

Proposed Industrial Development
Burnaston Cross / Axis 50 Willington
A50/A38 Junction Impact and Mitigation

Highways Meeting Minutes

Date: 19.09.18

Time: 1pm

Venue: Highways England, The Cube, 199 Wharfside Street, Birmingham B1 1RN

Attendees:

Steve Freek – Highways England
 Daniel Law – Highways England
 Mark Roxburgh – Highways England
 Richard Groves – South Derbyshire DC

James Houghton – Brackley Property Ltd
 Andrew Gore – Marrons Planning
 Ashley Russell – WSP
 Jo Posnett – BSP

Circulation: as above plus Chris Nash & Kevin Exley at SDDC

ITEMS	ACTIONS
1.0 Initial Impact Assessment Conclusions	
- Baseline situation – already over capacity. - Volume of development traffic compared to background growth. - Impact of development traffic exacerbated due to junction being over capacity in reference case.	
2.0 Contribution Towards Wider Mitigation Scheme	
- We initially proposed that a contribution to a wider scheme would be more practical and help to deliver the Local Plan development strategy. - It was agreed that the required mitigation scheme is likely to offer some net benefits to the highway network. However, there is no requirement for it to fully address the capacity issues in the reference case. - If the agreed scheme does much more than mitigate the development traffic, it would not be in proportion to the scale of the development (unless it offsets impact elsewhere that is not fully mitigated). - Therefore, a financial contribution to a wider infrastructure improvement scheme would be preferable, but this is not currently an option.	
3.0 Initial Response from Highways England/Confirmed Position	
- HE has said that although they are considering a scheme here it is very early stages and therefore the development will need to propose a scheme to mitigation the impact. If a HE scheme comes forward prior to its implementation then a contribution of the same value as the proposed mitigation scheme can be provided instead - HE confirmed that a scheme design has not yet started, but it will probably involve signalisation and possibly widening works, and that the funding for HE infrastructure improvement schemes for 2015-2020 has now gone	

• MR estimated timescales for wider scheme development: • Good idea of scheme design by the end of 2018 • Starting work imminently using same validated 2016 base model, as being used by WSP • End of first quarter 2019 – estimated cost • Hoping to have an idea of the total funding pot and rules for bids fairly soon • Could be 12-18months until knew if were successful • Would aim to deliver 18months from a successful fund allocation • MR/SF confirmed that the status of the wider infrastructure improvement scheme will be reviewed leading up to the agreed trigger point. • If a wider scheme is agreed but funding is not in place, tweaks to future proof the mitigation scheme may be required at detailed design stage. • If a wider scheme is agreed and funding is reasonably secure, a contribution to the wider scheme will be applicable at the agreed trigger point, instead of delivering the scheme agreed to mitigate the impact of the development.	
4.0 Planning Context	
• South Derbyshire Local Plan - Policy INF4: Transport Infrastructure Improvement Schemes <i>A The Council will work with partners to deliver the following transport schemes:</i> <i>... iii) A50 junction with the A38 improvement scheme ...</i> <i>B Where required to mitigate the transport impacts of the development, the Council will seek to negotiate financial contributions toward these schemes. Proposals that would prejudice their implementation will not be permitted.</i> • AG asked about timescales for reviewing the South Derbyshire LP RG confirmed Local Plan Part 1 adopted 2016, and Part 2 2017. Review of Local Plan anticipated 2021. • To achieve the proposal in the Local Plan, an agreed scheme to bring the junction back into capacity would be needed along with funding from a number of developers, based on their proportional impact. Based on the volume of committed development traffic, it appears that some opportunities for funding have been missed. • We discussed the status of other application and potential to work together, e.g. Rykneld Road (Derby City) old scheme from 2007 with recommended condition for a mitigation scheme at this junction – recently varied development scheme and therefore further work to confirm suitable mitigation scheme required, understood to be being undertaken by BWB. • RG also mentioned Radley Way, Primula Way/Stenson Fields, Boulton Moor Phases 2 & 3. • It was acknowledged that timing, etc. can be an issue to jointly fund highway improvement works. • RG mentioned modelling work for the potential new A50 junction forming part of the south derby link road infrastructure works. It was confirmed that this scheme could not be considered committed in the	JP/AG/JH to investigate potential joint working with other developers

