Hi Georgina

Thanks for your email.

Yes this does answer our question. Thank you.

With regards to the Highways England, contacting Highways England should come directly from yourselves. It is not typical for us to do this on your behalf because it is your Local Plan. As a borough, you decide at what point you would like to engage with Highways England. Some boroughs/districts do this early in the process, others much later when their preferred option is known. It is often related to the impact which is estimated to occur on the HE’s network, and whether it identifies any mitigation requirements on their network. As a result, all correspondence should go directly through yourselves. Obviously we will offer support as and when required.

Rest assured, however, we do already work closely with Janice, and their team are familiar with the model.

Given your recent communications with the Highways England, please can I suggest that you submit the Transport Assessment report directly to them once this is complete at the end of May and you are satisfied with the findings. The model’s development and validation will also be contained within this report.

Kind regards

Gemma

To improve client satisfaction, please can you take 5 minutes to complete the following survey:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TransportStudies
Hello Georgie

Yes please, can you apply the 73:35 ratio to the DERA site and rows 179-202 please as well as row 284 (you have put row 285 but this already has the unit breakdown so my assumption is you mean row 284?). In terms of row 15, this ‘DERA ratio’ would not apply as I have put the breakdown in for this site based on the approved plans.

Does that answer your question?

On a separate point we held a Duty to Cooperate presentation and workshop this morning and Heather Archer from Highways England came. She said that she was not aware that SCC had sent them a scope for the TIA work for Runnymede. She asked if the SRN junctions had been modelled. She also said that they would be looking for details of which model SCC is using and confirmation of how SCC has updated their model to take into account recent surveys. She said that a model validation report should also ideally be submitted to them. She asked if these items could be sent to planningSE@highwaysengland.co.uk FAO Janice Burgess.

Please can you advise me if SCC has already consulted with Highways England, and if not can this be done? We would rather iron out any issues with Highways England now before we run into difficulties further down the line.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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From: Georgina Sharpe [mailto:georgina.sharpe@surreycc.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 April 2016 11:45
To: Karen Merredew
Cc: Gemma Joyner
Subject: FW: Proforma - defining sites

Hi Karen,

Thank you for this. Everything is clear apart from point 5. I just wanted to confirm that you would like to apply the new ratio of 73:35 houses:flats ratio to the rest of the DERA units AND ALL OTHER proposed residential sites with unknown amounts of flats/houses and known amounts of units (Rows: 15, 179-202 and 221. (SCC refs 100, 256-271, 306-313, 285)).

Below is the text that I am referring to:
5. Some of the Proposed Residential sites have unknown or blank amounts of houses (column BC) and flats (column BE) despite a known total number of units. Could you supply this detail please as it is these values which are used to generate trip rates? This information has been inserted where we have it. If this is unavailable we can assume all proposed units are houses as this is the worst case scenario, or we can do a 50:50 split? Please can you apply the same house:flat ratio for all of the remaining sites as is being proposed for the first 108 units on DERA North (row 84)?
Dear Ms Burgess,

As you may be aware, we recently held a Duty to Cooperate workshop at the Council Offices (April 22nd). Your colleague Heather Archer attended this meeting alongside Stephen Gee from WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff. Stephen Gee raised at the meeting that there were concerns that:

- Highways England had not been sent the scope for the TIA work for Runnymede.
- It was not clear if the SRN junctions had been modelled.
- Highways England needs details of which model SCC is using and confirmation of how SCC has updated their model to take into account recent surveys.
- Highways England needs to see the model validation report.

I have discussed these points with our contact at Surrey County Council (SCC), Gemma Joyner who has suggested that Runnymede submits the Transport Assessment report to Highways England once this is complete at the end of May and Runnymede officers are satisfied with the findings. She has advised that the model's development and validation will also be contained within this report. She has assured me that SCC works closely with you and that your team is familiar with Surrey’s model.

Is this an acceptable course of action to Highways England? To clarify, the TIA that SCC is currently producing will support the Council’s Issues and Options consultation which is due to commence at the end of June for 6 weeks. We have asked SCC to model 6 different scenarios for growth in the Borough. Whilst we will be indicating our preferred strategy for growth as part of the Issues and Options consultation, this will not be firmed up until November this year when we finalise our pre submission version of the Plan for our second round of consultation in December. We envisage that further transport modelling will be required to take place between August and November to take account of any comments made during the Issues and Options consultation, including those made by Highways England on the Council’s proposals.

I hope that the approach suggested in relation to our TIA is acceptable to you and look forward to hearing your views in due course.

Kind regards

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This
George,

I agree with your proposal. The email looks to me to be a more or less standard one designed to safeguard their position in the event of a 'worst case scenario', which I am sure will not arise with our arrangement with SCC.

Thanks,

Richard
Dear Georgina,

Thank you for your email clarifying the work being undertaken by Surrey County Council in developing the Transport Assessment that will form part of the local plan evidence base. Whilst we are happy with the approach outlined below we should highlight that should any concerns be raised about the suitability of the model or methodology then this could result in abortive work and delays to the timescales outline in below.

We look forward to working with all parties as the Runnymede Local Plan develops.

Regards

Sent on behalf of Janice Burgess Spatial Planning Manager

Teresa Gonet,
NDD SE Strategy & Planning Team
Highways England | Bridge House | 1 Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | GU1 4LZ

Web: www.highways.gov.uk, www.highwaysengland.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales No. 9346363
Hi Georgina

Thanks for your email and forwarding HE’s response. In fact they are very similar to another borough’s response which was received last week. Hopefully I can put your mind at ease at little - there is nothing too concerning which shouldn’t be able to be worked through with the HE to satisfy their needs. Most of the comments refer to clarification of the methodology employed.

I have written my views to their comments in blue next to the HE’s below. Please note that this is not a formal response for the HE, but just opinions for yourself, as requested, so that you have a better understanding.

Given where you are in the development of the Local Plan, you could respond on the basis that we will be revisiting the transport modelling assessment prior to your next round of consultation and to finalising site allocations and will engage with them to address any concerns at this point? This is in fact what another borough is currently considering who are at a similar stage to you. The problem is that until you know what your final option is, it is very difficult for us to provide any further detail to the HE.

We will not directly liaise with the HE, as it is your Local Plan and not ours. However, if you do want to meet with them, obviously we will provide support and work through together their concerns.

Kind regards

Gemma

Gemma Joyner MSc MTPS
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport
020 8541 7378
gemma.joyner@surreycc.gov.uk
gemma.joyner@surreycc.gcsx.gov.uk

To improve client satisfaction, please can you take 5 minutes to complete the following survey:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TransportStudies
Dear Gemma

Please see attached the consultation response that I have just received from Highways England on the TIA. Having read it, I have to say that I am very concerned about the comments they have made as they seem to have a number of fundamental concerns about the TIA and as such I fear it is likely that we will receive an objection from them during our forthcoming consultation. Obviously we try to avoid objections from statutory consultees wherever possible.

Are you able to review their email today and let me know your thoughts? Are you able to liaise with Highways England on the technical aspects of the work? Obviously I am keen that whatever necessary is done to overcome the concerns that have been raised as soon as possible.

Any advice that you can provide would be much appreciated.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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From: Gonet, Teresa [mailto:Teresa.Gonet2@highwaysengland.co.uk]
Sent: 16 June 2016 09:17
To: Georgina Pacey
Cc: Planning SE; Burgess, Janice
Subject: #543 Runnymede TIA

Dear Georgina,

Thank you for your email dated 7 June 2016 consulting Highways England on the Transport Assessment.

Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

We note the document has been prepared by Surrey County Council (SCC) and is based on their SINTRAM strategic highway model, which uses OmniTRANS software, has a base year of 2009 and models the road network of Surrey and surrounding local authorities. Given the age of the observed origin-destination data in the base model and current DfT guidance on the age of underlying data
used in transport models, our view is that the model may no longer be suitable for use. Should Runnymede wish to use such a model further justification should be provided and/or refinements made to the model to ensure that we can have sufficient confidence that its forecasts adequately cover likely future traffic flow impacts. During peak times, most traffic flows have not altered, particularly in congested areas. It may mean that we will need to show evidence of this for the borough to satisfy their needs.

Section 2.4.2 details that only a AM average peak hour has been provided. Given the heavy congestion experienced on the M25 and M3 through Runnymede and outside throughout most afternoons and evenings, it is imperative that an evening peak hour assessment is also provided. Recommend that a PM average peak assessment is undertaken during the stage of model assessment.

The model uses weekday average peak hours (0700-1000 for AM, 1000-1600 for inter peak; and 1600-1900 for PM). The use of average peak hours over a 3 hour period is likely to underestimate the actual peak hour situation. This means that the assessment of highway capacity including impact of local developments in the borough may not be sufficiently robust as network capacity is likely to appear better than it should be. Therefore, it is recommended/suggested that the analysis is undertaken for the busiest peak hour for the AM and PM peak hours Section 2.1 outlines that the 2014 reference year has been created from the 2009 base using a growth rate derived from 64 observed DfT counts within Surrey, which show that the number of cars and total traffic has reduced in the AM peak, although the number of LGVs and HGVs has increased along with all vehicle types in the PM peak, with growth rates for all vehicles of 0.984 in the AM peak hour. However, details of the count locations and which growth rate has been used does not appear to be set out. With regards to the point above - we can either provide a peak hour assessment on top of a peak period (would suggest only AM peak hour), and/or show evidence from count sites located across the borough of not requiring this as the peak hour is not so marked. It is difficult though, as the hour of peak flow will vary for different locations and road types. Given the assessment is for the entire borough - it is finding the best balance, and given the location of your potential development sites, I do not think that it is an issue if only the peak periods are assessed. Also the HE sometimes need reminding that there are very few counties out there that are lucky enough to have a model to make an assessment such as this! Furthermore, the peak on the HE’s network is not likely to be 0800 - 0900 - for example at M25 J10 (A3 Wisley interchange) is 0700 - 0800 - so it is about finding a balance for all parties involved.

