
Technical Note

Project No: ITL15734
Project Title: Land at Hindsland, Eastbourne Road, Willingdon
Title: Highways England Response
Ref: NM/MD/ITL15734-006a
Date: 14 May 2021

SECTION 1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 Danescroft (FREOF V Willingdon) LLP has appointed i-Transport LLP to provide highways and transport advice for a proposed development of up to 180 residential dwellings and a 2,170 sqm medical centre on land at Hindsland, to the east of the A2270 Eastbourne Road, Willingdon.

1.1.2 An outline application was submitted in March 2021 (*planning ref: WD/2021/0594/MEA*) for the following:

“Outline application with all matters reserved except for access (excluding internal estate roads beyond the access to serve the medical centre plot) for demolition of existing vacant dwelling and erection of up to 180 no. Dwellings and medical centre together with all parking, servicing and on-site open space”.

1.1.3 The application was supported by a Transport Assessment (i-Transport ref: ITL15734-004) and a Framework Travel Plan (i-Transport ref: ITL15734-005), both dated March 2021.

1.2 East Sussex County Council

1.2.1 East Sussex County Council (ESCC) is the local highway authority. A consultation response was received from ESCC on 28 April 2021. ESCC recommends no objection to the development, subject to Conditions and a legal agreement.

1.3 Overview

- 1.3.1 Whilst explained in greater detail in the covering letter from Neame Sutton planning consultants, it is critically important for the correct impact assessment of this development proposal to understand the site's location, policy support, and planning history.
- 1.3.2 This site is known as "Hindsland" and is contained wholly within the Wealden Core Strategy's (February 2013) (which covers the period 2006 – 2027) site allocation (Policy WCS4 – Site SD4) for a mixed use development including a minimum of 700 dwellings. It has therefore been considered that housing will be delivered on this site for a number of years, and this application is therefore not proposing anything "new" in terms of the local context.
- 1.3.3 It is therefore clear that this application site should deliver a proportionate contribution of the total 700 dwellings established in the Core Strategy. A fair and reasonable calculation is that the proposed 180 dwellings, at 25% of the total, is such a proportionate amount.
- 1.3.4 It is clearly for any other development application that comes forward on the remainder of the allocation land to demonstrate that they are a proportionate level of impact. Should an application be put forward on land that is only partially within the allocation, but for the whole allocation quantum, it would be for that application to demonstrate how proportionate delivery on the remainder of the allocation could still be provided for, i.e. that the greater density delivered on the third party site does not prejudice delivery on the remainder of the allocation.
- 1.3.5 In this case, an application has been submitted by the Vine Family for the 700 dwellings on the land to the east of the Hindsland site, known as Mornings Mill Farm. That 700 dwelling application seeks to deliver the full allocation (noting that the allocation wording is actually for a "minimum" of 700 dwellings") on land partially within the allocation, but also on land to the southeast that is outside the extent of the allocation in the Core Strategy.
- 1.3.6 That application is materially different to a previous application and Appeal site on the allocation land. That Appeal site was for a different applicant, and was wholly within the land set out in the allocation. The new application on Mornings Mill Farm however:
- is by a different applicant to the previous Appeal scheme;
 - does not cover the whole allocation land; and
 - also seeks permission for land beyond the extent of the allocation.

- 1.3.7 It is therefore for that applicant to assess, and potentially mitigate, for any impact on the local or strategic transport and highway networks resulting from any development in excess of the allocation wording.

SECTION 2 Highways England Response

- 2.1.1 Highways England (HE) has been consulted and a suite of comments from HE were received on 28 April 2021. The following section sets out the comments and queries raised by HE on the application and the applicant's response.

2.2 Committed Development

HE response:

The application is seemingly above the Core Strategy SD4 allocation which was allocated to planning application WD/2021/0174/MEA. For clarity it is assumed that this application therefore is in addition to SD4. Accordingly assessment scenarios should consider this application on top of the full SD4 allocation. Applicant to confirm.

