

Southampton to London Pipeline Project

Deadline 2

Response to the Examining Authority's First Written
Questions Traffic and Transport (TT)

Application Document: 8.6.14

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: EN070005

Revision No. 1.0

November 2019



Southampton to London
Pipeline Project



Contents

1 Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions – Traffic and Transport (TT)..... 2

1 Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions – Traffic and Transport (TT)

Table 1.1: Applicant response to Question

ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
TT.1.1	<p>Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [AS-059] requires the submission and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) in accordance with the REAC which is contained within Chapter 16 of the ES [APP-056]. Although the Applicant relies on the measures contained within the CTMP to mitigate transport effects, no outline document is before the Examination.</p> <p>i) Justify the approach that no outline submission is before the ExA, particularly as it must be approved by numerous relevant Highway and Planning authorities.</p> <p>ii) Explain how the ExA and relevant planning</p>	<p>1.1 In answer to i), commitment G111 sets out the topics that would be covered within the CTMP. The principles and potential subject matter of a CTMP have and are being discussed with the two relevant highways authorities.</p> <p>1.2 Commitment G11 states, <i>'The CTMP would consider the traffic generated by construction vehicles and how the contractor(s) would manage the diversions and closures within the highway network (provided for under the development consent). The CTMP could also include, but would not be limited to, the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• show the location of construction compound(s), access routes, site boundaries, entry/exit points;</i> <i>• develop measures to promote safe access to and from site;</i> <i>• detail each road crossing including the technique for installing the pipeline, access points and traffic management requirements;</i> <i>• define routes that would be taken by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), light vehicles (including Light Goods vehicles with a gross weight less than 3.5 tonnes) and other site traffic;</i> <i>• make drivers aware of designated access routes;</i> <i>• provide appropriate temporary signage directing HGV drivers to relevant compounds;</i> <i>• show the location of temporary road closures including temporary diversion routes agreed with the relevant highway authority;</i> <i>• manage Abnormal Indivisible Loads;</i>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	<p>authorities can be satisfied and take any confidence that its measures would be capable of adequately mitigating traffic matters.</p> <p>iii) Provide an Outline CTMP, listing measures that would be secured, drawings to be prepared, and detailing consultation that would be undertaken and with whom.</p> <p>iv) If an Outline CTMP is to be provided, explain whether it should form a Certified Document in Schedule 11 of the draft DCO [AS-059] and update accordingly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>provide proof of concept for the proposed measures, for example, large vehicle swept path analysis at pinch points on the public highway;</i> <i>provide a Travel Plan for transport of the construction workforce; and</i> <i>provide measures for the monitoring of the CTMP and details of appropriate actions in the event of a non-compliance’.</i> <p>1.3 The Applicant considers that relevant highways authorities are the appropriate body to consider the local impacts and mitigation that will be set out in the CTMP. Given the subject matter, a CTMP is location specific and not capable of universal adoption along the pipeline route. In addition, at this stage in the project there is no meaningful detail that can be included in an outline CTMP beyond that which is set out in commitment G111, given the further detail will depend upon the methodology resulting from the detailed design and construction schedule. It is accepted that a final CTMP would need to be approved by both the relevant highway authorities, but the Applicant does not consider that provision of an outline document for examination would reduce that requirement or assist at the discharge stage. As far as the Applicant is aware, this is consistent with the approach adopted by many other Development Consent Orders (DCOs).</p> <p>1.4 In answer to ii), commitments in respect of traffic matters are set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (Application Document APP-056) (which also signposts which commitments would be included in the CTMP). As per Requirement 7(1) of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1 (3)), the CTMP for each stage must reflect the mitigation measures set out in the REAC, which would be a certified document. These measures are therefore secured. As set out in Requirement 7, the relevant authority would need to approve the CTMP, and any concerns they have over the delivery of the mitigation can be resolved as part of the approval process. Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1 (3)) governs this process, and if necessary, the relevant authority can request further information as part of its deliberations. Ultimately, if the Applicant and the relevant authority disagree over whether the CTMP should be approved with or without amendments, an appeal process is</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
		<p>provided for with an appeal to the Secretary of State. As far as the Applicant is aware, this is consistent with the approach adopted by other DCOs.</p> <p>1.5 In answer to iii and iv), as noted above, the Applicant does not consider it necessary or appropriate to provide an outline CTMP</p>
TT.1.3	<p>i) Confirm whether any vehicle movements associated with the removal of excavated spoil from the pipeline construction corridor, as confirmed by Table 1.2 of Appendix 13.1 [APP-119], have been allowed for in the assessment of traffic movements during the construction period.</p> <p>ii) Clarify the likely traffic generation that would arise from the removal/ deposition of such waste.</p>	<p>1.1 In answer to i), the traffic generation for the project includes all anticipated vehicle movements, including vehicle movements associated with the removal of excavated material. On this basis, they are included in the assessment of traffic movements during the construction period summarised in Table 1.3 of Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 13.1 (Application Document APP-119) and set out in more detail in Appendix 2 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) particularly Table A2.6 to Table A2.8.</p> <p>1.2 In answer to ii), paragraph 3.4.71 in ES Chapter 3 (Application Document APP-043) states that <i>'in rural and other open areas, it is not anticipated that stripping or trenching would generate any large volume of excavated material that needs to be removed from site, with all excavated material expected to be replaced within the working area'</i>. Paragraph 3.4.65 states that in urban areas there is an <i>'increased likelihood that material excavated from the pipeline trench would require off-site disposal; i.e. material excavated when laying pipelines in or across roads cannot be re-used, with suitable imported material having to be used for backfilling of the trench'</i>. These assumptions have been used when estimating the anticipated vehicle movements for the project as outlined in i) above. The Applicant therefore considers that the likely traffic generation that would arise from the removal of excavated material would be very low.</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