Looking at the NTM adjusted growth in TEMPRO for all roads within the borough, rate of 1.0419 for the AM peak is provided, indicating that application of the growth rates derived from DfT counts across the borough could be low and therefore underestimate traffic flow in 2014, especially for the AM peak hour. This depends on where the 64 DfT counts are taken and therefore how representative they are. Tempro v6.2 is now quite out of date and the industry is eagerly waiting for the DfT to revise their forecasts with their next release, particularly as time and time again they have been shown to be overoptimistic. Furthermore they are most suited to variable demand, whilst this a fixed trip assessment and hence the impact of growth is not dampened, as would be the case using a variable demand assignment.

Section 2.5.4 highlights that a calibration factor of 0.5 has been applied to the A30 Egham By-pass approach to Runnymede roundabout in the base model. Additional information should be provided to detail the effect of this adjustment. This can easily be provided. Also it has no bearing on the forecast scenarios as the Runnymede roundabout major scheme is in place removing the need for the calibration factor has been removed.

Section 3.4 of the report outlines that TRICS has been used to calculate vehicle trips but does not set
out the trip rates used. Further, net trips have been calculated whereby those associated with the previous or existing land use have been subtracted from the new development trips. Where trip rates are subtracted based on a previous use that is no longer operational, this could result in an underestimation of trips as the 2014 scenario is based on a growth rate from observed data. Indeed, it is noted that negative trips result at a number of locations. I don't fully understand this comment - I think they haven't fully grasped the method as only developments since 2014 are considered so we are not removing trips twice.

Analysis of the trips in the document with TRICS suggests that the residential trip rates used are likely to underestimate trips for the AM peak hour. Based on the information on number of units and associated trips, this suggests a trip rate of approximately 0.35 per unit in the AM peak hour. This is considered low for the AM peak hour, as the TRICS average for mixed housing developments in Surrey is 0.44 in the AM peak. TRICS values used go beyond 'Surrey' to obtain a bigger sample by location type.

It is noted that section 4.7 outlines that the following Highways England links have been identified as hotspots, indicating that mitigation is likely to be required:

M25 mainline junctions 10 to 11 clockwise
M25 mainline at junction 11 anticlockwise
M25 mainline junctions 11 to 12 clockwise
M25 mainline at junction 11 clockwise
M25 mainline junctions 12 to 11 anticlockwise
M25 mainline junctions 12 to 13 clockwise
M25 mainline at junction 12 clockwise
M25 on-slip to M3 westbound
M3 eastbound junction 2 off-slip to M25
M3 junction 2 off-slip to M25 clockwise

As detailed junction capacity analyses have yet to be undertaken, it is not possible to identify what mitigation may be required at the above locations. Additionally, given the lack of peak hour assessments the extent and scope of impacts may be subject to change.

I would be grateful if these matters could be considered further with the modelling updated as necessary and as agreed by Highways England based on the comments outlined. This is necessary to ensure that a robust Transportation Assessment supports the Development Plan as currently Highways England is concerned that the modelling is likely to underestimate the situation with the proposed developments. It will also be necessary to consider the locations highlighted above and potentially elsewhere with a view to potential mitigations to ensure that the Development Plan proposals are deliverable with a no worsening of the operation of the Strategic Road Network.

I trust that our initial comments are of assistance and look forward to working with the Council and its Surrey County Council partners as the plan develops.

Thanks

Sent on behalf of Janice Burgess Spatial Planning Manager

Teresa Gonet,
Dear Teresa

Many thanks to your email. I am pleased to confirm that the Runnymede Transport Assessment has now been completed (attached) We will be formally going out for public consultation on our Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document on 29th June, and this document will form part of our evidence base, but I wanted to give you the opportunity to view the Assessment in advance.

I will send you the maps via 2 separate emails as I can only send them one at a time because of their size.

If you have any comments on the content of the Transport Assessment, please do let me know and Runnymede officers would be happy to meet with you to discuss.

Kind regards

Georgina Pacey

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
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Dear Georgina,

Thank you for your email dated 10 June 2016 regarding the above consultation.

Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft document. We will provide comments on the final document when available during the consultation period, and look forward to receiving notification in due course.

If you have any queries regarding this response, please contact us.

Issued on behalf of:

Janice Burgess
Spatial Planning Manager - M25
(M25 DBFO Leatherhead and Sunbury H&S Depot Champion)
Highways England Company Limited
Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 4LZ
Registered in England and Wales No. 9346363

Direct Tel: 0300 470 105 | Mobile: 07778262531
www.highwaysengland.co.uk
Dear Sirs

On Wednesday 29th June, Runnymede Borough Council will be commencing a 7 week public consultation on its Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document as part of its ongoing work on its Local Plan. The Council has identified Highways England in its October 2015 Duty to Cooperate Framework as a relevant Duty to Cooperate body for matters relating to transport.

The Council’s Duty to Cooperate Framework identifies that in the preparation of its Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation, RBC will circulate its emerging consultation document to relevant partners to provide an opportunity for discussion prior to the commencement of the public consultation.

In line with this commitment, please find attached the Council’s draft Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation document which will go before Planning Committee on 22nd June and where approval will be sought for the document to be subject to public consultation, subject to minor amendments being made to the document following receipt of the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal Report later this month.

Please note that this document should be treated as confidential until it is released into the public domain one week before the planning committee meeting on 15th June. We are also aware that there are a number of what appear to be minor formatting issues in the document. This is where we have had problems with the file when it has been converted to a pdf because of its size, but the actual content is as it should be.

Should you have any comments to make on the contents of the document in advance of the consultation, or should you wish to meet with Richard and I to discuss any cross boundary matters, please do let us know as we value your input as we progress with our Plan.

Yours faithfully

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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Dear Teresa,

Many thanks for looking at the Runnymede TIA so quickly and coming back with detailed comments. I have passed your email straight to Surrey County Council and ask that they review your comments and come back to me as soon as possible so that we can hopefully seek to progress positively to address the concerns that you have raised.

Either myself or an officer at Surrey County Council will come back to you as soon as possible on the points that you have highlighted.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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From: Gonet, Teresa [mailto:Teresa.Gonet2@highwaysengland.co.uk]
Sent: 16 June 2016 09:17
To: Georgina Pacey
Cc: Planning SE; Burgess, Janice
Subject: #543 Runnymede TIA

Dear Georgina,

Thank you for your email dated 7 June 2016 consulting Highways England on the Transport Assessment.
Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

We note the document has been prepared by Surrey County Council (SCC) and is based on their SINTRAM strategic highway model, which uses OmniTRANS software, has a base year of 2009 and models the road network of Surrey and surrounding local authorities. Given the age of the observed origin-destination data in the base model and current DfT guidance on the age of underlying data used in transport models, our view is that the model may no longer be suitable for use. Should Runnymede wish to use such a model further justification should be provided and/or refinements made to the model to ensure that we can have sufficient confidence that its forecasts adequately cover likely future traffic flow impacts.

Section 2.4.2 details that only an AM average peak hour has been provided. Given the heavy congestion experienced on the M25 and M3 through Runnymede and outside throughout most afternoons and evenings, it is imperative that an evening peak hour assessment is also provided.

The model uses weekday average peak hours (0700-1000 for AM, 1000-1600 for inter peak; and 1600-1900 for PM). The use of average peak hours over a 3 hour period is likely to underestimate the actual peak hour situation. This means that the assessment of highway capacity including impact of local developments in the borough may not be sufficiently robust as network capacity is likely to appear better than it should be. Therefore, it is recommended/suggested that the analysis is undertaken for the busiest peak hour for the AM and PM peak hours.

Section 2.1 outlines that the 2014 reference year has been created from the 2009 base using a growth rate derived from 64 observed DfT counts within Surrey, which show that the number of cars and total traffic has reduced in the AM peak, although the number of LGVs and HGVs has increased along with all vehicle types in the PM peak, with growth rates for all vehicles of 0.984 in the AM peak hour. However, details of the count locations and which growth rate has been used does not appear to be set out.

Looking at the NTM adjusted growth in TEMPRO for all roads within the borough, rate of 1.0419 for the AM peak is provided, indicating that application of the growth rates derived from DfT counts across the borough could be low and therefore underestimate traffic flow in 2014, especially for the AM peak hour. This depends on where the 64 DfT counts are taken and therefore how representative they are.

Section 2.5.4 highlights that a calibration factor of 0.5 has been applied to the A30 Egham By-pass approach to Runnymede roundabout in the base model. Additional information should be provided to detail the effect of this adjustment.

Section 3.4 of the report outlines that TRICS has been used to calculate vehicle trips but does not set out the trip rates used. Further, net trips have been calculated whereby those associated with the previous or existing land use have been subtracted from the new development trips. Where trip rates are subtracted based on a previous use that is no longer operational, this could result in an underestimation of trips as the 2014 scenario is based on a growth rate from observed data. Indeed, it is noted that negative trips result at a number of locations.

Analysis of the trips in the document with TRICS suggests that the residential trip rates used are likely to underestimate trips for the AM peak hour. Based on the information on number of units and associated trips, this suggests a trip rate of approximately 0.35 per unit in the AM peak hour. This is
considered low for the AM peak hour, as the TRICS average for mixed housing developments in Surrey is 0.44 in the AM peak.

