

Chidswell, Dewsbury – M62 Junction 28 Cumulative Impact Assessment – Scoping

PREPARED FOR: Paula Bedford (Highways England)
PREPARED BY: Richard Edwards (CH2M)
DATE: 29th September 2020
PROJECT NUMBER: STWY001
DOCUMENT REF: TM002v1
REVIEWED / APPROVED BY: Richard Edwards (CH2M)

Task Overview

CH2M (on behalf of Highways England) has been working with Leeds City Council [LCC], Kirklees Council [KC], Pell Frischmann [PF] acting for the Church Commissioners who have two current planning application for sites at Chidswell lodged with KC and I-Transport [IT] acting for Sterling Capitol who are scoping an application with LCC for the Capitol Park site at Tingley.

The purpose of the discussions was to agree an assessment which all parties could agree as to the impact of the development proposed within both the LCC and KC Local Plans and how this could be mitigated at M62 Junction 28. The discussions centred around how a solution could be derived (including who should undertake this work) and how any derived solution will be delivered.

Although Highways England are happy to review any assessments undertaken, the outcome of any assessment should be agreed by all parties to ensure a deliverable solution.

PF have submitted a scoping report [SR] to undertake a cumulative assessment of M62 Junction 28 at Tingley. The remainder of this technical memorandum reviews the SR and heading below use those contained within the SR.

Summary of Requirements

This section of the SR sets out that they require all parties to agree to the list of items collated in Section 6 (this is reviewed further below) and that KC and LCC are required to provide a list of their required cumulative significant development sites within their planning authority area.

Although it is not for Highways England to determine which sites are significant and should contribute towards any final mitigation derived, Highways England require the full impact of the Local Plans to be assessed and mitigated.

Introduction

The introduction identifies the two planning applications for the sites in Chidswell and that Highways England have identified that M62 Junction 28 may have future capacity issues and may not be able to accommodate the cumulative impact of developments across Kirklees and Leeds.

It identifies that the Church Commissioners preferred approach for this assessment was to appoint an independent third party to undertake this assessment, but this was not agreed by Sterling Capitol. Therefore, PF are undertaking an assessment on behalf of the Church Commissioners.

As identified above it is essential that all parties are in agreement with this approach, so a deliverable solution is derived.

The introduction identifies that the SR deals with traffic forecasting and the sites that need to be individually assessed, whereas subsequent stages will involve modelling of the junction and each future stage will be scoped individually.

Scenarios

The SR sets out the recent survey history of M62 Junction 28 and identifies that the most recent surveys in October 2019 (Highways England) and November 2019 (PF) are the latest surveys. PF propose to use the late 2019 surveys for the assessment. It is not entirely clear which surveys PF propose to use, however, given the TRANSYT model that will be used to assess the impact of the flows was based upon the Highways England flows it is assumed that these will be used as the base position.

It is proposed to assess a future year of 2032 as the KC Local Plan has an end date of 2031 and the LCC Local Plan has an end date of 2033. Given the scale of development it is unlikely that it will be fully built out within this time period. However, as the purpose of the study is to consider the impact of the two local plans, the proposed 2032 end date is considered acceptable, although the full impact of the Chidswell developments will need to be considered.

It is noted that the SR identifies the Highways England RIS 5 year cycles and sets out that schemes are often developed through one cycle for delivery in the next. It then identifies that a scheme identified within this study could be delivered in RIS3 by 2030. It should be noted that the schemes identified as a result of Local Plan development would be independent of the RIS process and therefore will need to be delivered at the appropriate time by LCC and KC rather than through RIS.

The SR identifies three scenarios to be assessed in both the morning and evening peak periods. These scenarios are set out in Table 1 of the report repeated below.

Table 1: Build-up of traffic flow scenarios

Scenario	Base data	year	Future background growth factors applied to base year data	Cumulative trip generation including: KC sites, LCC sites, and the applicants' sites
2019 base	✓			
2032 future: 'Background'	✓		✓	
2032 future: 'With Development'	✓		✓	✓

This identifies the 2019 base flows (which has already been modelled within the TRANSYT models provided by CH2M). The 2032 future background scenario which represents the position without Local Plans and the 2032 future with development scenario which represents the position with the Local Plans. Given that the purpose of the study is to identify and mitigate any impacts associated with the Local Plans these scenarios would appear appropriate. It will be necessary to agree the level of background growth not associated with development identified with the KC and LCC Local Plans.

Background Traffic Growth

It is identified that background traffic growth includes new development, changes in propensity to travel and other factors. These other factors could include increases in population (not associated with new development) and changes in car ownership. It identifies that TEMPRO is commonly considered to over-predict future increases and that the Covid-19 pandemic may lead to long term changes in transport behaviour. However, it only discusses the impact which will lead to decreases in traffic flows. It should also be noted that there has been a change in mode of travel as a result of a reluctance to use public transport which has increase car mode share.

In order to assess the background growth, it is proposed to base this on TEMPRO derived factors with cumulative developments in the KC and LCC authority areas removed through the alternative planning assumptions. The principle of this is considered acceptable. As set out in paragraph 3.6 of the SR these will need to be agreed as part of the next stage before they are used.

Cumulative Developments

The SR defines cumulative developments as those developments occurring between the base and future years which will reasonably expected to add new traffic flows to M62 Junction 28. It is expected that these sites will generally be the largest Local Plan site allocations for KC and LCC. The remainder of the site will be assumed to be included within the TEMPRO derived background growth forecasts.