TT.1.4	<p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>i) Confirm that the Traffic and Transport assessment study area [APP-135] is established relevant to the locations of the proposed logistics hubs, construction compounds and where works are within roads which are anticipated to exceed four weeks in duration.</p> <p>To All Relevant Highway and Planning Authorities:</p> <p>i) Explain whether the extent of the study area for this assessment is acceptable.</p>	<p>1.1 The Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) considers the change in traffic flows at all logistics hubs (see Section 2.4 including Tables A2.10 and A2.11). Project traffic demand at construction compounds was calculated (see Table A2.8) showing one-way traffic demand at construction compounds. A change in the traffic flow on the adjacent road network was not undertaken at compounds because the total two-way traffic is forecast as 12 vehicles per day on average at each compound and therefore is very low. All roads where there would be traffic management or diversions exceeding four weeks were also assessed.</p> <p>1.2 This approach is set out in Appendix 8 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135), which was issued to and confirmed with relevant highway authorities.</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
TT.1.5	Provide Appendix 3 (Transport Assessment Scoping Report) to the Transport Assessment [APP-135].	<p>1.1 The Transport Assessment Scoping Report is provided with the deadline 2 submission documents (Document Reference 8.11).</p> <p>1.2 The Transport Assessment Scoping Report has previously been provided to Hampshire County Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England, as the relevant highways authorities. They were invited to provide comments through either meetings, Statements of Common Ground or other forms of communication. All three highways authorities have either confirmed that they are satisfied with the work completed based on it, and/or have not raised issues with the content of the document, as documented within the relevant Statements of Common Ground (Document References 8.4.23 and 8.4.30, and REP1-009).</p>
TT.1.6	Explain the screening processes undertaken with the relevant Highways Authorities for excluded the locations listed in Appendix 8 [APP-135] from the assessment	<p>1.1 The Transport Assessment Appendix 8 (Application Document APP-135) sets out all those locations considered for, but not requiring, assessment. In the majority of cases this is because the locations do not fulfill the criteria requiring potential impacts to last for a period exceeding four weeks. In only one exception, B3015 The Maultway, assessment is not required because works would be completed in the verge and so not restrict the movement of traffic.</p> <p>1.2 The criteria that potential impacts require assessment where they exceed four weeks was set out within the Scoping Report (AS-019) and within the draft Transport Assessment Scoping Report, which was issued to Surrey County Council and Hampshire County Council in January 2019. Scoping of the locations has also been discussed with the relevant Highways Authorities (Surrey County Council, Hampshire County Council and Highways England) in meetings, as recorded within the Statements of Common Ground (Document References 8.4.30 and 8.4.23, and REP1-009), where no issues in relation to this were raised.</p>
TT.1.7	i) With particular reference to Tables A2.1 and A2.2 in the Transport Assessment [APP-135] explain the certainty and	<p>1.1 In answer to i), the locations that were assessed are based on the proposed locations where there would be traffic management or diversions with potential impacts exceeding four weeks. This is based on both the agreed scoping criteria (set out within the Appendix 8.2 of the Scoping Report (AS-019) and in discussions with the relevant highway authorities (Hampshire County Council and Surrey County Council) as to how the pipeline would be constructed in or along the</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	<p>levels of sensitivity to the Assessed Locations used throughout the assessment.</p> <p>ii) It is noted in Footnote 1 in Table A2.2 that St. Catherine's Road is assumed to be completed at a slower rate than other urban locations. It is therefore assumed in the scoping exercise missing from Appendix 3 that there has been a similar assessment of all streets and highways that would be affected by the works. If not include the assessment that has been done in response to this question.</p> <p>iii) Confirm an apparent error in Table A2.2 Balmoral Drive column 4 which should read 375 and not 37.</p>	<p>carriageway. These discussions are recorded within the relevant Statements of Common Ground (Document References 8.4.23 and 8.4.30).</p> <p>1.2 The assessment is based on observed traffic data provided by the highway authorities or collected by the highway authorities for the project. Consistent with good practice, this baseline traffic data was used to generate a future baseline by applying industry standard growth factors (paragraphs 4.1.9 to 4.1.17 in the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135)). The baseline traffic flows therefore inherit the certainty and sensitivity provided by these factors, which are generated by the Department for Transport. The traffic flows therefore provide a 'central' or 'most likely' forecast scenario based on these factors. This approach was set out in paragraph A8.2.5.15 of the Scoping Report (AS-019).</p> <p>1.3 In answer to ii), the Applicant undertook a screening assessment of all roads potentially affected by the works. The streets and highways that met the screening criteria (i.e. works in Balmoral Drive that would exceed four weeks) were screened into and are assessed within the Transport Assessment, with the exception of St Catherine's Road that is assumed to be no worse than Balmoral Drive). Roads that did not fulfil the screening criteria, were screened out of the assessment and are documented in Appendix 8 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135).</p> <p>1.4 In answer to iii), the Applicant can confirm that the Examining Authority's statement is correct. Consistent with Table 1.4 in Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 (Application Document APP-119), Table A2.2 Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) Balmoral Drive column 4 should read 375 and not 37.</p>

ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
TT.1.8	Explain further the methodology outlined in Section 4 of the Transport Assessment [APP-135] with respect to whether the future baseline without the Proposed Development can be considered to represent a realistic worst-case for the assessment of journey times and collisions from traffic management and diversion impacts.	<p>1.1 The traffic flows used for the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) are based on observed data and industry standard growth factors (see response to Written Question TT.1.7 for further information). These traffic flows inform the baseline journey times and collisions for the realistic worst-case future baseline.</p> <p>1.2 Using the 2018 Baseline traffic flows, journey times were calculated using the method set out in Transport Assessment Section 4.1 'Journey Times' (Application Document APP-135), the calculation method used in standard industry software. The same method was applied to the 2022 Future Baseline to generate the realistic worst case, which assumes that there is no reassignment of traffic on the road network. This means that no dispersal of traffic was assumed, which may occur as traffic adopts alternative routes that could not be foreseen as part of the assessment but that are better suited to a driver's origin and destination. It therefore represents a realistic worst case for journey times.</p> <p>1.3 The assumption that there is no dispersal of affected traffic means that there is the greatest potential for changes in collisions on roads affected by traffic management and diversions using the method set out in Transport Assessment Section 4.1 'Collisions' (Application Document APP-135). It therefore represents a realistic worst case for collisions.</p>
TT.1.9	Justify the assumptions made in the assessments contained within the Transport Assessment [APP-135] as stated in paragraph 6.1.1 and used throughout the assessment regarding severe traffic effects and road diversions and explain the apparent	<p>1.1 The criteria based on potential impacts arising where changes exceed four weeks, which were used throughout Appendix 13.1 Traffic and Transport Technical Note (Application Document APP-119) were originally set out in Section A8.2.5 of Scoping Report (AS-019). This was not challenged in 4.11.9 of the Scoping Opinion (AS-018), which confirmed the need to assess changes to traffic flows, journey times and collisions and safety in urban areas. The four-week criteria are based on good practice from several other major construction projects that are linear in nature.</p> <p>1.2 The criteria that require potential impacts to exceed four weeks are confirmed in Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135). The same criteria are set out in Table 1.8 and Table 1.9 of Appendix 13.1 (Application Document APP-119). In both Table 4.5 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) and Table 1.10</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	<p>discrepancy between Appendix 13.1 [APP-119] and Appendix 13.2 paragraph 1.6.22 [APP-120] in this regard.</p>	<p>of Appendix 13.1 (Application Document APP-119) the criteria for assessment of collisions and safety are not based on potential impacts exceeding four weeks because they use the Annual Average Daily Traffic to calculate the change in 100 million vehicle kilometres. This is consistent with standard industry practice.</p> <p>1.3 There is a difference in the assessment of bus journey times between the criteria for the assessment of changes to bus journey times in paragraph 1.4.16 of Appendix 13.1 (Application Document APP-119) (which has no constraint based on distance) and para 4.2.9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) (which requires that there is a change in bus route distance of more than 400m for an impact to be considered). There is no requirement for criteria in a Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement to be identical, indeed they are often significantly different to reflect the different purposes of these documents. For this project the criteria are generally aligned. The criteria for the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) were provided for review by relevant highway authorities in the Transport Assessment Scoping Report (Appendix 3 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135)) prior to assessment and no concerns were raised by them.</p> <p>1.4 Paragraphs 1.6.20 to 1.6.23 of Appendix 13.2 (Application Document APP-120) include analysis and assessment of potential significant impacts on air quality from construction-related road traffic. The air quality assessment considered traffic associated with the construction logistics hubs and, consistent with relevant best practice guidance, is based on changes to Annual Average Daily Traffic. Therefore, the criteria used for the basis of the air quality assessment are different to the criteria used in paragraph 6.1.1 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135). However, the assessment is consistent with good practice for each discipline and so does not represent a discrepancy.</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
TT.1.10	Explain when the worst-case for construction activity is anticipated to be and how this has been established with respect to the anticipated phasing and duration of the construction works.	<p>1.1 The phasing of total one-way construction traffic is presented in Illustration 11.2 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135). This shows that the busiest month for total project traffic demand would be month 12 of the construction programme. This is determined based on the programme in Table 3.4 and assumptions set out in Appendix 2 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135). This total daily traffic demand would be spread across multiple sites (including logistics hubs and construction compounds) throughout the working day (07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday). Traffic generation for all sections of the pipeline that are anticipated to be undergoing construction during month 12 are included in the total traffic generation for that month.</p>
TT.1.11	<p>Paragraph 1.1.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-132] refers to the selection criteria for when trenchless as opposed to open cut techniques would be used. Amongst other things this includes 'heavily trafficked' roads.</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>i) Explain the criteria which determined roads which are deemed to be 'heavily trafficked'</p> <p>To All relevant Highway and Planning Authorities:</p>	<p>1.1 The text in paragraph 1.1.4 of the Planning Statement (Application Document APP-132) identifies a number of locational constraints where specialist trenchless techniques would be used to construct the pipeline. This includes reference to '<i>some other heavily trafficked roads</i>' (emphasis added). The full text of the sentence is, '<i>For major crossings of A-roads, motorways and some other heavily trafficked roads, railways and some watercourses, specialist trenchless techniques would be used</i>'.</p> <p>1.2 The identification of heavily trafficked roads was determined using professional judgement and feedback from the Highway Authorities.</p> <p>1.3 The construction methods for road crossings were discussed and agreed with the two highway authorities, Hampshire Highways Authority and Surrey Highways Authority, during the design development of the pipeline route. This is reflected in the Statements of Common Ground with the two authorities (Document References 8.4.23 and 8.4.30).</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	<p>ii) Confirm the roads selected as being correct.</p> <p>iii) Explain whether additional roads could be defined as 'heavily trafficked' and should benefit from trenchless crossings and if so, why.</p>	
TT.1.12	<p>RR-118 suggests that the change in route for the Cove Road section may have been undertaken for financial rather than technical reasons as it would enable the use of open cut as opposed to trenchless techniques even though this would potentially cause more disruption to road users.</p>	<p>1.1 The route derived was for technical reasons, the original route for crossing the railway at Cove Brook by horizontal directional drilling (HDD) was changed after discussions with Network Rail. The route did not meet the required criteria of crossing the railway at 90 degrees plus or minus 15 degrees, and the bore being 15m away from any Network Rail structure; the bridge supporting the railway over Cove Brook would have been impacted within these criteria.</p> <p>1.2 In addition to the above, the Applicant was not able to achieve the Network Rail settlement requirements. To achieve the Network Rail settlement requirements it would have required a significantly deep crossing of the railway, which in turn would require a longer entry point at the northern side to allow the required depth to be attained, which would then mean that the footprint for the HDD set up would not be possible without encroaching on the residential properties in West Heath Road. .</p>

ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
TT.1.13	<p>With particular reference to both Ashford Road and Woodthorpe Road confirm the following:</p> <p>i) How residents, businesses and other users of Ashford Road and Woodthorpe Road would be affected during construction works and over what period of time.</p> <p>ii) The alignment of the Order Limits and the Limits of Deviation.</p> <p>iii) Whether the works would be contained entirely within the carriageway.</p> <p>iv) Whether tree removal is necessary and over what period of time would the trees be removed.</p> <p>v) How on street parking and access arrangements</p>	<p>1.1 In response to i), at this stage, it is not practicable to state how long the roads would be affected as this is dependent on the detail of the construction programme both in terms of duration and timing. The project will seek to reduce the impact for all residents, not only those from Ashford Road and Woodthorpe Road, through the measures within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Document Reference 6.4 Appendix 16.1 (2)). Commitment G79 states '<i>Pedestrian access to and from residential, commercial, community and agricultural land uses would be maintained throughout the construction period. Vehicle access would be maintained where practicable. This may require signed diversions. The means of access would be communicated to affected parties at least two weeks in advance.</i>' In addition, commitment G26 states, '<i>Construction traffic movements would be kept to the minimum reasonable for the effective and safe construction of the project</i>', plus Commitment G23 states '<i>All plant and vehicles would be required to switch off their engines when not in use and when it is safe to do so.</i>' All traffic related issues will be documented in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (CoCP commitments G110 and G111) and agreed with the local authorities.</p> <p>1.2 In response to ii), the Order Limits and the limits of deviation for Ashford Road and Woodthorpe Road are as shown on the Sheets 51 and 52 respectively of the DCO Work Plans (AS-048) which include working and installation areas.</p> <p>1.3 In response to iii), the Order Limits as defined on Sheets 51 and 52 of the DCO Work Plans (AS-048) include the carriageway of Ashford Road and Woodthorpe Road, and extend beyond the carriageway into the verge and adjoining land. Where practicable, the Applicant intends not to lay the pipeline within the carriageway. However, it is not practicable at this stage to define the exact location of the pipeline.</p> <p>1.4 In response to iv), the total number of trees to be removed during the construction phase along Ashford Road and Woodthorpe Road has not been determined at this stage. This will be confirmed during the detailed design stage for the project. The CoCP (Document Reference 6.4 Appendix 16.1 (2)) commitment G65 states that '<i>Working widths would be reduced in specific locations where trees or hedges are present. Where notable trees would be retained within or immediately adjacent to the Order Limits, the trees and their root protection areas would be</i></p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	would be managed during construction.	<p><i>protected where they extend within the Order Limits and are at risk. This would be by means of fencing or other measures</i>'. The project is seeking to limit tree removal, but at this stage it is not practicable to specify which trees would need to be removed or when.</p> <p>1.5 In response to v), the Applicant would manage access and street parking through measures within the CoCP (Document Reference 6.4 Appendix 16.1 (2)). Commitment G79 states <i>'Pedestrian access to and from residential, commercial, community and agricultural land uses would be maintained throughout the construction period. Vehicle access would be maintained where practicable. This may require signed diversions. The means of access would be communicated to affected parties at least two weeks in advance.'</i> Emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout the areas impacted along the highway.</p> <p>1.6 In relation to the specific roads listed, they are all within the Order Limits. The on street parking details would be confirmed once the construction detail has been determined, and would be documented within the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). With regards to the roads referenced in the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woodthorpe Road – A busy road with some double yellow lines sections and some sections which allow on street parking. The works would be retained in as short an area as practicably possible to undertake the works. Parking would be available along some sections of Woodthorpe Road. There is also a car park (chargeable) off Church Road. • Ashford Road – A busy road with no parking restrictions through its length. The works would be retained in as short as practicably area possible to undertake the works. It is possible to park either side of the highway.