It is noted that section 4.7 outlines that the following Highways England links have been identified as hotspots, indicating that mitigation is likely to be required:

- M25 mainline junctions 10 to 11 clockwise
- M25 mainline at junction 11 anticlockwise
- M25 mainline junctions 11 to 12 clockwise
- M25 mainline at junction 11 clockwise
- M25 mainline junctions 12 to 11 anticlockwise
- M25 mainline junctions 12 to 13 clockwise
- M25 mainline at junction 12 clockwise
- M25 on-slip to M3 westbound
- M3 eastbound junction 2 off-slip to M25
- M3 junction 2 off-slip to M25 clockwise

As detailed junction capacity analyses have yet to be undertaken, it is not possible to identify what mitigation may be required at the above locations. Additionally, given the lack of peak hour assessments the extent and scope of impacts may be subject to change.

I would be grateful if these matters could be considered further with the modelling updated as necessary and as agreed by Highways England based on the comments outlined. This is necessary to ensure that a robust Transportation Assessment supports the Development Plan as currently Highways England is concerned that the modelling is likely to underestimate the situation with the proposed developments. It will also be necessary to consider the locations highlighted above and potentially elsewhere with a view to potential mitigations to ensure that the Development Plan proposals are deliverable with a no worsening of the operation of the Strategic Road Network.

I trust that our initial comments are of assistance and look forward to working with the Council and its Surrey County Council partners as the plan develops.

Thanks

Sent on behalf of Janice Burgess Spatial Planning Manager

Teresa Gonet,
NDD SE Strategy & Planning Team
Highways England | Bridge House | 1 Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | GU1 4LZ

Web: www.highways.gov.uk, www.highwaysengland.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales No. 9346363
Hi Sue

Thanks for your email. I agree that some kind of meeting with HE is required. Richard is back from holiday tomorrow, let me chat with him about it and I will come back asap with some potential dates. Obviously I am happy to arrange the meeting and we are happy to host or come to County Hall. As you say, hopefully this could be useful in determining whether a further meeting with people like DCLG and other boroughs and districts is required, depending on what position HE takes on various issues. Has this issue been raised at PWG yet? Could be an interesting one for discussion.

As you know, my ultimate concern is the Duty to Cooperate and Runnymede showing that it is working with HE in a positive way to address concerns. Hence whilst I take Gemma’s point that it is difficult to go too far until we have picked our final strategy, I think that reaching agreement with HE on how we intend to proceed moving forward to address their concerns would be worthwhile.

Thanks to you and Gemma for your continuing help.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
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Hello Gemma

Sorry for the delay in responding to your email. I note that from the 8th July you will no longer be our contact for the TIA work, best of luck with your new arrival!

In terms of our timescales moving forward, it sounds like Surrey could have another pinch point on its hands I’m afraid. Our detailed timetable for the next phase of our local plan work (i.e. between the close of the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation and the commencement of our pre submission consultation) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29th June 2016</td>
<td>Commencement of Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th August 2016</td>
<td>Close of IOPA consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th June-2nd November 2016</td>
<td>Consideration of all representations received during the IOPA consultation and revise Plan as necessary in readiness for pre sub consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd November 2016</td>
<td>Agreed deadline for 16th November Planning Committee. All relevant material must be passed to committee section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th November 2016</td>
<td>Planning Committee to approve material for pre submission consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th December 2016</td>
<td>Full Council to approve material for pre submission consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th December 2016</td>
<td>Pre submission consultation to commence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st February 2017</td>
<td>Pre submission consultation to close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, working backwards, as we need to have all completed documentation for our pre submission plan with our committees section by 2nd November 2016. Therefore our HRA and SA consultants will need this draft consultation report for the preceding month (i.e. we will need to send it to them at the beginning of October). Therefore the TIA will need to be completed by October. We will need Surrey to do any necessary modelling to support our chosen spatial strategy. Are you able to provide an indication of how long it would take SCC to produce the TIA at this stage in the process, and whether we would need to provide you with the same level of information and format of information as we did this time?

Many thanks for your help.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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From: Gemma Joyner [mailto:gemma.joyner@surreycc.gov.uk]
Sent: 07 June 2016 14:54
To: Georgina Pacey
Cc: John Devonshire; Richard Ford; Georgina Sharpe; William Bryans; Sue Janota
Subject: RE: Comments on TIA - version 2

Hi Georgina
Thank you for responding so quickly and please find version 2 of the report attached.

Just so that you are aware, I will be going on maternity leave from the 8th July. In my absence, please can you contact Sue Janota, but obviously I will be around for the next few weeks if you have any further questions.

With regards to the delivery of any future assessment work, if you are able to please can you let us know when you would like us to undertake the next assessment and what your deadlines are? We are keen to avoid the disappointment that you experienced this time with regards to timescales. At the moment we already have Elmbridge and Tandridge Local Plans programmed in for this Autumn and would like to ensure that we are in a position to meet your timescales too.

Please can I also ask that you make us aware of when the report is issued to Highways England - that way we can be ready to assist with any questions they may have.

Many thanks

Gemma

______________________________
Gemma Joyner MSc MTPS
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport
020 8541 7378
+ gemma.joyner@surreycc.gov.uk
+ gemma.joyner@surreycc.gcsx.gov.uk

To improve client satisfaction, please can you take 5 minutes to complete the following survey:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TransportStudies

Hi Gemma

Thanks for coming back to me so quickly. Please see my comments below in red.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
g Georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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Hi Georgina

Thank you for your comments.

In answer to your questions:

- para 2.5.3 regarding site visits. Yes site visits have taken place. In terms of the strategic model, this does not just relate to your borough and also the site visits are over a long period of time (i.e. years) rather than necessarily specific to this study. For example in Runnymede, I have personally visited Egham, Runnymede Roundabout and the level crossings to enhance this model for the past Airtrack assessment. If you would prefer me to leave this out, to avoid confusion then please let me know. The site visits relate to existing highway conditions and behaviour rather than any proposed development sites. I think you can leave as is Gemma. But thank you for the explanation.

- para 2.5.4. The factor reduces the model delay at the junction by half to reflect observed delay. Without it the model was overestimating delay here and flow on the A30 was consequently very low, providing a poor replication of reality. The current part time signals on Runnymede Roundabout have a very long intergreen to enable vehicles from the A30 to enter the circulatory carriageway. Although these signals are captured in the model, this interaction is not capable within a strategic model. Hence to overcome this, a calibration factor has been applied. I am happy to add further context to this paragraph, leave alone, or omit it entirely - what would you prefer? If you could add some further context, this would be helpful.

- para 2.6.2. The reason why "Rusham Park Centre" has a separate zone is because the existing zone connector feeds trips directly to Egham town centre and not Prune Hill. This would not reflect well the change in trip generation arising from the site. As a result, to more accurately capture the impact of this, we gave it its own zone. It is recognised that this is part of the baseline and therefore not part of the main assessment. However, we had a spare zone that we could utilise for a comparatively sizeable development. Thanks Gemma, I have no further questions on this.

- para 2.7.1. Don't worry, we are not expecting you to understand the technical details of trip assignment. Unfortunately we need to report on this in the 'technical' section as it is key to the method adopted in the model. These statements are for partners, such as Highways England and other related professional bodies to understand the methods applied, and the standards adopted. I would say that the entire Section 2 is for this purpose - to be transparent and for other technical bodies, rather than public domain. Similarly with the calibration factor of para 2.5.4 - for us to be open with partners with regards to the methods applied so it can be challenged by the relevant bodies if needed. Thanks Gemma, I have no further questions on this.

- para 2.9.1. The model uses forecasts set out by the Department for Transport (DfT, which makes assumptions regarding economic growth). In Runnymede, however, only background growth from the DfT has been applied. The trip generation resulting from growth in employment (which is indirectly given by commercial development) is what has been provided by yourselves in the proforma. Thanks Gemma, I have no further questions on this.

- para 3.4.5. I will make the amendment - thank you for this. Noted

- para 3.5.3. Sorry, this is another one of our technical statements for external bodies. Standard means that we have just taken the factors directly as the DFT have provided. The alterations have only been made to Runnymede itself. I can add in the word "forecast" if that helps, so it reads "Outside the study area of Runnymede borough, standard TEMPRO forecast factors have been used to growth vehicle trips."? Yes please Gemma

I will wait for your response before issuing version 2 of the report, but will be able to make the amendments immediately.
Hello Gemma

Please see attached the comment from officers on the Runnymede. As you will see we don’t have many.

I hope these are helpful.

If you are able to review the attached and let me know when you intend to issue the final version, I would be grateful. At this point I will publish on the website and pass to Highways England.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Para</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5.3</td>
<td>In the first sentence it states that the ‘audit was assisted by site visits’. Did Surrey actually visit sites? If so which ones? It would be handy to know in case the question gets asked later down the line, which I am sure it will in regard to the larger, more controversial Green Belt releases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5.4</td>
<td>What does a calibration factor of 0.5 mean? Should be explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6.2</td>
<td>In the list of sites, I am confused why 575-Rusham Park centre features. It seems an odd choice to me. Why is this site included specifically? Not a resultant land parcel, and there are bigger individual development sites than this. i.e. Aviator Park, St Peters Hospital?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7.1</td>
<td>What does this mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9.1</td>
<td>Does this mean that the 2014 base starts from a lower flow than 2009? This could be down to the economic downturn from 2008 onwards, so does the model factor in what would happen in the economy picks up or look at longer time periods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.4.5</td>
<td>Suggest amendment as follows: Historic information regarding the numbers of windfalls and prior approval sites was supplied by ward. Since the exact location of future windfall and prior approval schemes are unknown their exact locations were unknown, the relating trip generation was apportioned by the area of model zone contained within each ward, based on historic trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5.3</td>
<td>This sentence doesn’t read well to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Georgina

I forgot to add below that Kath has pointed out that in Guildford's case the full transport assessment was actually provided when the document went out to consultation after the various committee meetings had taken place.

