

Pell Frischmann		Project No. A13398/VAA
		Version No. Final 1
TECHNICAL NOTE	Project Land to the East of Leeds Road and Land at Heybeck Lane, Chidswell, Dewsbury	Date 13/11/2020
	Subject Response to Highways England (HE) M62 Junction 28 Scoping Comments	By Chkd CJO SME

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 Pell Frischmann is commissioned by C.C. Projects (the 'Applicant') to provide transport planning and highways consultancy services in connection with the Proposed Development of Land to the East of Leeds Road and Land at Heybeck Lane, Chidswell, Dewsbury (the 'sites') (Kirklees Local Plan site ID: MXS7).
- 1.2 The Proposed Development site is split into two development parcels, referred to as 'Land at Heybeck Lane' ('Site A') and 'Land to the East of Leeds Road' ('Site B'). Site A and Site B are the subject of separate outline planning applications that have been submitted in parallel to Kirklees Council (KC) in their position as the Local Planning Authority (LPA).
- 1.3 Site A, to be accessed from Heybeck Lane, is proposed to comprise up to 181 residential dwellings (C3 Use Class) with associated access and landscaping. Site B, to be accessed from Leeds Road, Chidswell Lane and a new access from Owl Lane (via the adjacent site HS47 being promoted by Barratt David Wilson Homes), is proposed to comprise up to 35 hectares (ha) (equal to up to 122,500 square metres [m<sup>2</sup>]) of employment space (mixed B1(a) / B1(c) / B2 / B8 Use Classes); up to 1,354 residential dwellings (C3 Use Class); a new two-form entry (2FE) primary school; a new local centre (including community facilities); and associated accesses and landscaping.
- 1.4 As a part of the planning application submissions, a Transport Assessment (TA) and associated documents were prepared to assess the individual and combined impacts of the Proposed Development. These documents, and the scoping documents that inform them, have been submitted to KC in their role as LPA and as Local Highway Authority (LHA). In addition to KC, Highways England (HE), in its role as Highways Authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN), was invited to provide comments on the TA and FTP Scoping Report and the feedback received was reflected in the final scope of the TA and FTP. Leeds City Council (LCC) and Wakefield Council (WC) are neighbouring local planning and local highway authorities and were also approached during the pre-application stage with various pre-application scoping discussions taking place.

## 2 Scope of Technical Note

- 2.1 During pre-application scoping discussions, HE raised issues with regards to the expected future capability of the M62 Junction 28 (Tingley Interchange) to accommodate the cumulative effects of Local Plan developments across the wider Kirklees and Leeds areas.
- 2.2 Pell Frischmann produced and issued a Scoping Report in July 2020 to propose a methodology for the assessment of the cumulative impacts at the motorway junction of the Applicant's sites, and the other identified cumulative development sites including the proposed development at Capitol Park being promoted by Sterling Capitol. The Scoping Report detailed a series of items requiring responses and agreement.
- 2.3 HE have reviewed the Scoping Report and have produced a Response (Ref: STWY001-TM002v1; 29 September 2020) providing commentary and recommendations as to the acceptance of the items specified in that report.

- 2.4 We acknowledge receipt of the comments from HE and its consultants. We note the broad agreement/approval of the proposed methodology. We further note HE's position that HE are happy to review any assessments but expect that the outcome (and any deliverable solutions) should be agreed also by KC and LCC.
- 2.5 This Technical Note addresses and provides a response to outstanding/queried items. Items which have been noted by HE as being in agreement (e.g. the use of TEMPro background traffic growth factors) have been excluded from this Technical Note for conciseness. Similarly, some items are mentioned in multiple places in the HE Response (e.g. definition of background growth) as narrative requires. These are considered below in the main section to which they relate. Finally, some items are agreed, subject to ultimate review following the progression of this work process. Again, these items have been omitted for conciseness.

### 3 Items Requiring Comment/Response

#### HE Response Section: Introduction

- 3.1 **HE Response:** *"it is essential that all parties are in agreement with this approach, so a deliverable solution is derived."*
- 3.2 At time of writing, responses to scoping have been received from KC and (subject of this Technical Note), HE. It is understood that i-Transport (on behalf of Sterling Capitol for Capitol Park) are also in agreement and are progressing a similar methodology in parallel. A response to scoping has yet to be circulated by LCC.

#### HE Response Section: Scenarios

- 3.3 **HE Response:** *"The [Scoping Report] 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."*
- 3.4 This assumption is correct. The HE October 2019 survey has been adopted as the base flow set.
- 3.5 **HE Response:** *"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."*
- 3.6 We can confirm that the full impact of the Proposed Development will be considered against this end date.
- 3.7 **HE Response:** *"It should be noted that the schemes identified as a result of Local Plan development would be independent of the RIS [Road Investment Strategy] process and therefore will need to be delivered at the appropriate time by LCC and KC rather than through RIS."*
- 3.8 We acknowledge this clarification of the relation of the independence of the scheme from the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) process.
- 3.9 As a general note, whilst the appropriate timescale of delivery for any proposed scheme is a matter for later consideration and agreement, it does seem likely that a scheme could be delivered in the period 2025-2030. Scheme delivery may therefore have physical or programme interactions with nearby emerging RIS3 schemes, which should inform the process of delivery to maximise any efficiencies and minimise any disruptions.