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
TT.1.14	<p>Table 4.1 of the Planning Statement (APP-132) provides an estimate of the average number of two-way vehicle movements per working day at each proposed logistics hub.</p> <p>Provide an hourly breakdown.</p>	<p>1.1 An hourly traffic flow profile was not developed for the project because the traffic generation is low. Traffic generation is forecast to be greatest at the M3 Junction 3: New Road, Windlesham logistics hub with 29 heavy and 159 light vehicle average two-way movements per working day. This is the five-day average across the whole construction programme and totals 188 vehicles.</p> <p>1.2 Construction workers travelling by car would primarily arrive and depart before 07:00 and after 19:00 for the working day. There would be a smaller number of cars arriving and departing throughout the day. Other light vehicles and heavy goods vehicles are expected to be spread across the working day. The peak demand within a day would therefore be outside of peak traffic hours for the road network and is not expected to impact on the performance of the road network, supporting the decision not to produce an hourly profile of traffic demand.</p> <p>1.3 The Applicant has advised the Planning Inspectorate (see REP1-001) of its intention to submit a change request to reduce the number and size of the temporary logistics hub sites included within the application for development consent. This would include the removal of the logistics hub at M3 Junction 3: New Road, Windlesham.</p>
TT.1.17	<p>Explain how, during construction, parking, access (vehicular and pedestrian) for residents, businesses and emergency services would be managed and maintained where the Order Limits run along an existing road. If this information has been provided, signpost where in the Application</p>	<p>1.1 The application includes good practice measures and construction commitments to manage the impacts of construction of the replacement pipeline so as to reduce the inconvenience to local residents, particularly where the construction works would be undertaken within a highway. Where commitments are listed below, they can be found in Table 16.2 of ES Chapter 16 (Application Document APP-056).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment G110 'A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) would be produced. The project would then implement measures within the CTMP.' • Commitment G111 lists the measures that would be included in the CTMP. • Commitment G26 'Construction traffic movements would be kept to the minimum reasonable for the effective and safe construction of the project.'