Best wishes

Sue

Sue Janota
Spatial Planning and Policy Manager
Environment & Infrastructure Directorate
Tel: 020 8541 7593
----- Forwarded by Sue Janota/EAI/SCC on 17/06/2016 17:38 -----
and county officers to agree how the TIA be taken forward. Maybe the outcome of that will help to decide whether a higher level meeting is needed.

In terms of your timetable, I understand from Will that in order to meet it, his team would need your revised planning data to input to the model by early July, but I must admit I can’t quite see how you will have confirmed your spatial strategy by then which is what the TIA will need to support. We also need to set up a workshop with highways colleagues and yourselves to look at some of the mitigation measures that would be needed and tested in order to meet NPPF guidance. This will build on the interim Local Transport Strategy we have developed and we can also start looking now at how it compares with what the current TIA is showing. There is the issue of potential mitigation that HE is referring to in its recent comments to mitigate impacts on the SRN.

Best wishes

Sue

Sue Janota
Spatial Planning and Policy Manager
Environment & Infrastructure Directorate
Tel: 020 8541 7593

---

Hello Gemma

Sorry for the delay in responding to your email. I note that from the 8\textsuperscript{th} July you will no longer be our contact for the TIA work, best of luck with your new arrival!

In terms of our timescales moving forward, it sounds like Surrey could have another pinch point on its hands I’m afraid. Our detailed timetable for the next phase of our local plan work (i.e. between the close of the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation and the commencement of our pre submission consultation) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29\textsuperscript{th} June 2016</td>
<td>Commencement of Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17\textsuperscript{th} August 2016</td>
<td>Close of IOPA consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29\textsuperscript{th} June-2\textsuperscript{nd} November 2016</td>
<td>Consideration of all representations received during the IOPA consultation and revise Plan as necessary in readiness for pre sub consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} November 2016</td>
<td>Agreed deadline for 16\textsuperscript{th} November Planning Committee. All relevant material must be passed to committee section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16\textsuperscript{th} November 2016</td>
<td>Planning Committee to approve material for pre submission consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8\textsuperscript{th} December 2016</td>
<td>Full Council to approve material for pre submission consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14\textsuperscript{th} December 2016</td>
<td>Pre submission consultation to commence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} February 2017</td>
<td>Pre submission consultation to close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Gemma

Thanks for coming back to me so quickly on this. I am pleased that you have a response to the comments made by HE, and from reading your comments, you appear confident that the concerns can be addressed.

It is a little disappointing however that County take the position that they will not liaise with HE about their concerns directly as whilst I appreciate the Local Plan is our document, the TIA is a technical document produced by specialist staff at the County. I therefore feel that if the Borough Council asks the County Council to liaise with Highways England on technical matters on their behalf, that this is not an unreasonable request.

In your email dated 26th April, you said that we needed to decide at what point we wanted to engage with Highways England. As you are aware, unfortunately we only have a limited amount of time to produce our Local Plan in line with the Government’s requirement that we submit our Plan in Spring 2017. In trying to minimise risks that could cause delays in the process we are trying, wherever possible, to liaise with consultees early in the process to ensure that we can iron out concerns and avoid delays later down the line.

Highways England has shown that they are also keen to engage with us early in the process, and set out various concerns at our Duty to Cooperate event of 22nd April which I made you aware of by email later that day. HE asked for various information to be sent to them before the TIA work went too far so they could check they were happy with the approach being taken. In your email of 26th April you stated that you work closely with Janice Burgess’s team at HE and her team is familiar with the County model. You therefore suggested that we wait until after the completion of the TIA to send it to HE for their comments and we were happy to follow this advice, on the basis of the strength of the working relationship which appeared to be in place between SCC and HE. HE confirmed that they were also happy with this approach although they felt the need to highlight that should any concerns be raised about the suitability of the model or methodology then this could result in abortive work and delays to our timetable.

Given the earlier confidence of Surrey County Council about the TIA methodology, it is disappointing that we find ourselves in the position where Highways England still have a number of concerns following the receipt of the Runnymede TIA, and I am nervous about waiting another few months before we pick up work with Highways England to address the points they have raised, as we cannot afford any substantive delays. I would suggest therefore that a meeting is arranged with Highways England, officers at Runnymede and officers at County so that we can agree now what will be an acceptable approach at the next stage of the TIA process. The alternative I would suggest is that SCC contacts HE on Runnymede’s behalf (as our technical advisors) to seek to reach a written agreement with HE on the points that have been raised and to agree the best way forward at the next stage of the process. I really cannot see that Runnymede officers have the technical expertise to lead on the discussions with HE in this instance.

I would be grateful if you could consider the above. Richard and I are available for a conference call on Tuesday afternoon if this would be helpful.
Hi Georgina

Thanks for your email and forwarding HE's response. In fact they are very similar to another borough's response which was received last week. Hopefully I can put your mind at ease at little - there is nothing too concerning which shouldn't be able to be worked through with the HE to satisfy their needs. Most of the comments refer to clarification of the methodology employed.

I have written my views to their comments in blue next to the HE's below. Please note that this is not a formal response for the HE, but just opinions for yourself, as requested, so that you have a better understanding.

Given where you are in the development of the Local Plan, you could respond on the basis that we will be revisiting the transport modelling assessment prior to your next round of consultation and to finalising site allocations and will engage with them to address any concerns at this point? This is in fact what another borough is currently considering who are at a similar stage to you. The problem is that until you know what your final option is, it is very difficult for us to provide any further detail to the HE.

We will not directly liaise with the HE, as it is your Local Plan and not ours. However, if you do want to meet with them, obviously we will provide support and work through together their concerns.

Kind regards

Gemma
Hello Teresa

Many thanks for your comments on the Runnymede TIA. I have passed your comments on to the officers at Surrey County Council who appear confident that your concerns can be addressed. I thought however that it might be helpful for us to meet to go through your comments so we can make sure they will be adequately addressed at the next stage of the TIA works to your satisfaction.

Are there any dates in July that Highways England would be able to attend a meeting with Runnymede and Surrey County Council officers to discuss the comments in your email? Runnymede officers could meet with you on the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 11th, 12th and 13th July if any of these dates would be convenient for you, although I would need to check that Surrey County Council officers also have availability on these dates.

If alternatively you feel that a meeting is not required, please do let me know.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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Dear Heather

Many thanks for coming back to me so quickly on this. Officers at Runnymede are available for a meeting on the afternoon of 7th July, I am just waiting for confirmation that Surrey County Council will also be available to attend.

Would it be possible to pencil this meeting in for pm on 7th July and I will get back to you asap to firm this up when I have a response from Surrey.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Heather

Heather Archer, Spatial Planning Manager
Highways England | 1st Floor, Bridge House | Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | GU1 4LZ
+44 (0) 300 470 1019
Web: http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk

Highways England Company Limited | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ | Registered in England and Wales No. 9346363

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF | https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england | info@highwaysengland.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.
Thanks for this Sue

I don’t think I have seen this document so thanks for sending over. I have had a quick flick through just now but will read properly before our meeting with HE.

That’s a shame that the meeting this morning didn’t go ahead, but as you say I understand that there has been train and traffic mayhem everywhere! That’s good though that Will has had an initial chat with them about RBC and R&BBC issues, hopefully we can get them on side without too much difficulty.

When Will has come back about 7th July I will draft an agenda and will add on the points covered in your email. Obviously I will run any agenda past SCC before I pass on to HE.

Thanks for all your help.

Kind regards

Georgina

---

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

---

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.

---

From: Sue Janota [mailto:sue.janota@surreycc.gov.uk]
Sent: 23 June 2016 14:26
To: Georgina Pacey
Cc: William Bryans
Subject: Runnymede meeting with HE
Hi Georgina,

Thank you. A start time of 2pm is fine for us. If it helps with your decision where to have it, we'll be in Guildford already as we are there for meetings up until 1pm. But obviously we can get to your offices in time as well.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc MCILT
Transport Studies
Surrey Highways & Transport
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
e-mail: william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk
GCSX e-mail: william.bryans@surreycc.gcsx.gov.uk

Hello Will

Thanks for your email and for confirmation that someone in your team will be able to come along on 7th July. We have offered to host here at the Runnymede but we are equally happy to go to Guildford. I will firm up the details with Highways England and come back to you. I was going to propose a start time of 2pm.

Thank you for taking up our rep with HE, I hope that your meeting with them next week goes well and look forward to hearing your feedback.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This
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Hi Georgina

I could potentially make a meeting on afternoon 7 July with HE and have copied in Will as I think its important that someone from his team is also there.

Will was due to meet the HE this morning - he thought probably on Guildford/Waverley issues - but the person he was meant to be meeting couldn't make it because of all the train disruption due to flooding. However, he did have a conversation and raised with them the HE's responses to you and R&BBC. The meeting has been deferred to next Thursday, so we may well have more information by then.

I assume you have come across this document:


We also need to explore with HE how they can help by indicating what the existing position is in terms of capacity on their network/links and how they expect SRN improvements set out in their delivery plan - which I think includes widening to 5 lanes on the M25 between Chertsey and the M40 - to affect future capacity and the interaction with Local Plan proposals.

Best wishes

Sue
Yes please Sue, as with both DERA and Chertsey Bittams they are just options for consultation at this stage.