- 2.2.1 As summarised previously, and set out in more detail in the Neame Sutton letter, this site falls entirely within the SD4 allocation and that considered at the previous Appeal, and is a fair and proportionate quantum of development on a small parcel of the allocation. The site is therefore considered to not be "above" the SD4 allocation but fully contained within it.
- 2.2.2 Notwithstanding this point, the Transport Assessment supporting the application has considered the impact of delivery of the fair and proportionate quantum of development on this parcel, alongside that being delivered by the neighbouring Mornings Mill Farm application for land within and beyond the extent of the allocation. However, any need for mitigation of impacts resulting from development of more than 700 dwellings falls solely within the requirements of the Mornings Mill Farm application as that application is delivering additional land to increase dwelling numbers above the minimum threshold set out in the Core Strategy.

HE response:

It is not clear why trip rates outlined in the Mornings Mill TA have not been used for this purpose. The same can be said of Brodricksland and Hamlands Farm.

- 2.2.3 The trip rates used in the Transport Assessment have been taken from TRICS based on the latest survey dates available. It is noted that the 2021 Transport Assessment for the Mornings Mill Farm application does not include a re-review of any updates to the TRICS database and thus the trip rates are relying on those agreed in 2018. It is best practice to use the most up to date information available at the time of submitting an application – the site selection parameters are identical, it is just the dates of surveys that have changed, ensuring that the most up to date surveyed sites are captured.

2.2.4 The trip rates obtained from TRICS have been assessed against the Mornings Mill Farm and Brodricksland and Hamlands Farm assessments which demonstrates a higher trip rate. As such, for a robust assessment, the TRICS trip rates were used. The comparison between trip rates is illustrated in Table 2.1.

2.2.5 It is noted that later sections (6.4) of the HE response confirm that as the residential trip rates used are broadly in line with those used for Mornings Mill Farm, they are acceptable for this assessment.

Table 2.1: Residential Trip Rate Comparison

	Morning Peak Hour			Evening Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Two-Way	In	Out	Two-Way
Mornings Mill Farm	0.143	0.370	0.513	0.324	0.190	0.514
Brodrickslands and Hamlands Farm	0.149	0.323	0.472	0.329	0.137	0.466
Land at Eastbourne Road	0.135	0.382	0.517	0.364	0.158	0.522

Source: Consultants

2.3 Future Design Year

HE response:

The application has used a design year of 2030 to assess impacts and as stated in para 6.3.1 has a 2024 year of opening. It is noted that the impacts on the SRN have not been modelled at this stage. Elsewhere we have noted that the trip generation / impacts have not yet been fully understood. As stated it in the EIA scoping response, Highways England require that impacts should be considered on the SRN 10 years after opening or at the end of the Local Plan whichever is later and in this case that would be 2034.

2.3.1 The application site is wholly contained within the Core Strategy's SD4 allocation, is a fair and proportionate quantum of development on that land, and has already been assessed as a first phase of development at Appeal. It is also the most sustainably located, in terms of proximity to existing services and facilities, part of the allocation.

2.3.2 As part of the Appeal scheme on the allocation site, the impacts of the delivery of up to 700 dwellings on the SRN were assessed and considered acceptable subject to an agreed set of mitigations to be delivered by obligation. The Hindsland application site is not delivering additional housing within the allocation, and therefore its impacts on the SRN are already considered acceptable as part of the Appeal decision. This is the same approach that has been taken by the adjacent Mornings Mill Farm application, which has been considered acceptable to the HE (as set out in the consultation response

of March 2021). This is despite that application actually delivering development (and additional housing) on land beyond the allocation, and not testing such impacts.

- 2.3.3 The test of 2030 in the Hindsland application is purely to provide an indication to HE as to the potential impacts that may be created by the additional housing being sought by the Mornings Mill Farm site, on which it will be a necessary part of their assessment to determine whether the additional housing over and above that tested previously (at Appeal) will have a detrimental impact on the SRN.

2.4 Proposed Development Trip Rates and Trip Generation

HE response:

Further justification should be provided as to why the medical centre trip rates presented are lower than those proposed for Mornings Mill Farm for a similar land use. Also, any traffic forecasts related to COVID are uncertain and should not be considered, (DfT). A robust assessment would assume that any COVID impacts are not considered to be permanent and that no virtual appointments occur.

