

BAL RESPONSE TO NSC NOTE ON TRANSPORT INFORMATION

This note responds to that submitted by NSC on 28 September 2021 which outlined "outstanding transport information" relating to the transport evidence. That table included reference to a number of documents that have since been provided and therefore did not accurately capture what NSC consider to be outstanding. For the sake of clarity, BAL's response in the table below responds only to the bottom row of NSC's table, which identifies what they consider to still be outstanding.

It should be noted that much of the "outstanding information" is actually a presentation of NSC's case before the Inquiry. Where this is the case, this note summarises BAL's case in response. These responses should, however, be read in conjunction with Mr Witchalls's evidence, as set out in his Proof of Evidence and Rebuttal.

Document	Surface Access	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
Information Outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Road Safety Audit not updated for A38 mitigation scheme Rev 11.0	<p>A Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out for Revision 8 and re-submitted as part of the TA (CD 2.9.1). BAL disagrees that the scheme has changed to such a degree that an updated RSA would be required now.</p> <p>It is the changed (further improved to account for RSA comments) scheme that was the basis for the officer recommendation in Issue 11 Highway Works, page 135 of the Committee Report.</p> <p>A further RSA will be undertaken at the next stage of design, as is normal, and previously agreed with officers.</p> <p>The detailed response and rationale for the above (as previously agreed with NSC officers) is set out clearly in Scott Witchalls Rebuttal PofE paras. 2.2.19-2.2.26</p>

Document	Surface Access	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note 1: Analysis confirmed articulated lorries cannot negotiate proposed improvements to A38/West Lane junction 	<p>were shared with NSC and their advisors, who undertook detailed checking and review. The various technical notes (CD 3.4.2, 3.6.9 and 3.6.12) and TASD (CD 3.6.13) submitted with the application set out the junction checking and validation process. Technical Notes on Model Validation submitted to NSC and Jacobs, amongst others, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TN011 – Response to Modelling Comments (22nd January 2019) – CD 3.4.2 pg. 20 • TN016 – Model Validation Report (February 2019) – CD 3.4.2 pg. 421 • TN027 – Response to Jacobs Modelling Comments (22nd July 2019) – CD 3.6.9 pg. 8 • TN029 – Model Validation Report on A38/ A368 Signalised Junction (October 2019) – CD 3.6.12 <p>Full traffic survey data including queue length surveys was issued to NSC & Jacobs on 19th October 2018 (to Graham Stevenson (Jacobs)), and re-issued in June 2019.</p> <p>The detailed response and rationale for the above (as previously agreed with NSC officers) is set out clearly in Scott Witchalls Rebuttal PofE paras. 2.2.4-2.2.8</p> <p>Note 1 - Articulated lorries that make up a very small number of vehicles on West Lane can negotiate turns at the proposed A38/West Lane junction but with some minor overhang.</p> <p>This will be resolved at detailed design stage. The kerb can be moved slightly to accommodate this movement if deemed necessary by NSC officers.</p>

Document	Surface Access	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note 2: Confirmed that footway cycleway to west of A38 substandard between West Lane and Downside Road and entire extent of footway to the east of A38 is substandard. 	<p>The detailed response and rationale for the above (as previously agreed with NSC officers) is set out clearly in Scott Witchalls Rebuttal PofE paras. 2.2.16-2.2.18</p> <p>Note 2 - The section between West Lane and Downside Road is a footway only, not a cycleway, and complies fully with design standards.</p> <p>The detailed response and rationale for the above (as previously agreed with NSC officers) is set out clearly in Scott Witchalls Rebuttal PofE paras. 2.2.54 and 2.2.72.</p> <p>The footway/cycleway to the east of the A38 is an existing facility carrying very low flows. The proposed scheme already provides several new pedestrian/cycle facilities and upgrades and represents a significant improvement from the current layout. NSC officers agreed that widening of the foot/cycleways east of the A38 was not necessary</p> <p>The detailed response and rationale for the above (as previously agreed with NSC officers) is set out clearly in Scott Witchalls Rebuttal PofE para 2.2.40 and 2.2.52-2.2.53</p>

Document	Parking	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
<p>Information Outstanding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No calculations have been provided to demonstrate how the occupancy and car entrances information has been assessed in determining required parking provision. 	<p>Occupancy and car entrances information and calculations have been provided as well as parking provision forecast calculations that correlate with the results presented in the 2020 update PDS (CD 2.23)</p> <p>Calculations showing car park transaction data and car park peak occupancy were provided in Appendix J of Mr Witchalls Rebuttal PofE including a description of the calculation and how the data compares with the modelled data.</p> <p>The detailed response and approach (as previously agreed with NSC officers) is set out clearly in Scott Witchalls Rebuttal PofE paras. 2.3.15-2.3.20</p> <p>Additional information was provided in an email from Liz Higgins (BAL) to NSC on 11th August 2021, and was included in the list of inquiry documents (INQ033 - 035), as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Daily car park occupancy data for 2017 and monthly barrier counts to show how data is used to calculate the occupancy/ demand ratio used in the forecasts is included in Occupancy and OE ratio, 5 page pdf (INQ033). 2. Calculations and analysis to show the derivation of and to verify the 12mppa 2030 parking demand as reported in the Nov 2020 PDS update (CD 2.23), Propensity to Park (Park&Fly), 26 page pdf, (INQ034 and 034.1).