On a separate point I emailed Highways England yesterday to ask their views on whether they would like to meet with us to talk about matters TIA related, and they have come back today and said that they think a meeting would be helpful but the only date they can do is 7th July (I gave them a whole list of dates in July that Richard and I can make as a starting point). I am available in the afternoon of the 7th and I would bring John Devonshire with me as Richard has a DTC meeting with Natural England that afternoon. Are you able to make a meeting on this date in the afternoon along with anyone from your transport team who would be coming along?

Really we are just keen to show Highways England that we are keen to engage with them and agree how we would aim to address their concerns moving forward. I understand that County will not be able to give specifics on certain points as we have not yet picked our final strategy however I am hoping that a way forward can be agreed in terms of amending the methodology the next time round to overcome their concerns. I am also keen to discuss timetabling with them in terms of what is shown in our LDS although I understand that separate discussions are required between RBC officers and County on the timetable for the TIA work moving forward.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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Dear Georgina,

We can make:
Tues 5th PM
Weds 6th AM
Weds 13th PM

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA, MSc, CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

On 24 Jun 2016, at 14:02, Georgina Pacey <Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Sue and William

Late yesterday afternoon I had a telephone call from Heather Archer at Highways England. She said that she had misread an email from her colleagues and out of the dates I originally suggested to HE for a meeting, 7th July was the only date they couldn’t do not the only date they could do. She apologised for this error but obviously now we need to start again with the dates I’m afraid. The other dates I gave to HE and which they have confirmed they can make (and which we can make) are:

Tuesday 5th July,
Wednesday 6th July
Wednesday 13th July

Please can you let me know which of these dates would suit SCC the best? Heather has confirmed that they are happy to host us in Guildford if this is convenient.

Kind regards

Georgina
I can do 6th July am and 13th July pm. Maybe able to miss meetings on 5th July, but would prefer not to.

Best wishes

Sue

Sue Janota
Spatial Planning and Policy Manager
Environment & Infrastructure Directorate
Tel: 020 8541 7593

Dear Sue and William

Late yesterday afternoon I had a telephone call from Heather Archer at Highways England. She said that she had misread an email from her colleagues and out of the dates I originally suggested to HE for a meeting, 7th July was the only date they couldn’t do not the only date they could do. She apologised for this error but obviously now we need to start again with the dates I’m afraid. The other dates I gave to HE and which they have confirmed they can make (and which we can make) are:

Tuesday 5th July,
Wednesday 6th July
Wednesday 13th July

Please can you let me know which of these dates would suit SCC the best? Heather has confirmed that they are happy to host us in Guildford if this is convenient.

Kind regards

Georgina
If you are happy to Heather that would be really helpful.

Have a lovely weekend, and I shall see you and/or your colleagues on 6th July.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
Dear Heather, Sue, Richard and William

Thank you for all coming back to me with dates that you would be able to attend a meeting to discuss the Runnymede TIA work. It seems that the best date for us all to meet would be Wednesday 6th July in the morning. Heather when we spoke yesterday, I got the impression that you would be able to host the meeting at your offices in Guildford. Please can you confirm that this is still the case? In terms of a start time can I suggest 10am? I am happy to produce an agenda but will circulate in advance of the meeting so that Surrey County Council and Highways England can add any items that would like to discuss which I may have missed.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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Thanks Heather

I had not long gone back to County when your email came through and said 5th, 6th and 13th as Runnymede now cannot do the 12th or the other dates initially set out in my email to Teresa. So that is good that you can still do these dates too. I shall let you know when I hear back from County.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Dear Georgina,

Thank you for the draft agenda. I don't have any comments on it other than I met HE last week and can give feedback on that meeting during the relevant items.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc MCILT
Transport Studies
Surrey Highways & Transport
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
email: william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk
GCSX email: william.bryans@surreycc.gcsx.gov.uk

---

Dear Sue, John and William

I have drafted a meeting agenda for our meeting with HE tomorrow. Please can you review and let me know if you think that any changes are required? I will like to circulate to HE this afternoon if at all possible.

Sue and William, please note that John Devonshire will be attending the meeting with me instead of Richard Ford.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
giorgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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Meeting to discuss the Runnymede TIA, Wednesday 6th July 2016, Highways England offices, Guildford

To be attended by officers from Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England.

Agenda items

1. Introductions
2. Discussion of the Runnymede TIA and the points specifically raised by Highways England, including:
   - Suitability of the model being relied upon.
   - Provision of an evening peak hour assessment in the TIA.
   - The suitability of the use of average peak hours over a 3 hour period, and possible alternatives
   - Comments on NTM adjusted growth in TEMPRO
   - Additional information required in section 2.5.4 on the Runnymede roundabout
   - Comments on trip rates and TRICS
3. How HE can assist with the Runnymede TIA, i.e. by indicating what the existing position is in terms of capacity on their network/links and how they expect SRN improvements set out in their delivery plan – including the widening to 5 lanes on the M25 between Chertsey and the M40 - to affect future capacity and the interaction with Local Plan proposals.
4. Timetable moving forward for the Runnymede Local Plan and TIA work
5. AOB
Dear Sue, William and John

Please see attached the minutes that I have drafted following our meeting today with Highways England. Please can you review and add in any text that you think is missing and/or correct any inaccuracies before I sent to HE.

Sue and William, in terms of John and I coming over to discuss local plan and TIA timetabling with you, we are free next Wednesday at 2pm, or in the afternoons on either 21\textsuperscript{st} or 22\textsuperscript{nd} July. Are any of these dates and times convenient for us to come over for an hour?

Kind regards, and many thanks for all your help today.

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

gleorgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Dear Georgina,

Please find attached my comments on the notes from the meeting with the HE.

I look forward to seeing you later on today - please ask for me at Reception and I will come and collect you.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc MCILT
Transport Studies
Surrey Highways & Transport
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
e-mail: william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk
GCSX e-mail: william.bryans@surreycc.gcsx.gov.uk

---

Dear Georgina Pacey <Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk>,
John Devonshire <John.Devonshire@runnymede.gov.uk>, "Sue Janota (sue.janota@surreycc.gov.uk)" <sue.janota@surreycc.gov.uk>, "William Bryans (william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk)" <william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk>,

Date: 06/07/2016 17:09
Subject: minutes from our meeting today

Dear Sue, William and John

Please see attached the minutes that I have drafted following our meeting today with Highways England. Please can you review and add in any text that you think is missing and/or correct any inaccuracies before I sent to HE.

Sue and William, in terms of John and I coming over to discuss local plan and TIA timetabling with you, we are free next Wednesday at 2pm, or in the afternoons on either 21st or 22nd July. Are any of these dates and times convenient for us to come over for an hour?

Kind regards, and many thanks for all your help today.

Georgina
Hi Georgina,

I have been thinking about how we address some of the points raised by Highways England.

1. Software version - we are in the process of importing the existing model into the latest version of the OmniTRANS software, and we will check the model validation once this has happened.

2. Average peak hour versus peak hour. As you know, the model at the moment is calibrated and validated to the average peak hour, which for the AM is the average of the periods 07:00-08:00, 08:00-09:00 and 09:00-10:00. At the meeting on the 6th July, I explained that the peaks on the different road types varied with the morning peak on the strategic road network occurring earlier than on the local road network. As a result it was suggested that an average peak based on just two hours might be better. Consequently we agreed that we would look at data for the Runnymede area.

This we have done, and for the morning period it shows that the strategic road network and many of the A roads have a peak of 07:00-08:00, whereas the remainder of the A roads and the B roads have a peak of 08:00-09:00. This lend support to using a two-hour average peak.

However, we have been looking at our data. In the database that feeds into the existing model, we do not have the data for the 07:00-08:00 hour. There are 1,800 counts used in the model and it means for each one that we would need to find the original surveys, extract the relevant data and insert it into the database before we even start to calculate a two-hour average ready for insertion into the model. It is a big enough task already to convert the model from 3-hour average peak hour to a 2-hour average peak hour without the need to extract further data, and I have serious doubts that we could complete this within the required timescale.

The other alternative is to use the 08:00-09:00 peak hour. This meets HE's requirement that a peak hour should be used, but it is the wrong peak hour for the strategic road network. Furthermore, if a PM peak assessment is required, the model database only holds the 3-hour average peak hour data: if a PM peak hour was required, we are back to extracting the relevant data from the original surveys.

This is not an issue if we use our new county model because the survey data is in the right format, but the updated model will not be ready for use until sometime in 2017 (we expect delivery later this autumn, but we will have further work to do before it is ready for use).
Essentially the choice is either leave the model as it is or convert the AM to the single peak hour of 08:00-09:00

I realise you are on leave at the moment, but I hope we can discuss this once you have had time to digest and consider the options.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.
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The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.
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http://www.surreycc.gov.uk

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Hello William

Please see attached the comments from Heather Archer on the meeting notes from 6th July. I will make all the changes she asks for unless you have any concerns. Please could you let me know if you are happy with the changes in red that she suggests?

Kind regards

Georgina

---

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

gorgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

---

From: Archer, Heather [mailto:Heather.Archer@highwaysengland.co.uk]
Sent: 16 September 2016 14:52
To: Georgina Pacey
Subject: FW: minutes from meeting of 6th July

Georgina

Apologies for the delay in replying. I have made three comments on the note of the meeting in red. If you have any issues with my comments could you please let me know.
Hello Heather

Further to my emails of 20th July and 11th August I wanted to see if you have yet had the chance to look at the minutes from our meeting of 6th July? I have a member of the public who has been waiting to see these minutes for some time now and as such, if I have not heard from you by the end of tomorrow (Friday 16th September) I will assume that HE have no comments to make on the minutes and will finalise.