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	<p>documents it can be found. Make particular reference to the arrangements</p> <p>for Nash Close, Cove Road, Stake Lane, Brewers Close, Cabrol Road, Ship Lane, Ringwood Road, Balmoral Drive, St Catherines Road, Frith Hill Road and Canford Drive.</p>	<p>1.2 The street works would be undertaken in within controlled traffic management systems in accordance with Part (iii) of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and the details set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan, required to be agreed with the local highway authorities as set out in Requirement 7 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1 (3)).</p> <p>1.3 In regard to maintaining access (vehicle and pedestrian) to the highway for businesses and individual properties, the Applicant would develop a detailed schedule of proposed works within the highway and agree this through the CTMP with the relevant local highway authority. Within the application, as submitted, the Applicant has made specific commitments regarding access to residential, commercial, community and agricultural land uses. These are listed below and set out in Table 16.2 of ES Chapter 16 (Application Document APP-056).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment G79: '<i>Pedestrian access to and from residential, commercial, community and agricultural land uses would be maintained throughout the construction period. Vehicle access would be maintained where practicable. This may require signed temporary diversions. The means of access would be communicated to affected parties at least two weeks in advance.</i>' <p>1.4 The project would then implement measures within the CTMP. This document would provide the details of the procedure and methodology the Applicant would use to manage the impacts of the works within the highway.</p> <p>1.5 In regard to access in particular by emergency services, the Applicant has made the following response to relevant representations:</p> <p>The Applicant would discuss the proposed traffic management methodology and measures with the relevant local highway authority. These measures would be detailed in the CTMP. The Applicant would comply with statutory obligations which make it an offence to obstruct or hinder certain emergency workers who are responding to emergency circumstances. Emergency workers are defined as firefighters, ambulance workers and those transporting blood, organs or equipment on behalf of the NHS, coastguards and lifeboat crews. By default, allowing enough</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
		<p>access room to accommodate the emergency services listed, would enable refuse and delivery vehicles to access the highway adjacent to proposed works.</p> <p>1.6 In addition, the Applicant would adopt a Community Engagement Plan (See commitment G31 in the Code of Construction Practice (Document Reference 6.4 Appendix 6.1 (2)) which would manage the process to inform residents of the proposed works and impacts locally.</p> <p>1.7 In relation to the specific roads listed, they are all within the Order Limits. The on-street parking details would be confirmed once the construction detail has been determined, and would be documented within the CTMP. Taking each road in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nash Close – Residential road with parking space between the driveways. The works would be retained in as short a length as practicably possible to undertake the works, allowing parking outside of the works for the remaining length of the road. Only a limited number of parking spaces would be within the enclosed working area given the limited space available. • Cove Road – A busy road with double yellow lines throughout the Order Limits hence there is no on street parking. The works would be retained in as short as practicable an area to undertake the works, allowing parking outside of the works for the remaining length of the road. • Stake Lane and Brewers Close – The proposal is to use trenchless techniques below Stake Lane. Access only by foot would be required; parking on the carriageway would not be affected. Access to the private garages within Stake Lane would be limited; alternative on-road parking within Brewers Close is assumed to be available. • Cabrol Road – Residential road with restricted on-street parking on one side and double yellow lines on the other side. This is a narrow road with free parking at the far end at Queen Elizabeth Park. • Ship Lane – The carriageway has dedicated parking between the driveways and double yellow lines along the opposite side, so no on-street parking. The enclosed works would be