- 2.4.1 The medical centre trip rates are considered suitable as they are based on similar centres and parameters from the TRICS database. The trip rates are also in line with trip rates agreed for recently approved medical centres in the local area (including in Eastbourne and Hailsham). The trip rates have been agreed with ESCC. This is an important consideration, as the medical centre is largely to serve the local community (both existing and future) with its anticipated catchment resulting in minimal need to travel along or across the A27.
- 2.4.2 As per the residential trip rate review above, it is noted that the current Mornings Mill Farm application's medical centre trip rates are those agreed in 2018.
- 2.4.3 A summary of the comparison of medical centre trip rates with Mornings Mill Farm is presented in Table 2.2. The Table demonstrates that those used for this application are slightly less than those in Mornings Mill Farm. However, as set out above, these have been agreed with ESCC (based on other similar local centres) and thus considered acceptable noting that trips to the medical centre will be local (due to the nature of the land use) and thus the medical centre trips are unlikely to impact on the SRN.

Table 2.2: Medical Centre Trip Rate Comparison

	Morning Peak Hour			Evening Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Two-Way	In	Out	Two-Way
Mornings Mill Farm	4.229	2.168	6.397	1.730	2.618	4.348
Land at Eastbourne Road	3.683	1.739	5.422	1.846	2.479	4.325

- 2.4.4 With regard to the impact of Covid and increase in virtual appointments, this has been indicated from the future occupier of the site. They have confirmed that their occupation of the site is based on future changes to appointments and the increased use of virtual appointments. A discount of 20% is a modest estimate, noting that the occupier anticipates up to 30% of appointments to be made virtually. This approach has been agreed with ESCC, on whose local highway network the medical centre trips will be largely focused on.

HE response:

The trip generation figures in Table 6.6 should be checked and any amendments followed through into subsequent analysis.

- 2.4.5 The future trip generation of the site (including both the residential units and medical centre) is set out in Table 6.6. These figures are calculated using the following:

- Table 6.3 – proposed residential multi-modal trip generation (revised with HPEMAC improvements); and
- Table 6.5 – proposed medical centre trip attraction (revised with virtual appointment discount).

- 2.4.6 The proposed total trip generation of the site, as set out in Table 6.6, is therefore correct and no updates to analysis is required.

2.5 Assessment Scenarios

HE response:

As outlined above, the assessment year of 2030 is not accepted. Additionally, the Mornings Mill Farm application included and assessed the full SD4 allocation. Accordingly the impact of this application is additional to the SD4 allocation and should be considered in full as additional to SD4.

- 2.5.1 The Mornings Mill Farm application has **not** included and assessed the full SD4 allocation. It has assessed 700 dwellings on land within its control within the allocation, plus further land within its

control **outside** the allocation. It has not considered the impact from build out on the remainder of the SD4 allocation, i.e. the Hindsland land.

2.5.2 The assessment put forward to support the Hindsland application has considered the full SD4 allocation, plus the additional land outside the allocation being brought forward outside the allocation by the Mornings Mill Farm application. To be clear, it has assessed the following:

- 180 dwellings on Hindsland – this is a fair and proportionate quantum of housing on part of the SD4 allocation;
- 180 dwellings on Hindsland and 520 dwellings on Mornings Mill Farm – a fair and proportionate division of the 700 dwellings across the two main land parcels making up the SD4 allocation and which was considered as part of the historic appeal; and
- 180 dwellings on Hindsland and 700 dwellings on Mornings Mill Farm – 880 dwellings which accounts for the additional land outside the allocation which is being applied for by the Mornings Mill Farm applicant.

2.5.3 The Hindsland application has also considered additional traffic from other committed developments (e.g. Brodricksland and Hamlands Farm) which has also not been considered within the recent Mornings Mill Farm application.

2.5.4 As referenced previously, the Hindsland application site is fully within the land considered previously at Appeal, and formed a first phase of it. As a result, the re-use of a 2030 assessment year is wholly appropriate. It is for the Mornings Mill Farm applicant to demonstrate that any additional impact resulting from their delivery of housing on land outside the allocation and over and above that agreed as part of the previous Appeal can be effectively mitigated if necessary – at this stage no such assessment has been presented by the Mornings Mill Farm applicant.

2.5.5 The 2024 opening year assessment is used to determine the impact of mitigation needs from the development. The latter assessment year is to determine the risk to HE of any further growth, and to determine whether any development proposals that do not feature in an adopted or emerging Local Plan (such as the additional land being brought forward as part of the Mornings Mill Farm application could compromise the delivery of the Local Plan.