I hope that’s ok.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This
Hello Heather

I wondered if you had yet had the opportunity to consider the draft minutes that I sent you for your review on 20th July? I only ask as I have a member of the public who has asked to see the minutes and I have told him that I will check with you to see when you think you may have looked at them as I cannot pass to him until the minutes have been agreed by all parties.

Many thanks and kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Hi Heather

Sorry to chase you on this but I am getting chased by a local resident who wants to see these minutes. I would like to send the minutes out to him next week really, as such is it possible that you could let me know if you are happy with the proposed changes by the end of next week? I will assume that if I have not heard from you by next Friday that you are happy with the minutes as they stand in the attached.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey
Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Are you able to let me know when you may be able to come back on Surrey’s comments on the minutes from our July meeting and whether you are happy with the text that they have suggested. If possible I would like to get these minutes finalised this week.

Many thanks and kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.

---

From: Georgina Pacey
Sent: 19 September 2016 14:19
To: 'Archer, Heather'
Subject: RE: minutes from meeting of 6th July

Hi Heather

Many thanks for coming back on this. I have run your suggestions past SCC. They are happy with two of the proposed changes (changes 4 and 5-I have inserted comments to indicate that I will just make these changes). SCC have made comments on the other three changes proposed which you can see in the attached. They are happy for two of the changes to be made (suggested changes 2 and 3) but have suggested additional text. For the other (the first change you have asked for) they are asking that the text be retained but have suggested some additional text to be inserted to hopefully provide a compromise. I have added new text in green in line with the comments made by SCC. Your original suggestions for changes remain shown in red.

Please could you let me know if you are happy with the changes in green and with the text in the first para of the summary of the discussion under item 2 remaining as requested by SCC?

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Georgina

Apologies for the delay in replying. I have made three comments on the note of the meeting in red. If you have any issues with my comments could you please let me know.

Heather

Georgina Pacey
[Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk]
16 September 2016 12:09
To: Archer, Heather
Subject: FW: minutes from meeting of 6th July

Hello Heather

Further to my emails of 20th July and 11th August I wanted to see if you have yet had the chance to look at the minutes from our meeting of 6th July? I have a member of the public who has been waiting to see these minutes for some time now and as such, if I have not heard from you by the end of tomorrow (Friday 16th September) I will assume that HE have no comments to make on the minutes and will finalise.

I hope that’s ok.

Kind regards
Hello Heather

I wondered if you had yet had the opportunity to consider the draft minutes that I sent you for your review on 20th July? I only ask as I have a member of the public who has asked to see the minutes and I have told him that I will check with you to see when you think you may have looked at them as I cannot pass to him until the minutes have been agreed by all parties.

Many thanks and kind regards

Georgina
Hello Heather

I hope all is well at HE. I have now produced the minutes from our meeting on 6th July. SCC have reviewed and I have added their changes. Please can you now review the attached? Once you have confirmed whether you are happy with the minutes I will circulate to all parties that attended in their final form.

Kind regards

Georgina

---

From: Georgina Pacey
Sent: 20 July 2016 16:49
To: Archer, Heather (Heather.Archer@highwaysengland.co.uk)
Subject: minutes from meeting of 6th July

---

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF | https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england | info@highwaysengland.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ
Dear William

Thank you for your response on these points. From reading your email, as I read it we don’t really have any option but to progress in the way suggested given the limitations of the model. If I have misunderstood though, please do let me know. I look forward to hearing how you get on with Highways England in due course.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This
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Dear Georgina,

Thank you for coming back to me on these points.

Model time period
Producing an average 2 hour average peak is not possible within the time period. This is because the data for the 07:00-08:00 hour would have to be extracted for all count sites used in the whole model and processed to be able to be used in the model before we undertake calibration and validation. Should this be required, we would need to wait for our new county model to be delivered and this would delay work for Runnymede well
into 2017. Although the updated model is due to be with us later this autumn, there will need to be further work to improve the calibration and validation in the local Runnymede area. This, coupled with our work programme for next spring, means that we wouldn’t have the resource to do this until later in the year.

We are currently considering converting the model to an 08:00-09:00 peak hour model. The data is already in the model, but it means re-calibrating and re-validating the whole model and then checking the validation for the Runnymede area. Potentially this is possible, and we are going the progress this for a couple of weeks. If it is evident that we can produce an 08:00-09:00 model within a reasonable time, then we shall continue. Otherwise, we shall revert to the original average peak hour model.

AM & PM assessment
Unless we use the existing model, we are not going to be able to undertake an additional assessment for the PM peak. This is because converting the model to a peak hour from an average peak hour will take a number of weeks to do just for the AM. Producing a calibrated and validated PM peak hour model would double the duration of this task. In my view, an AM peak hour model would be more beneficial than retaining the current model but undertaking additional forecasting and analysis for the PM period.

Model software
We have already transferred the existing model to the latest OmniTRANS software and checked it. We are currently pursuing with the software providers the possibility of the model reflecting delays associated with motorway junctions where the slip roads merge with the main carriageway. I approached the software providers about this during September, but this needs to be resolved quickly now if we are to ensure this facility is included in a new peak hour model.

County Model
It will not be possible to use the forthcoming county model for the assessment for the reasons given in the first point above if we are to meet your timescales.

I will be writing to Highways England, but will not be doing so until at least tomorrow, Friday. So please come back to me if you would like to on any of the above points.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

From: Georgina Pacey <Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 October 2016 16:14
To: William Bryans EI
Dear William

I have spoken with Ian and Richard this afternoon about the Runnymede TIA and we have the following questions/comments in response to your email of 31st August.

**Average peak hour versus single/2 hour peak:** From reading your email, our preference would be to use a 2 hour peak from 7-9am to pick up on the single hour peaks on both the SRN and local road network. However you have said in your email that given the need to extract further data, you are concerned about how this would impact on the timetable for the delivery of the TIA. Are you able to provide us with an idea of the kind of delay that this would result in?

Depending on your answer to the point above, our second preference would be to use the single hour AM peak from 8-9am. However if we went down this route, again, are you able to confirm whether this would cause a delay to the delivery of the TIA (currently estimated for delivery in February 2017) and if so by how much? Also we would want to seek confirmation from HE that they would be satisfied with the use of this single hour peak and would remove their objection on this ground.

**Addition of a PM hour peak:** HE has asked that a PM peak is provided in the TIA. You have previously confirmed that it is possible to include a PM peak but this would double the amount of forecasting work and analysis required. I think the estimation that you have given is that it could add approximately 3 weeks on to the production of the TIA. Are you able to confirm if this 3 week delay would this be on top of the delay that would result if we change from a three hour to 2 hour/1 hour peak as discussed above? On receipt of your answer on this point we will confirm whether we would like a PM peak to be included.

**Model:** In the minutes from the meeting we had with HE (HE has today accepted your suggested amendments so I will finalise and send to you under a separate email) it is noted that ‘Agreed between all parties that Runnymede should only rely on one model and not change the model it uses midway through the plan preparation process’. However HE has emailed me today and asked the following: ‘the minutes state that the new Surrey County Council (SCC) model will not be available in time for Runnymede to use it for the remainder of your local plan. However, I now understand that SCC model will be available this autumn. Could you please confirm which model Runnymede will be using’. Please can you advise whether this is correct and whether we are able to use the new model as from what I have understood from previous discussions, the use of the new model would solve a lot of the issues that HE currently have with the Runnymede TIA? However if this model is available, I am now unsure as to whether there would be an issue with us switching model midway through the process?

I think that the above addresses all of the outstanding points but do let me know if you think there is any further information that you need from me.

Kind regards

Georgina

---

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
Please Think Before You Print This

---

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error,
Dear Heather,

I am just following up with some points that were raised at our meeting in July discussing the highway assessment of Runnymede's draft Local Plan and, in particular, the modelling work undertaken.

2-hour average peak hour
It was suggested that using a 2 hour average peak hour for the period 07:00-09:00 would be preferable to the current 3 hour average peak hour. While we agree with this, having investigated the possibility, we are unable to do this within Runnymede's required timescale. This is because the data for the hour 07:00-08:00 is not in the model. Therefore we would need to extract this data for all count sites used in the county model and process the data so that it is in the correct format to upload into the model. Once this has been done, the whole model will need re-calibrating and re-validating and then the local area of Runnymede re-checked. It is the data element that is so time consuming and making this unviable.

Single peak hour
Currently we are seeing if we have the time to convert the model to a single peak hour. It would for the 08:00-09:00 hour as this data is already in the model. It means re-calibrating and re-validating the whole model, and then undertaking a check for the Runnymede local area. We are progressing this at the moment while Runnymede Borough Council prepare their planning data for the forthcoming assessment. However, if it should prove to turn out to require much more time than we think it will take, then we may have to revert to the original 3 hour average peak model. But it should also be noted that we will only have time to do this for the AM period at the moment rather than for both the AM and PM periods.

Model software
We have already converted the Runnymede model for use with the latest OmniTRANS software (version 6.1.16). At the same time, we are in discussions with the software providers, DAT.Mobility, to add in the capability of simulating merges on the motorway network. If this is possible, then this needs to be done before we progress too far with re-calibrating and re-validating the model to the AM peak hour.

Model update
The updated Surrey County Model should be delivered to us later this Autumn. However, when we receive it the model will still require calibrating and validating to the Runnymede area. Given our resources and work programme for the first part of next year, it would mean putting back the Runnymede assessment until later in 2017. This is not acceptable to Runnymede as the Council needs to meet DCLG requirements.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further any of the points raised above.

With my regards,
William.
William Bryans BA MSc CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk
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If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk
The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position.
Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website -
http://www.surreycc.gov.uk

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Hi Heather

Thanks for your email. Please find attached a copy of the final agreed minutes from our meeting in July.

