featherstone sites need to be taken into account.

Finally, we have also been advised that South Staffs require that we assess the implications of the delivery of a further 1100 dwellings beyond the Temprow 7 assumptions which would take housing numbers within this District to 4900. Noted.

An important point to make is that we would require that Temprow rates would need to be adjusted to reflect any changes in household and employment parameters within the specific Local Authority zones and then capped. Agreed – if more accurate information is available for the specific local authority zones then this is more appropriate.

All other allocated sites would be dealt with by Temprow for the 2036 assessment. Noted and agreed.

I trust that this clarifies the position and the way forward.

Regards
Derek Jones
Principal Transport Planner
JMP Consultants Ltd, Innovation Court, 121 Edmund Street, Birmingham, B3 2HJ

[D] 0121 230 1427
[T] 0121 230 6010
[F] 0121 230 6011
[W] <http://www.jmp.co.uk>

From 1 January 2017, JMP will become a fully integrated part of the SYSTRA Group, with JMP staff joining a team of nearly 500 UK-based transport specialists. For more information, visit www.systra.co.uk.

Twitter <http://twitter.com/#!/JMP>
Facebook <http://www.facebook.com/JMP.Consultants>
LinkedIn <http://linkedin.com/company/jmp-consulting>

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

JMP is part of the SYSTRA Group. JMP Consultants Ltd Registered office: Dukes Court, Duke Street, Woking, Surrey, GU21 5BH Registered in England and Wales. Company number: 08158942

You are invited to read our full email disclaimer transcript at: <http://www.jmp.co.uk/email.htm>

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england> | info@highwaysengland.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Appendix B

Fielding, Ian

From: JONES Derek <djones1@systra.com>
Sent: 27 November 2017 09:43
To: Fielding, Ian
Cc: HE instructions; Tucker, Sheree; Bazley, Laura
Subject: West Midlands Interchange (WMI) - 2036 Models

Ian,

In October 2017 WSP provided SYSTRA with ARCADY models relating to the two proposed junctions; one the A5 and one on the A449 for the year 2036.

Our Initial finding was 'From the results and forecast analysis provided the two junctions appear to operate satisfactorily in 2036'. However this view was subject to the review of input and traffic flow data in order to verify the 2036 flows.

This further information has been reviewed, and found to be acceptable. Accordingly our initial finding still stands; namely that both junctions appear to operate satisfactorily in year 2036.

I hope this is helpful.

Regards,

Derek

From: Fielding, Ian [<mailto:ian.Fielding@wsp.com>]
Sent: 09 November 2017 15:12
To: JONES Derek <djones1@systra.com>; ORAM Nick <noram1@systra.com>
Cc: Bazley, Laura <Laura.Bazley@wsp.com>
Subject: RE: West Midlands Interchange (WMI)

Derek/Nick

Attached is the traffic flow model utilised to prepare the 2036 traffic flows. You will see the spreadsheet the provides the traffic flow diagrams contains the 2021 with scheme traffic flow turning diagrams. We also provide the output data received from your modelling colleagues that has been extracted from the South Staffs VISSIM model.

I hope that is all clear. Any queries, please let us know.

Regards

Ian Fielding

Tel: +44 (0)1256 318745


From: Fielding, Ian
Sent: 08 November 2017 14:48
To: 'JONES Derek'; 'ORAM Nick'
Cc: Bazley, Laura
Subject: RE: West Midlands Interchange (WMI)

Derek/Nick

Further to the TN provided by Neil, we will send you a spreadsheet detailing how the flows were calculated. The version we currently needs some refinement prior to issue just to make sure there are no references to links within the spreadsheet.

In terms of the input data, we had provided the Junctions 8 output files at Annex 5 of the note. This would have provided details of input flows together with the geometric parameters of the junctions.

Do you need us to also provide you with digital copies of the junctions 8 files for verification?

Regards

Ian Fielding

Tel: +44 (0)1256 318745



**West Midlands
Interchange**

On Behalf of
Highways England

Date

Signature

[Redacted Signature]

Name

[Redacted Name]

On Behalf of the
Applicant

Date

Signature

[Redacted Signature]

Name

[Redacted Name]