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
		<p>limited in length, allowing parking outside of the works for the remaining length of the road, as only a limited number of parking spaces would be within the enclosed working area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ringwood Road – Limited on-street parking as the driveways are close together. The enclosed works would be limited in length, allowing parking outside of the works for the remaining length of the road. There is a free car park at the end of Ringwood Road if required. • Balmoral Drive – A long through road with no parking restrictions for the majority of the road. The church and shops have their own parking off Balmoral Road which will remain available. Residential properties are all located at feeder roads with on-street parking. There would be on-street parking available outside of the working area. • St Catherines Road – A narrow through road with no parking restrictions. This is the only proposed road closure and there is no residential access off this section of road. • Frith Hill Road – A narrow through road with no parking restrictions. Alternative parking would be available on the road outside of the working area. • Canford Drive – Residential road with parking space between the driveways. The works would be retained in as short as practicable an area to undertake the works, allowing parking outside of the works for the remaining length of the road. Only a limited number of parking spaces would be affected within the enclosed working area given the limited space available.
TT.1.19	In paragraph 3.1.8 of the Transport Assessment [APP-135] the Balmoral Drive diversion route is detailed. This omits Field Lane.	<p>1.1 Traffic flow data (see Transport Assessment Appendix 4, Application Document APP-135) was obtained for B3411 Frimley Green Road, Balmoral Drive and Buckingham Way. This provided the baseline traffic flow data for the assessment of the diversion associated with Balmoral Drive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmoral Drive traffic flow data was used to indicate the volume of diverting traffic;

ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	<p>i) Explain why parts of the assessment only include Buckingham Way and Frimley Green Road and not the whole route.</p> <p>ii) Explain why later tables starting with Table 5.2 have Buckingham Way and Frimley Green Road separate from row entitled Balmoral Drive diversion route.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B3411 Frimley Green Road provided data for an adjacent local distributor road, where traffic flows along the diversion are likely to be highest; and Buckingham Way provided data for a local road representative of the diversion route away from the local distributor road. <p>1.2 In answer to i), the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) includes the whole route based on the traffic flows from the locations identified above. Although the description omits Field Lane in the description, it is included in the assessment. This is demonstrated by the length used in the journey time assessment provided in Table A5.1. 2,050 metres was used for the Balmoral Drive Diversion Route, which includes Frimley Green Road, Grove Cross Road, Frimley Grove Gardens, Field Lane and Buckingham Way.</p> <p>1.3 In answer to ii), because B3411 Frimley Green Road and Buckingham Way are used to provide traffic flows for the Balmoral Drive diversion, these roads are shown separately to provide the reader with the traffic flows that are then used to generate the traffic flow inputs for the Balmoral Drive diversion both with and without diverted traffic.</p>
TT.1.20	<p>i) Explain why in Table 4.4 of the Transport Assessment [APP-135] reference is made to change in peak hour journey times, then changes in bus route distance of more than 400 meters is used in the assessment of impact on bus users as set out in paragraph 4.2.9. and outputted into Table 8.9.</p>	<p>1.1 In answer to i), the assessment of journey times for all vehicles, including the separate assessment for buses, is based on peak hours. The assessment of buses is also based on changes in route distance of more than 400 metres, which is an approach adopted as good practice from other major schemes for linear projects.</p> <p>1.2 In answer to ii), Table 8.9 and paragraph 8.2.7 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) show that there are no severe impacts on buses because there are no changes in route distance exceeding 400 metres. The statement made in paragraph 10.1.3 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135) is based on paragraph 8.2.5 and Tables 8.7 and 8.8 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135). These indicate that the greatest change in journey time is approximately two minutes on the assessed diversion and traffic management. However, this is based on the diversion for Balmoral Drive, which does not carry any bus services. On this basis the largest assessed delay that bus users</p>



ExQ1	Question:	Applicant response to Question:
	ii) Explain how in paragraph 10.1.3 at the third bullet point the statement that bus services may experience delays of up to two minutes is evidenced.	would experience is approximately 1 minute in the AM peak based on B377 Ashford Road (see Table 8.7 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document APP-135)).