I have spoken to William Bryans at County and can confirm that the new model will not be ready in time for Runnymede to utilise and as such we will be sticking with County’s existing model.

Kind regards

Georgina
SCC model will be available this autumn. Could you please confirm which model Runnymede will be using. Thanks.

Heather

Heather Archer, Spatial Planning Manager
Highways England | 1st Floor, Bridge House | Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | GU1 4LZ
+44 (0) 300 470 1019
Web: http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk

Hi Heather

Sorry to chase you on this but I am getting chased by a local resident who wants to see these minutes. I would like to send the minutes out to him next week really, as such is it possible that you could let me know if you are happy with the proposed changes by the end of next week? I will assume that if I have not heard from you by next Friday that you are happy with the minutes as they stand in the attached.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Hi Heather

Are you able to let me know when you may be able to come back on Surrey’s comments on the minutes from our July meeting and whether you are happy with the text that they have suggested. If possible I would like to get these minutes finalised this week.

Many thanks and kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

---

Hi Heather

Many thanks for coming back on this. I have run your suggestions past SCC. They are happy with two of the proposed changes (changes 4 and 5-I have inserted comments to indicate that I will just make these changes). SCC have made comments on the other three changes proposed which you can see in the attached. They are happy for two of the changes to be made (suggested changes 2 and 3) but have suggested additional text. For the other (the first change you have asked for) they are asking that the text be retained but have suggested some additional text to be inserted to hopefully provide a compromise. I have added new text in green in line with the comments made by SCC. Your original suggestions for changes remain shown in red.

Please could you let me know if you are happy with the changes in green and with the text in the first para of the summary of the discussion under item 2 remaining as requested by SCC?
Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.

From: Archer, Heather [mailto:Heather.Archer@highwaysengland.co.uk]
Sent: 16 September 2016 14:52
To: Georgina Pacey
Subject: FW: minutes from meeting of 6th July

Georgina

Apologies for the delay in replying. I have made three comments on the note of the meeting in red. If you have any issues with my comments could you please let me know.

Heather

Heather Archer, Spatial Planning Manager
Highways England | 1st Floor, Bridge House | Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | GU1 4LZ
+44 (0) 300 470 1019
Web: http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk

Highways England Company Limited | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ | Registered in England and Wales No. 9346363

From: Georgina Pacey [mailto:Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk]
Sent: 15 September 2016 12:09
To: Archer, Heather
Subject: FW: minutes from meeting of 6th July
Hello Heather

Further to my emails of 20th July and 11th August I wanted to see if you have yet had the chance to look at the minutes from our meeting of 6th July? I have a member of the public who has been waiting to see these minutes for some time now and as such, if I have not heard from you by the end of tomorrow (Friday 16th September) I will assume that you have no comments to make on the minutes and will finalise. I hope that’s ok.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.

From: Georgina Pacey
Sent: 11 August 2016 15:03
To: Archer, Heather (Heather.Archer@highwaysengland.co.uk)
Subject: RE: minutes from meeting of 6th July

Hello Heather

I wondered if you had yet had the opportunity to consider the draft minutes that I sent you for your review on 20th July? I only ask as I have a member of the public who has asked to see the minutes and I have told him that I will check with you to see when you think you may have looked at them as I cannot pass to him until the minutes have been agreed by all parties.

Many thanks and kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
Hello Heather

I hope all is well at HE. I have now produced the minutes from our meeting on 6th July. SCC have reviewed and I have added their changes. Please can you now review the attached? Once you have confirmed whether you are happy with the minutes I will circulate to all parties that attended in their final form.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying,
Notes of meeting with Highways England and Surrey County Council to discuss the Runnymede TIA

Meeting held at Highways England offices at Bridge House, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford

Wednesday 6th July at 10am

Attendees:

Heather Archer (HA)-Highways England (HE)
Stephen Gee-WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
Sue Janota (SJ)-Surrey County Council
William Bryans (WB)-Surrey County Council
Georgina Pacey (GP)-Runnymede Borough Council
John Devonshire (GP)- Runnymede Borough Council

Item 1: Introductions. GP asked that the group went around the table and introduced themselves

Item 2: Discussion of the Runnymede TIA and the points raised by Highways England in their email dated 16th June 2016.

WB started by saying that he felt that it was important that HE ensured consistency when they were providing comments on TIAs. In a different area of the County Mouchel is the technical advisor to HE and seem happy with the approach taken by SCC but in the area that Runnymede is located within, where WSP Brinckerhoff is the technical advisor, different points have been raised. HA said that she would take this comment back to her team. Acknowledgement that consistency is important. [post meeting note: subsequent meetings have been held between SCC and HE and on the basis of these meetings, HE consider that this issue has been resolved].

GP suggested that the paragraphs in HA’s email were gone through in order.

- The first point discussed was the suitability of the model being relied upon. HE has raised concerns about the suitability of the model given that age of the underlying data. Should Runnymede wish to use such a model further justification should be provided and/or refinements made to the model to ensure that HE can have sufficient confidence that its forecasts adequately cover likely future traffic flow impacts.

SG said that whilst he appreciated that the model had been relied upon previously, data relied upon should be from the last 6 years. WB confirmed that at the current time, this was the only model available. He stated that the model is being updated but this new model will not be available for use until the early part of 2017, so Runnymede will not be able to rely on this new model. Agreed between all parties that Runnymede should only rely on one model and not change the model it uses midway through the plan preparation process. WB advised that observed data underpins the model, the current reference year being 2009. SG said that if SCC could introduce some extra test into the next iteration of the Runnymede TIA to
explain the history of the model, the level of updates that have occurred and the age of the information being relied upon, this may help to alleviate the concerns raised.

- HE has advised that given the heavy congestion experienced on the M25 and M3 through Runnymede and outside throughout most afternoons and evenings, it is imperative that an evening peak hour assessment is also provided in the TIA. JD said that he didn’t recall ever seeing a PM peak in a TIA in any of the previous Local Authorities that he had worked at. SG added that the busiest section of the SRN runs through Runnymede and as such he felt it important that a PM peak was provided, especially as this second peak could show different issues and pinch points on the network from the AM peak. WB confirmed that it is possible to include a PM peak but this would double the amount of forecasting work and analysis required. Could add approximately 3 weeks on to the production of the TIA. Furthermore, as there isn’t a validated PM model at the moment, extra time would be needed to produce this and factor to 2014 (this would be on top of the 3 weeks extra needed for the extra forecasting and analysis work). GP said she would discuss this matter further with her line manager and would let SCC how RBC wished to proceed.

- HE has stated that the model relies on the average peak hours over a 3 hour period. HE is concerned that this is likely to underestimate the actual peak hour situation. It is recommended/suggested that the analysis is undertaken for the busiest peak hour for the AM and PM.. HE wants to know the worst case situation rather than an average of 3 hours. WB advised that it was not possible to assess just the peak hour in the current model. The new model will be able to do this but this will not be ready in time for Runnymede to use. Peak hour is different on the LRN and SRN. If a LRN peak hour is used then flows on the SRN are lower as traffic is stuck in a queue. The only way of overcoming this is to use a dynamic model, but SCC wouldn’t take this approach to a strategic TIA. WB said that as one option the number of hours that the average is taken over could be reduced to 2. In addition, a statistical analysis could be carried out and inserted into the document to show the different between the average hour peak and the peak. SG said that this would be helpful as an initial starting point.

- HE has stated that section 2.1 outlines that the 2014 reference year has been created from the 2009 base using a growth rate derived from 64 observed DfT counts within Surrey. However, details of the count locations and which growth rate has been used does not appear to be set out. The information relied upon could underestimate traffic flow in 2014, especially for the AM peak hour. This depends on where the 64 DfT counts are taken and therefore how representative they are. WB said that further information could be provided in the next iteration of the TIA to confirm which of the counts were in Runnymede and these could also be plotted. If it is found that an insufficient number of the counts are in Runnymede, SCC would want to move back to TEMPRO. In addition WB said that the County could use an updated modelling programme: currently using OmniTRANS 6.0 but could move to OmniTRANS 6.1 (includes the block back function and could provide significantly different results and may better reflect the operation of the SRN) although this could add several weeks of delay onto the next stage of the TIA process as the model would need to be re-validated. SG to speak with his colleagues and feedback on whether use of OmniTRANS 6.1 would be preferable to HE. [post meeting note: WB has found that whilst OmniTRANS 6.1 includes this facility, it is optional and for it to work the software suppliers need to make
coding changes to files only they can access. If this facility were to be used, then the model(s) would need re-calibrating and validating.

- HE has stated that section 2.5.4 highlights that a calibration factor of 0.5 has been applied to the A30 Egham By-pass approach to Runnymede roundabout in the base model. Additional information should be provided to detail the effect of this adjustment. WB confirmed why a calibration factor had been applied and confirmed that this information could easily be added into the next iteration of the TIA.
- Negative trip data was briefly discussed. HE want to make sure that where negative trips are reported that sites are actually in the existing use that they are stated to be in to ensure that the impact of new development on the network is not underestimated. WB confirmed that this required Runnymede to ensure that the data being given to SCC was accurate. GP assured HE and SCC that the Runnymede data that the TIA is based upon will continue to be as reliable as possible and based on officers’ most up to date knowledge of sites.
- HE has commented that analysis of the trips in the document with TRICS suggests that the residential trip rates used are likely to underestimate trips for the AM peak hour. Based on the information on number of units and associated trips, this suggests a trip rate of approximately 0.35 per unit in the AM peak hour. This is considered low for the AM peak hour, as the TRICS average for mixed housing developments in Surrey is 0.44 in the AM peak. WB confirmed that the TRICS values used go beyond Surrey to obtain a bigger sample by location type which is considered to be a more robust approach. SCC is happy to provide more information to HE to justify how the trip rate has been arrived at, although WB would first obtain the views of colleagues in SCC’s Transport Development Planning team.
- JD suggested that it could be helpful for all three parties to produce a statement of common ground further down in the line in the process as this could be helpful at the EIP. All parties agreed that this could be helpful and explored at a later date.
- GP asked if there were any further points that any party wished to discuss. SG asked how the growth aspirations of other neighbouring/nearby Local Authorities had been factored into the Runnymede TIA. HE were not necessarily asking for additional scenarios to be tested but asked for further clarification on what the base model includes to assess cumulative impacts on the SRN from across the County. WB confirmed that essentially TEMPRO was relied upon, and that further information to provide clarification on this point could be provided in the next iteration of the report.

