

Fitch Way, Bramble

13/05/2016

— Planning Consultant.

AC + 10R

Aecom

Aecom

HE/Aecom Issues.

Re-in all the traffic work

+ Broomhills Industrial Estate - Trip Gen

→ currently 'mixed affordable'
70% private. ECC would like employ.
30% affordable.

Now have a figure for Galley's

Re-in all the AECADY assessments.

Trip
Gen

(ECC are doing LP work: trip rates in that work are > Fitch)

has also surveyed Nayling Road

Employment Trip Rate for B1
will update TR for BPH to office

BDC/ECC will get back to with affordable housing

Then agree trip rate before updating forecasts.

Comparators: Panfield Ln/ Lane to trip rates agreed.

What is a realistic Opening Year? 10 year build-out. Or 15.

Emerging LP horizon = 2033. Agree that as a Future Year.

Committed Developments = Broomhills

Panfield Lane link road = Now worked out & applied. SA will provide.

Springwood Drive A&B & its relationship with Rayne Rd/Aethere Way.

will calculate increased flow at Rayne/Aethere.

Panfield Lane link rd just provide 'nil detriment' - need to understand how this site interacts with queues

ECC trying to achieve a R/T bay @ Rayne - to model & propose solutions.

What needs to be done @ Springwood/Rayne?

ECC are still working on their acceptance of an improvement at Rayne Rd / Springwood Drive. Use 'With Panfield' as a base position then see how much more they need to do.

Need to model Rayne/Aethere & a mitigation scheme there.

If Acorn make a contribution towards work at Galleys Corner + LEP bid by ECC + contribution from other developers.

Make the case for slip roads @ Galleys Corner fumes.

In TA, assume no reassignment from Rayne Rd to A120.

Ring fence & get legal agreement to keep funds in place until slip roads are ready to build. Acorn go & think about.

Mitigation

RSA has been done & is in public domain.

No designer response. No response from ECC yet.

ECC need more detail: highway boundary etc. Detailed plan to determine whether it is achievable.

ECC Policy - no new access onto Podis Brook Road. Are there exceptional circumstances that Policy could be lifted e.g. LP Growth.

Highway Recommendations

'In the context of A12 widening' - find out from [redacted] what it means by this & does it need to be amended.

Sustainable Modes

ECC require a bus service into both parts of site?

Can bridge under Petch Way accommodate it? [redacted] produce a drawing to show

More info on what can be achieved & patronage to show what could be achieved i.e. commercially sustainable before 5 years is out.

Trip Dist

ECC & us have asked for different things.

Both agree 2011 Census JTW Car Driver Branches O10 appropriate.

ECC do some research & propose a compromise position based on recently-approved Rayne Lodge development.

Petch Way

Willing to contrib. upgrade but not to 'min' it by hard surfacing & lighting.

~4 weeks to resubmit TA.

Minutes

Meeting name Flitch Way Progress Meeting	Meeting date 28/11/16	Attendees [Redacted]	Circulation list [Redacted] For internal AECOM records only
Time 15:00	Location AECOM Chelmsford Office		Goldev Acorn PPML Consulting Journey Transport Planning (JTP) SP Broadway Braintree District Council (BDC) Highways England (HE) AECOM AECOM Essex County Council (ECC) Essex County Council (ECC)
Project name Flitch Way	Project number 60506522 / DX077		
Prepared by [Redacted]			

Item	Comment	Action
01	<p>[Redacted] introduced the meeting and stated that the aim of the meeting was to progress the Flitch Way planning application and to find a funding solution to implement the scheme, should planning consent be granted.</p> <p>[Redacted] proposed to fund the Millennium Way (MW) slip road scheme by way of a 'loan' to BDC. BDC could then re-coup contributions from other developers in Braintree to pay back the loan.</p> <p>[Redacted] confirmed that the funding or 'loan' would be in addition to funding of the local road network mitigation measures.</p>	
02	<p>[Redacted] outlined the status of the Flitch Way planning application (ref: 15/01538/OUT) in relation to Braintree's emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The Brook Green site was put forward in the 'call for sites' stage of the emerging LP but was not progressed as one of BDC's preferred options. The LP is currently going through public consultation and is due for examination in the early part of next year.</p> <p>Therefore the Flitch Way site is to be determined on its own merits.</p>	
03	<p>[Redacted] raised a concern that, from an outsider's point of view, the offer to fund or provide a loan for the MW slip roads appears to be a way of the developer 'buying' their planning permission.</p>	
04	<p>To demonstrate transparency in the process, [Redacted] proposed that Acorn would draft a legal document to present to BDC so that [Redacted] can seek legal advice on the proposed 'loan'.</p>	[Redacted]
05	<p>ECC summarised some of their main concerns regarding impact on the local road network, particularly with regards to a proposed bus service given that the bus corridor in Braintree is already congested.</p> <p>[Redacted] would like further information on bus usage from TEMPro forecasts, along with costs to deliver a bus service in the site. [Redacted] added that a bus service needs to be commercially viable following the period of funding from the developer.</p> <p>The mitigation proposed at Aetheric Road/ Pierrefitte Way was no longer required, as an equivalent scheme had been accepted as mitigation for the Rayne Lodge proposed development. The Rayne Lodge scheme should be taken into the future year base case for this site.</p> <p>The mitigation proposed at Springwood Drive/ Rayne Road looked effective at dealing with the queueing problem on Pods Brook Road but at the expense of a severe impact on Springwood Drive. This would need to be addressed before the Scheme could be accepted.</p>	