2.5.6 The assessment scenarios presented in the Hindsland application include an assessment of all committed development, Mornings Mill Farm at 700 dwellings and the proposed development. As such, the assessment includes a thorough assessment of the full SD4 allocation.

- 2.5.7 As noted in Neame Sutton's letter this application is not in additional to the SD4 allocation but part of it.

2.6 Section 7.2 Operational Assessments

HE response:

The development is adding additional delay and increasing queue lengths [at the High Street signals] and indeed takes the AM peak RFC over 100%. Accordingly a nil detriment to delay and queue lengths is required.

- 2.6.1 The operational assessment results demonstrate that the Eastbourne Road/ High Street/ Wannock Road junction is already operating close to capacity (without the proposed development). The proposed development is anticipated to result in a less than 3% increase in traffic flows at this junction during the peak hours. The resultant is small increases to delay and queueing at an existing junction that is already at capacity. These small increases cannot be considered 'severe'. These increases have been found acceptable by ESCC who maintain the junction. Again, this Hindsland application is only delivering a fair and proportionate contribution of the amount of housing on the SD4 allocation, for which the level of impact on the highway network has been determined to be acceptable at Appeal.
- 2.6.2 Further, the HPEMAC scheme to significantly increase capacity at the junction with a mode shift to bus and cycling. This is supported in ESCC's consultation response.

HE response:

It is not clear how the trip values shown in Table 7.6 have been calculated. Referring to the peak hour residential flows indicated in Table 6.1, 44% of 93 AM and 94 PM peak hour trips should be 41 two-way trips?

- 2.6.3 The distribution of trips onto the A27 and A22 has been taken from the assignment tables (based on Census Journey to Work and a Gravity Model data) in Appendix H of the TA.
- 2.6.4 As set out above, the proposed residential development flows are presented in Table 6.3, not Table 6.1 (which HE has based the above figures on) which includes revisions to the trip generation to take on board the HPEMAC improvements.
- 2.6.5 The flows are therefore correct and no reassessment is necessary.

HE response:

“The development is in addition to that already agreed in the Mornings Mill Farm application, Highways England having provided a formal response on that application earlier in the year. No additional measures have been proposed which bring about a ‘no worse’ case scenario from that which was previously agreed. Highways England do accept the arguments put forward and require the applicant to either demonstrate that the agreed mitigations can be made to work with the proposed impacts from this application or provide suitable mitigations on top of those already accepted to ensure a no worse scenario. In the event that it can be demonstrated that the already agreed mitigations can be shown to operate in a nil detriment scenario this site will not be permitted any occupancies or any aspect of it brought into use until such time as those improvements are delivered and fully upon to all traffic. This is because this development will be relying on those mitigations and Highways England have already provided a formal response to the Mornings Mill application”

- 2.6.6 As set out in Neame Sutton’s letter, and referenced repeatedly in this report, the Hindsland site is not “in addition” to the Mornings Mill Farm allocation, with the site wholly contained within the allocation and previous Appeal scheme boundaries. The impact of the 180 dwellings, as a fair and proportionate contribution of the minimum 700 dwellings in the allocation has been agreed as part of the previous Appeal decision.
- 2.6.7 Further advice in relation to the need to consider the Hindsland application on its own merits, and not as an application that follows the Mornings Mill Farm application is provided in the Neame Sutton letter.

SECTION 3 Proposed Condition

3.1 HE proposes the following Condition to any future planning consent:

“No part of the development hereby permitted shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted and agreed in writing by the local Planning authority (who shall consult with Highways England). Construction of the development shall then be carried out in accordance with the agreed Construction Management Plan. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not necessarily be restricted to the following matters:

- ***the anticipated number, frequency, types and timing of vehicles used during construction (construction vehicles should avoid the network peak hours of 0800-0900 and 1700-1800 where practicable);***
- ***the provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders); and***
- ***measures to reduce dust, dirt and any other airborne contaminants and to avoid these passing beyond the site boundaries, including sheeted loads and dampening stockpiles where necessary.***

Reason: To ensure that the A27 continues to be an effective part of the national system of routes for through traffic in accordance with section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety”

3.2 The applicant confirms acceptance of the proposed condition should permission be granted.