## HE Response Section: Background Traffic Growth

- 3.10 We acknowledge HE's comments with regards further sources of uncertainty inherent in TEMPro forecasts. We also acknowledge HE's acceptance of the principle of the use of TEMPro with appropriate alternative planning assumptions applied.

## HE Response Section: Cumulative Developments

- 3.11 **HE Response:** *"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."*
- 3.12 In the period since the circulation of the Scoping Report, KC and LCC have each shared lists of those sites they consider to be required to be considered in detail. Early analysis indicates that some of these sites will have negligible impacts, but the decision has been taken to assess all identified sites.
- 3.13 **HE Response:** *"when assessing the need for / necessary improvements [to M62 Junction 28] to accommodate the Local Plans then consideration will need to be given to ensure that the full impact of the Local Plans is mitigated."*
- 3.14 It is confirmed that the assessments and subsequent identified needs for mitigation will consider the full impact of the background growth forecasts and Local Plan site allocations including the Proposed Development and Capitol Park.
- 3.15 **HE Response:** *"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."*
- 3.16 All sites will be broken out in the relevant reports to allow validation of the calculations undertaken.
- 3.17 **HE Response:** *"should developments come forward with a different quantum or type of development [to that assessed at this stage where these are allocations not yet progressed] 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."*
- 3.18 This is noted, and whilst not a specific matter for the Applicant to address nor for the wider stakeholder group to address at this stage, it is expected that proposed mitigations (and their delivery mechanism) would include sufficient flexibility to account for any variations from the current Local Plan allocations which may emerge.

## HE Response Section: Proposed Developments

- 3.19 **HE Response:** *"For the Chidswell development, the comments on the planning application should be addressed."*
- 3.20 The Applicant continues to engage with KC (and others) to progress the planning process for the Proposed Development. It is also noted that the Applicant has recently circulated responses to HE's comments with regards the submitted planning documents (e.g. the Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan). Pell Frischmann's responses to HE's comments on the TA and FTP are contained in the two Pell Frischmann Technical Notes issues to HE and KC officers on 10 November 2020.
- 3.21 It is also more generally confirmed that there have been no changes to the Proposed Development since submission of the planning applications that would result in any changes to this M62 Junction 28 assessment.
- 3.22 **HE Response:** *"For the Capitol Park development any comments made as part of the scoping assessment should be addressed."*
- 3.23 Whilst outside of the Applicant's control, we understand the scoping process for Capitol Park is ongoing. We have not received notice of any material changes to date which would require changes to the methodology or scope of work required. We can confirm we have received trip distribution flows

(and implied underlying trip generation) which we intend to use for the analysis to follow. Should there be material changes, we expect to be notified by the applicant for Capitol Park and or the relevant authorities..

## HE Response Section: Next Steps

- 3.24 This section of the HE Response draws together HE's comments with specific regard to the items detailed for agreement in the Scoping Report, and also with regard to KC's Response to same (circulated September 2020). Generally these are in agreement, and/or are subject to agreement following review of the work yet to be undertaken, save one item of note:
- 3.25 **HE Response:** Regarding scope limitation of full Census/TRICS approach to 6no sites: *“cannot limit the number until the number of sites is known. Site in similar areas can use same generation / distributions”*
- 3.26 The limitation was included in the Scoping Report to avoid the potential that the Applicant would be compelled to undertake full pre-planning transport trip analysis for a potentially unlimited number of sites across two large local authorities, which would be considered wholly unreasonable. Whilst HE's comment is noted, early indications – relating to the number of sites required by KC and LCC, and the data already available through the planning process – are that this suggested limit will not be reached.

## HE Response Section: Summary and Conclusions

- 3.27 **HE Response:** *“All parties need to sign up to assessment process to ensure that any derived solution has a realistic prospect of being delivered.”*
- 3.28 It is understood that the assessment process has been discussed and agreed by HE, KC and LCC. However, a formal agreement has not been put in place. Once the proportional impacts are determined and the methodology validated by the interested parties (i.e. HE, KC and LCC), it is expected that the outcomes – including proportional contributions to any improvements at M62 Junction 28 – will be identified in detail and secured through the planning process.

## 4 Summary and Conclusions

- 4.1 We welcome the review and comments provided by HE with regard the Scoping Report for the assessment of the M62 Junction 28. We also welcome HE's largely supportive comments.
- 4.2 This Technical Note considers those items where a response to comments was considered necessary. Comments and notes in the HE Response not broken out in this Technical Note are considered accepted/noted as appropriate. We would welcome confirmation from HE that all outstanding comments and queries have now been suitably addressed.