

DfT Transport Consultancy Advice – East Grinstead

WSCC Officer Comments

Background

The “west and south-west of East Grinstead for 2500 homes after 2006” is one of several locations identified for development “where possible” in paragraph 24.8 of the recently adopted South East Plan. This proposal has been carried forward from the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 which highlighted the need for a supporting transport package including a relief road. A number of difficulties associated with the delivery of the relief road have been identified. WSCC and MSDC officers have been working with ATLAS to consider next steps as MSDC progress their LDF. Through the work with ATLAS we have secured some consultancy support to consider options should the relief road not be deliverable. This work was funded by the DfT and undertaken by Atkins Limited. The brief was agreed by officers at WSCC and MSDC and East Grinstead Town Council were represented in the initial briefing meeting.

Atkins have produced two reports:

- East Grinstead - Review of A22 Corridor (Draft)
- East Grinstead Strategic Development – Transport Advice (Revised Final Draft)

This note provides a context within which these reports should be read.

The reports provide:

- a helpful review of previous work;
- a fresh look at 5 key junctions on the A22 approaching East Grinstead;
- a fresh look at modelling approaches;
- analysis of the impact of development;
- guidance on potential for increasing the proportion of new development trips that would use sustainable modes and hence the level of development that may be accommodated without a relief road.

The information in the reports should be considered to guide further work – the reports provide pointers. The report does not provide ‘the answers’. Where figures are quoted, particularly in the Transport Advice report, these should be considered as a guide – further validation is required to support this initial study.

The Outcomes

- a. The A22 Corridor Report identified a range of improvements, to support all transport modes, which could be considered to improve the operational efficiency of the 5 key junctions.
- b. The Transport Advice report considers a range of possible development options and suggests the level of impact associated with each. The results are summarised below.

Option	Trip Generation Assumptions	Number of units	% increase in AM Peak outbound flows
A	Traditional Trip Rates	1500	18.7
B	Traditional Trip Rates	2500	29.5
C	Increased Sustainable Modes (reducing ‘car driver’ mode share to 55%)	1500	14.9
D	Increased Sustainable Modes (reducing ‘car driver’ mode share to 55%)	2500	23.5
E	Increased Internalisation of Trips (and Increased Sustainable Modes)	1500	13.8
F	Increased Internalisation of Trips (and Increased Sustainable Modes)	2500	21.9
G	Impact capped at 5% - Ratio of land uses from previous	571	5

	work plus Increased Sustainable modes and Increased internalisation of trips		
H	Impact capped at 5% - All employment development retained from "Reduced" development scenario	313	5
I	Impact capped at 5% - All employment development retained from "Full" development scenario	215	5
J	Impact capped at 5% - 10% Mode Shift from all Existing Movement	1122	5

Notes

- a. Each option is based on greatest potential impact, identified as A.M. peak period.
- b. Each option assumes development but NO relief road.
- c. Traditional Trip Rates equate to those used in all assessments undertaken to date.
- d. Increased Sustainable Modes assumes a reduction in percentage of 'car driver' trips from 69% to 55%.
- e. Options A – F consider the impact of a "reduced" development of 1,500 units or a "full" development of 2,500 units.
- f. Options E - F assume that 20% of jobs within the development site are filled by residents of the development (as opposed to 10% assumed in other options), while 90% and 80% of primary and secondary school trips respectively are made by residents of the development (as opposed to 70% and 50% assumed in other options). <<Clarification of this assumption is being sought from Atkins>>
- g. Options G – J assume traffic growth on the network capped at 5%.
- h. Options H - I assume that the full scale of employment is provided within the cap of a 5% impact.

WSCC Officer Comments

- a. The junction improvements have not been tested in terms of deliverability and impact on capacity. Further work is required to explore these issues. This was not part of the brief for the recent Atkins commission.
- b. The impacts highlighted in Options A – F are unacceptable and it is **NOT** anticipated that local measures could be delivered to satisfactorily mitigate these impacts.
- c. For all options that consider a reduced vehicle trip rate (due to increased use of sustainable modes) little evidence is yet provided to demonstrate the ability of identified improvements to achieve the reduced trip rates. Further work would be required to explore how achievable these reductions would be. This was not part of the brief for the recent Atkins commission.
- d. Little evidence is yet provided to demonstrate that the assumptions made in terms of reduced trip rates due to increased internalisation are achievable. Further work would be required to explore how achievable this reduction would be. This was not part of the brief for the recent Atkins commission.
- e. Officers have real doubts that a 10% modal shift for all vehicle trips, as indicated in Option J, can be achieved. No evidence is provided to demonstrate that this is attainable. This needs to be considered further.
- f. Officers have concerns that reducing employment levels, as indicated in option G, will reduce the likelihood of increasing the modal share of sustainable modes and hence this needs to be considered further.
- g. Some verification of the methodology used by Atkins is still required.
- h. **NO CONCLUSIONS SHOULD BE DRAWN FROM THESE REPORTS UNTIL FURTHER DETAIL HAS BEEN EXPLORED.**

Duncan Barratt
Service Manager Local Development
June 5th 2009