Document	Parking	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No calculations have been provided to demonstrate how the Public Transport Input information has been assessed in determining required parking provision. Note 3: Provided in PDF format so not possible to scrutinise or check. Note 4: UPDS analysis is based on an average of 2017, 2018 and 2019 data. 2018 and 2019 data not provided. Without 2018 	<p>Detailed Public Transport Input Information calculations have been provided in an email from Liz Higgins (BAL) to NSC on 11th August 2021, and included in the list of inquiry documents (INQ035).</p> <p>This clearly shows the list of measures input and their impact on parking demand with associated calculations, 12 page pdf.</p> <p>Note 3. Pdf format sheets can easily be used to scrutinise and check calculations and results by following numbers through respective sheets.</p> <p>Mr Witchalls similarly used pdf sheets provided by NSC to scrutinise and check accident records without being provided with the data in Excel format.</p> <p>Scott Witchalls Rebuttal PofE paras. 2.3.15-2.3.20 referencing Appendix J, included a description of the parking validation calculations and how the data compares with the modelled data.</p> <p>It has not been possible to provide the full Excel format file due to commercial sensitivity and the tool being Teneo's intellectual property.</p> <p>Note 4 - The updated analysis is included in INQ 034. The model used to forecast the parking needs of the airport since the airport submitted the</p>

Document	Parking	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
	and 2019 data the occupancy data cannot be scrutinised.	<p>planning application has remained unchanged. The only differences between the assessment included in the 2018 Parking Demand Study and that in the 2020 Parking Demand Study relate to the use of up-to-date data only (CAA survey, air traffic forecasts, parking survey data to update O/D ratio, etc.).</p> <p>The data can be readily compared and checked by comparing Appendix J (2017) and INQ 034 (2019 updated data).</p>

Document	Public Transport	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
Information Outstanding	Analysis to identify unmet public transport demand and opportunities for additional public transport services, and the mode share shift they would equate to required.	This has been provided. The proposed services were identified during the preparation of the TA (CD 2.9.1), and were developed through analysis and knowledge of target market areas of unmet

Document	Public Transport	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
	<p>Justification for the quantity of funding for the proposals and commitments identified in the Addendum TA.</p>	<p>demand aimed at maximising PT mode share, and through discussions with NSC.</p> <p>This is evidenced and analysed in the TA (CD 2.9.1), Sections 9.2 and 9.3, for example, with further analysis of existing public transport capacity included in TN013 (CD 3.4.2).</p> <p>Detailed analysis of the effects of the proposed measures, based on CAA postcode data for passenger distribution and mode share, and founded on bus and coach industry typical elasticities (from Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) guidance, was provided in Section 6.5 of Mr Witchalls PoE (BAL/4/2). This considered the effects of different types of initiatives aimed at catering for unmet demand to understand the range of impacts that these could have on mode share.</p> <p>The above detailed analysis clearly set out the mode shift these opportunities would equate to.</p> <p>The quantity of funding proposed is based on BAL experience of funding 10mppa services and allowance for further additional investment and funding for the proposed new services outlined in Mr Witchalls PoE. The proposed contributions are believed to be realistic and sufficient to deliver the proposed bus services and other improvements.</p>

Document	Public Transport	
	NSC Comment	BAL Response
	<p>Bus ticket sales or patronage data to confirm the 2017 sustainable mode share of 12.5% and 2019 CAA 21.8%</p>	<p>Bus ticket sales data has not been provided since it is the commercial property of the bus and coach operators.</p> <p>In addition, the information shared would not be full or sufficient for an overall PTMS analysis, as described in para. 6.2.2 of Mr Witchalls PoE. Information missing in this could include:</p> <p>Not all rail users transferred to bus</p> <p>Rail users transferring to bus may have used an inclusive fare ticket</p> <p>Group tickets may only be classed as a single transaction</p> <p>Private shuttle buses / mini-buses are not included in the data</p> <p>CAA mode share data (21.8% PT as main mode) is taken directly from official published figures based on comprehensive passenger surveys and as an industry standard approach. NSC has agreed to use CAA data as the basis for establishing future baseline mode share</p>