

Simon Jones
Spatial Planning Manager
Highways England
Lateral
8 City Walk
Leeds LS11 9AT

Direct Line: 0300 470 2337

Ian Stokes
Development Officer (Transport Strategy)
City of York Council
West Offices
Station Rise
York
YO1 6GA

29th August 2018

By email only

Dear Ian,

YORK LOCAL PLAN MODELLING 2018

We have considered the latest model forecasts which were provided on 3rd August 2018. We have also reviewed the accompanying Technical Note which sets out the various forecasting scenarios.

Review of the future year forecasts

As you are aware, we have had concerns with the original forecast scenario that was presented as the trips from the matrix were constrained to TEMPRO traffic growth forecasts. This reduced the number of trips generated by the strategic sites and therefore did not reflect the potential impact of the strategic sites.

The Council therefore developed a number of alternative methodologies which did not constrain the matrix to TEMPRO. Of these four alternative methods, we would suggest that Method 5 (Furnished) provided the best representation of the trips generated by the strategic sites. However, we note that the departures from zone 329, which represents strategic site 15 (Land West of Elvington Lane), are less than forecast.

For the Furnessed method, assuming the same distribution of trips from zone 329, there could potentially be a further 170 trips northbound on the A64 (north of Grimston Bar) and 220 trips southbound on the A64 (south of the new junction) in the morning peak. In the evening peak, there could potentially be a further 100 trips northbound on the A64 (north of Grimston Bar) and 126 trips southbound on the A64 (south of the proposed junction).

Our consultant, SYSTRA, has queried this discrepancy with your colleague, Ben Crick. However, to expedite consideration of any required mitigation, we have agreed a way forward.

Model results (for Furnessed Forecast Method)

We have analysed queued traffic (i.e. the traffic that cannot get through the model). Our analysis shows that there is a significant amount of queued traffic, particularly in the evening peak, with 243 PCU's not able to reach the A64 southbound (south of the proposed junction on the A64). This additional traffic could make forecast problems worse, or could result in additional problems.

We note that the capacities of some of the links and saturation flows at some of the junctions used in the base model are low compared with guidance given in the Highways England *Regional Transport Model Coding Manual*. However, where this is not the case, an improvement may be required on the strategic road network and/or the local road network.

As the model has been calibrated and validated, we would not recommend changing capacities or saturation flows without checking that the base model still calibrates and validates. However, we accept that this will not be possible before the Examination in Public. Therefore, we have considered the queued traffic at each junction when determining whether any mitigation is required.

Junction assessments

Based on the model results and the queued traffic, we would suggest that there are potential issues which may require mitigation at the following junctions:

- A1237 Hopgrove
- A1079 Grimston Bar
- A19 Fulford Road

We therefore request that these junctions are now tested, by the Council, using appropriate local junction models to confirm whether mitigation is required, and the scale and nature of that accordingly.

The base assessments should use manual traffic turning counts and queue length survey data, and we understand that you hold this. We suggest that you add the difference in flow between the base and forecast year model to the observed traffic flows to produce the forecast year traffic flows.

Highways England has identified the A64 at Hopgrove as a priority for improvement within the RIS to improve the junction.

Merge / diverge assessments

We note that the models show areas of concern at the majority of the merges and diverges on the SRN (A64). We will therefore require that merge/diverge assessments (in accordance with DMRB) are also undertaken by yourselves. To ensure that all the forecast traffic is considered, the difference in demand flows should be used.

This will allow for the traffic which is not getting through in the modelled hour due to a constraint in the network. Where possible, HATRIS data should be used as the base. The difference in flow between the base and forecast year model, should then be added to the observed traffic flows to give the forecast year flows.

I trust the above comments are of assistance.

Yours sincerely

Simon

Simon Jones
Spatial Planning Manager
Email: simon.jones@highwaysengland.co.uk