Item 3: How HE can assist with the Runnymede TIA, i.e. by indicating what the existing position is in terms of capacity on their network/links and how they expect SRN improvements set out in their delivery plan – including the widening to 5 lanes on the M25 between Chertsey and the M40 - to affect future capacity and the interaction with Local Plan proposals. HA confirmed that the technical team at HE is run from Birmingham. Until schemes are confirmed they should not be included in any TIA modelling.

Item 4: Timetable moving forward for the Runnymede Local Plan and TIA work. GP gave a brief update on the Runnymede Local Plan timetable moving forward. It was confirmed that the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation had commenced today for a 6 week period. Both SCC and HE had been posted a letter and DVD today which provided more information about the consultation. GP advised that the next round of consultation on the
Local Plan was anticipated to commence on the 14th December. GP confirmed that the timetable was ambitious as the Government had made it clear that a number of Local Authorities including Runnymede needed to have a Local Plan in place by early 2017. As such the Council was aiming to submit its Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate in March 2017 to meet the Government’s deadline. GP, SJ and WB agreed that a further meeting was required to discuss the Council’s timetable in more detail to allow the TIA work for the draft plan to be properly timetabled in the County’s work stream. GP to contact SJ and WB with some suggested dates for this meeting.

**Item 5: AOB.** SG confirmed that WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff’s contract ends with HE on 2nd September. Atkins will be the technical advisor for Runnymede from this date.
Dear Georgina,

Here's the email from Heather Archer, received yesterday evening.

I will be in touch after I've met with Elmbridge and HE on Tuesday afternoon.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

---

Dear William

Thank you for your email of 21 October concerning the modelling work in relation to Runnymede Local Plan. I apologise for the delay in replying.

In response to your point you made in your email concerning 2-hour average peak hour and single peak hour, our assessment requirement is we advise you to look at a single peak hour as this will examine the worst case scenario on the network. Modelling any other scenario will under-represent peak conditions, in particular queues and delays. We require assessments of both morning and evening peak hours. If SINTRAM is to be used it will need to adequately represent existing conditions on the network and will need to include recent observed origin destination data in line with WebTAG Unit M3.1 guidance.

In the absence of a properly validated assignment model for both morning and evening peak hours, a manual assignment process and detailed junction modelling plus merge/diverge assessments using DMRB 22/06 might be sufficient. This would normally require current or recent observed data factored to future year.

Highways England would not insist on the use of specific software to assess merges or diverges on the strategic road network.
Hello William.

Thanks for your email. When you are back in the office from annual leave, if you could let me know when you are about on Wednesday, Richard and I will call you together from one of our quiet rooms if that’s ok so we can put you on loud speak so that we can both be part of the conversation?

In the meantime, enjoy your time off.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
HE were not very helpful on Wednesday afternoon. They stuck to their guns about wanting AM and PM peak assessments and continued to express concerns about the age of the data in the model. When I tackled them on this last point, they said that they had been concerned for a little while. I made the point that this was the first time they expressed this concern in this way, and that it had not been raised before at EiPs on Local Plans.

I am happy to continue to fight the point if you want to progress your Plan according to your current timetable. However, HE are really hoping for Local Plan work going forward to use our forthcoming replacement county model.

As I mentioned, I'll ring you later in the week.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

From: Georgina Pacey <Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk>  
Sent: 23 November 2016 15:59  
To: William Bryans EI  
Cc: Richard Ford  
Subject: discussion of best way forward with the Runnymede TIA

Hello William

I hope you had a good meeting with HE and Elmbridge yesterday? I know when we met last Friday I suggested that it might be helpful for Richard and I to come over to County so we can discuss how to proceed with the Runnymede TIA given the concerns raised by HE about the model being used. I know you said we would need to decide how we wanted to proceed during the next couple of weeks.

If you think a meeting would be helpful, Richard and I could come to county hall on the following dates/times:
Monday 28th-anytime
Tuesday 29th-between 11am and 2m
Wednesday 30th-anytime
Monday 5th Dec-any time
Wednesday 7th Dec-any time

I have almost back to back meetings tomorrow and I am not in the office on Friday so please copy Richard in to any response so I can be sure that one of us has picked up your email and a response from us can be provided.

Kind regards

Georgina
Thanks William,

That’s really helpful.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council

georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

Please Think Before You Print This
At the moment, we anticipate completing the modelling work by the end of this month and then undertaking analysis and writing the report during February so that you have a draft report no later than the end of the month. Obviously if we can complete it before then you will have it before. In theory this is possible in that generally the analysis and reporting takes about three weeks. However, much will depend on what pre-modelling work has to be done on the mitigation measures. However, we will have a better idea after Wednesday, and I'll give you an update then.

With my regards,
William.

William Bryans BA MSc CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

From: Georgina Pacey <Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 January 2017 12:13
To: William Bryans EI
Cc: Richard Ford; John Devonshire
Subject: FW: Highways England workshop last week.

Hello William.

Happy New Year. I hope that you had a nice break over the Christmas period.

I wondered if you were yet in a position to come back to the points raised in my email below, in particular in regard to an anticipated submission of the TIA work to us. I ask as we are keen to do some detailed timetabling over the next few weeks and we will need the results of the TIA to feed in to other project work.

Many thanks and kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
Please Think Before You Print This

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Hello William

Many thanks for your email which has been very helpful to Richard and I in highlighting the options and risks. We would like to proceed on the basis of your advice please and run with option 2. However I note that there are a couple of extra elements which need completing by County if this approach is followed. I think that you originally said that we could expect the TIA to be delivered in February. Would this still be the case if we follow option 2 or would there be a delay? Also are you able to confirm whether there is any information that you are outstanding from us that you need to feed into the TIA?

On a separate point we have now sent over the great majority of the representations received during the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation which contain specific comments related to highway pinch points/‘problem areas’ (we just have about 10 more to check which have only recently been processed). As you will see we received a substantial number of comments on our highway network and the suitability of it to accommodate further growth; indeed I would say that it is one of the key concerns raised by local people through the consultation. Are you able to advise how County will utilise the reps that we have send you? For example, does County use such reps in its general intelligence gathering of problem areas across the County? Also will the representations have any input/impact on the TIA modelling?

Many thanks and kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Furthermore, we are struggling to convert our existing average peak hour model to a peak hour model - we are unable to validate it, and successful validation is key if we are to meet HE requirements. This leaves us three options:

1. Progress assessment work now using the model we employed for your Reg 18 assessment, but in updated OmniTRANS software. We can combine this with a DMRB 22/06 capacity assessment, as referred to in HE's letter. We have already converted the model for use with the new software, and it's validation is fine. But it is only a an AM model.

2. As above, but with two alterations: adding in the merge/diverge facility and 2011 census trip patterns. We can also undertake a DMRB capacity assessment as well. The issue with this option is that we know the merge/diverge facility is adversely affecting the validation of the model, and we need to sort this out before we can progress. However, it would still be just an AM model.

3. Wait and use the new model we are expecting in January. This is a risk in that it is an unknown quantity. While it is up-to-date and contains recent information, it is a new tool that we will be using. In addition, it is still an average peak model, and sub-area models will need to be created and converted to peak hour models for both the AM and PM. Until we have tried this I do not know how long this will take us to do.

Recently, HE have accepted the use of our existing model for Waverley. While I acknowledge that the Waverley area includes only the A3, compared with the Runnymede area that includes the M3 and M25, I do not consider the increase in trips on the Strategic Route Network in the context of your draft Plan to be significant. The main increases in trips occur on the M25 J11 on-slips, the M25 J12 on-slip to M3 eastbound and on the M3 section J2-1 eastbound. The main issues associated with the motorway network are due to underlying problems rather than the amount of additional traffic expected as a result of proposed development. The one location that is likely to need further work is the M3 J3 junction as a result of the DERA development, but this should be considered as part of progressing this development rather than Runnymede's strategic plan.

It should also be recognised that by delaying the assessment, the adoption of the plan will be delayed thereby increasing the opportunity for developments to come forward in the intervening period. Furthermore, potentially there may be time to undertake some further assessment work using the new model in the run-up to an EiP. I cannot promise anything at this stage as there are too many variables, but it remains a possibility.

On this basis, I suggest Option 2 is progressed with a fall-back position of Option 1.

With my regards,
Will.

William Bryans BA MSc CILT
Transport Studies
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council
020 8541 7222
07968 832464
william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk
Hello William

I just thought I would send you a quick email to see if you had any update for us following your attendance at the Highways England workshop last week? Richard and I need to report back to the team and our head of service on the options for the way forward for the TIA but as discussed on our conference call I wanted to wait to see if you thought the new Highways England modelling may help us to continue with the old TIA model but overcome HE’s concerns before I set out the options available to us.

Kind regards

Georgina

Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932 425248 | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone
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