modelling work for the proposed development. RG asked about the impact on the Willington double mini-roundabouts and the level crossing. JSP confirmed that BSP are liaising directly with DCC Highways and Network Rail. The junction in Willington is a known issue, however BSP and DCC have concluded that land constraints prevent a suitable mitigation scheme. Net highway network benefits resulting from the A50/A38 junction mitigation scheme would help to off-set this impact.	
5.0 Agreed Methodology to Develop Mitigation Scheme	
- Assessment of 2025 (the opening year of final phase of the development based on Phasing Plans) + proportion of committed development traffic (agreed with SDDC) + with and without full proposed development traffic. - Committed developments individually added removed from TEMPOR growth forecast to avoid double counting. - JP confirmed sites and build out rates have been agreed with SDDC. - HE/AECOM requested that the PTV guidance be followed & AR confirmed convergence levels have now been improved. - It was agreed that as the junction is over capacity in the reference case, the developer will not be required to bring this back into capacity but rather provide sufficient mitigation so that the addition of development traffic with a mitigation scheme has no material effect on junction performance. - MR confirmed that a reasonable view on viability and to keep the scheme proportional to the development impact would be taken. It was agreed that a scheme suitable to retrofit further improvements as part of the wider scheme would be ideal, and that tweaks may be required to future proof the scheme with that in mind.	
6.0 Mitigation Scheme Development	
- AR identified that some of the key issues are due to long/high speed circulatory sections and therefore poor gaps. - AR confirmed that WSP are considering a fixed time signalisation scheme within the existing infrastructure – no widening – and are also reviewing lane allocations. This would assist with cost/viability, reduced traffic management, night works, etc. - MR flagged up that not including MOVA would be a departure from standard but agreed it could be fairly easily retro-fitted. - Costing of the mitigation scheme is to consider ADS and other signage and road markings required to implement lane allocation changes. - AR agreed to consider no lane changes, to avoid the additional costs associated with the above. - MR also suggested that in order to keep costs down, HE/AECOM can specify in the wording of the condition that no lighting scheme upgrades would be required as part of the scheme – significant cost with no impact on achieving mitigation and more appropriate to form part of the wider infrastructure improvement scheme in due course. - MR confirmed that the initial Assessment element of a WCHAR and a Stage 1 RSA would be needed as part of the mitigation scheme package (and confirmed some equestrian use).	AR to note AR to provide details for costing AR to consider ALL to note AR/JP to organise

MR suggested WSP submit preliminary LinSig model of basic signalised scheme being proposed as mitigation for comments from HE/AECOM for review and comments prior to testing in VISSIM.	AR/JP/MR
7.0 Establishing Trigger Level when over Capacity in Reference Case	
- MR/SF confirmed that HE do not like to impose first occupation conditions, acknowledging viability/practicality issues. However, confirmed HE would need to be happy with the situation up until the mitigation scheme was triggered. - We discussed looking at a % occupation, the level of development to trigger a TA rather than TS, and considering the impact on Q lengths, journey times, and total network delay. - AR agreed for WSP to add total network delay to 2025 reference case and with development VISSIM results and submit to HE/AECOM (via BSP) for initial comments on impact from 100% of the development, in view of agreeing how best to establish the trigger level.	AR to finalise report for circulation by JP HE/AECOM to respond
8.0 Proposed Sustainable Travel Choices/Travel Plan Measures	
- We discussed some of the sustainable transport measures being proposed to help manage the level of development traffic. - It was agreed that reductions assigned to reflect these measures would need to be evidence led reductions and agreed on a site by site basis. - RG mentioned committed tow path improvements which will improve the route between Willington and the south derby development area. - MR raised the issue of ensuring sufficient HGV parking/waiting facilities for the type of development proposals, and to consider provision of on-street/layby waiting areas within the development. JH acknowledged the potential issue for the public highway and the developer, confirmed that HGV parking and service yards were proposed for each unit and these should be sufficient to meet demands based on similar sites.	JP to research and add details as required into TA & TP JP & JH to review current proposals
9.0 Key Actions & Timescales	
- WSP to provide BSP with finalised report of current results to circulate A.S.A.P. - HE/AECOM to advise on levels to be considered reasonable to accept prior to mitigation works, to establish a trigger point. - WSP to provide LinSig and summary of basic signalised scheme being proposed as mitigation, to submit to HE. - HE/AECOM to provide comments prior to testing in VISSIM. - WSP to finalise scheme proposal to mitigate the development traffic and identify any net benefit, and to provide evidence for proposed trigger for the mitigation scheme to be implemented. - WSP/BSP to submit above information to HE following review with Brackley. - HE/AECOM to provide comments/approval of proposed scheme and trigger. - HE/AECOM to keep BSP informed regarding progress on the wider infrastructure improvement scheme proposals for this junction.	JP circulated 24.09.18 DL/MR/SF w/c 01.10.18? AR 02.10.18 MR 05.10.18 AR +2wks AR/JP early Nov HE/AECOM 3wks HE/AECOM/JP ongoing