In order to aid the process of site identification it is recommended that a list of all sites within the Local Plans and within the planning process are identified by the Councils and then discussions over which sites should have traffic flows derived for them is undertaken. Once site have traffic flows derived for them, it may be possible to exclude further sites if their individual impact is small.

However, when assessing the need for / necessary improvements to accommodate the Local Plans then consideration will need to be given to ensure that the full impact of the Local Plans is mitigated.

The SR sets out methodologies for two types of sites, those in the planning system as applications and those that are not. For those within the planning system it is proposed to identify the quantum of development, any agreed trip generation and modal share, any agreed distribution and therefore isolate those trips that interact with M62 Junction 28. The principle of this is accepted, however, it is important that any agreed trip rates and distributions were agreed with Highways England. This should be the case for all sites that individually have an impact at Junction 28.

For those sites not within the planning system, the quantum and type of development will be determined form the Local Plan allocation and discussions with the Local Planning Authority. Although this is acceptable at this stage should developments come forward with a different quantum or type of development a reassessment of the impact at M62 Junction 28 may be required. It will need to be demonstrate by these developments when they come forward that the scheme is still appropriate and funding is available to deliver the scheme.

Trip generation will be derived through TRICS with mode share being derived from 2011 Census data. This is considered as appropriate. This will give road vehicle trips which will be distributed based upon 2011 journey to work census data. Again this is considered appropriate as long as the appropriate data for residential and employment development is used.

Proposed Developments

Section 5 of the SR sets out that the assessment is to ascertain the level of impact from each of the cumulative developments both overall and relatively to each other. The study must ascertain the overall impact of the Local Plans and relative impact of those developments which should contribute towards any necessary mitigation solution.

It is proposed to use information from the supporting Transport Assessments within this assessment. Any agreements reached through the application process for the Chidswell sites and the Capitol Park sites should be brought forward as part of this assessment. For the Chidswell development, the comments on the planning application should be addressed. For the Capitol Park development any comments made as part of the scoping assessment should be addressed.

Next Steps

The table below identifies the actions required and Kirklees / Highways England response. It is recommended that a meeting should be held to discuss and agree the parameters for use within the assessment. This meeting should include LCC.

Agreements sought / reached

Topic	PF Proposal	KC Response	Highways England Response
Scenarios			
Base 2019	Based upon Highways England October 2019 surveys	Agreed	Agreed flows in line with base models
Future Year 2032	Based upon end of KC and LCC Local Plans	Full build out of site should be considered	Acceptable as end of Local Plan with full Local Plan developments will allow determination of impact of Local Plans
6 Traffic Flow scenarios	Base 2019 (counted) Base 2032 Background Future 2032 with Development	Additional scenario at 2032 with committed developments between base 2032 and future 2032	Accept the scenarios as they allow for impact of whole Local Plan to be derived
Background Traffic Growth			
No underlying change is strategic traffic distribution	No known strategic network changes so no strategic flow changes	Agreed	Agreed, no know changes
Use TEMPRO for blended KC and LCC	Given the location of the developments and the junction on the border of the two areas	Agreed	Agree
Use alternative planning assumptions to discount cumulative development growth	Avoids double counting	Suggests using full TEMPRO to get future 2032 then remove developments to get Base 2032 without developments	Agree, details of assessment / growth rates need to be agreed
Cumulative Developments			
Only sites in KC and LCC authority areas	As these are the Local Plan we are looking to mitigate for	Agreed	Agreed
KC to provide list for KC area	Request	Three sites identified MXS7, HS47 and HS61	Other sites including Dewsbury Riverside. A wider list should be provided and if necessary, calculations should be provided to show that site will not impact at M62 Junction 28

LCC to provide list for LCC area	Request	No Comment	Principle acceptable. Full list should be provided and then sites removed if no impact
Agreement by all other parties to KC and LCC list	Request	Waiting information from LCC	Comprehensive list should form starting point with site removed under agreement
Use of agreed information for sites in the planning process	Proposed methodology	Agreed in principle	Agreed as long as agreement was reached with Highways England as part of planning process
Other sites / unagreed information to use standard TRICS and Census approach. Limit to 6 separate areas	Proposed methodology	Agreed in principle	Agreed in principle but cannot limit the number until the number of sites is known. Site in similar areas can use same generation / distributions
Affordable housing levels as per Local Plan policies	Proposed methodology	Agreed in principle	Accept in principle assuming KC and LCC agree the level is likely to be achieved. Any change at time of application could lead to need for reassessment.
Proposed Developments			
TA for Chidswell appropriate	Proposal	Trip generation agreed Distribution required further evidence	See comments on application
TA for Capitol Park appropriate	Proposal	LCC responsible for this	See comments on scoping
No adjustments are required	Proposal	Distribution still needs agreeing	Until above resolved then not agreed

Summary and Conclusions

The above table summarises the responses to the specific action requested within the Scoping Report. In addition to these actions the below comments are relevant.

- 1) All parties need to sign up to assessment process to ensure that any derived solution has a realistic prospect of being delivered.
- 2) Deliver of the improvement is unlikely to be done through the RIS process and therefore these timescales are not relevant.
- 3) The assessment needs to demonstrate that the impact of the Local Plans can either be accommodated or mitigated at M62 Junction 28.
- 4) The assumption that TEMPRO over estimates growth is not accepted. Nor that Covid will lead to a lower growth rate than predicted by TEMPRO.