Item	Comment	Action
	<p>ECC acceptance of the mitigation offered at both these locations was critical to HE's acceptance of the predicted impact at A120/A131 Panners junction.</p> <p>█ commented that we don't know at this stage the potential level of traffic re-assignment to the A120 from Braintree town centre if the slip roads are implemented. This would remove some existing traffic from the Rayne Road corridor through the Aetheric Road and Springwood Drive junctions, thus reducing the problems there. But this benefit cannot currently be quantified.</p> <p>█ confirmed that the VISSIM modelling to date had only modelled the impact of the development generated traffic at Galleys Corner and had not considered re-assignment of traffic currently going through the town centre.</p>	
06	<p>There was further discussion regarding localised mitigation measures which all agreed, need to be seen to be deliverable before the formal consultation responses from ECC and HE can be progressed.</p> <p>Some discussion followed as to the extent to which matters could be agreed as acceptable in principle, subject to further 'tweaking' at detailed design stage.</p> <p>HE and ECC both felt that there would need to be at least one further iteration of the material presented to date before this stage was reached. The mitigation proposed at A120/A131 Panners junction was close to being accepted as compliant with DMRB but this acceptance depended upon further work to the Local Road Network that had not yet been drawn up. ECC would need to see and approve this before HE could accept a mitigation scheme that depended upon it.</p>	
07	<p>█ concern was that he needs the TA to be finalised before he can go to planning committee. █ therefore suggested that the assessment can be amended to form 3 phases, as follows:</p> <p>Phase 1 of the assessment will be for, say up to 800 dwellings (without the MW slip roads);</p> <p>Phase 2 of the assessment will be for, say up to 1,000 dwellings (without the MW slip roads);</p> <p>and</p> <p>Phase 3 would be dependent on the implementation of the MW slip roads and would be subject to a planning condition.</p> <p>The quantum of development proposed in each phase is to be determined, subject to further assessment by JTP.</p>	█
08	<p>The planning application will remain the same (i.e. for up to 1,600 dwellings), but the quantum of development to be consented will be subject to planning conditions.</p>	
09	<p>█ anticipated that the process of responding the HE/AECOM and ECC's comments and assessing the proposed Phases would take until Christmas to complete.</p> <p>█ suggested a working meeting with JTP, ECC and AECOM/HE to discuss the technical aspects of the TA with a view to confirming remaining actions for the revised TA and aiming for a position where the next submission of technical material would be acceptable to HE and ECC. █ to organise the meeting on behalf of HE, prior to the Christmas break.</p>	█

Fitch Way - Meeting

12/12/2016

- ① [redacted] is in process of updating layout.
- ② Updated layout will go through Stage 1 RSA via HE happy.
[redacted] send SMU L/Os → [redacted] for info. Assume Cost < 4%.
- ③ ARCADY to be updated to take acc of revised layout
- ④ ARCADY to be revised to include Broomhills 1/Etc. etc.
- ⑤ Springwood Drive L/O from Penfield to be taken into [redacted] FT Base.
once ECC accepts it. [redacted] will add additional length to their approach flow. ARCADY to be adjurked to suit.
- ⑥ [redacted] working on phased approach. Cost idea = 400 div. of Rayne Rd. only, what else needs to be done to accommodate.
- ⑦ Aethere/Pierrefitte - committed improvement to get major benefit, need to remove traffic etc.
[redacted] follow up availability of traffic model forecasts for MM Way 8th L/Os.
- ⑧ RSA to be commisional. RSA 1/2 combined, because [redacted] concerned that for RAB too much will be left.
- ⑨ Need to show bus patronage to show break-even point.
Fitch Way.

[Lands to (consented) side - start work next yr - access to the West for condition side access. ~ opp. Fitch Way

- ⑩ Travel Plan. 12%, but only if good access by RT.
Failure to achieve

Design First. ARCADY. Then RSA