Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council
16 December 2011

Matter 15: Infrastructure

1. Introduction

1.1 East Sussex County Council reaffirms the content of its statement submitted to the Inspector at the Examination in Public exploratory meeting on 12th October 2011 and which is available on the Wealden District Council's website (U27).

1.2 This further supporting statement should be read in conjunction with the October 2011 statement (U27) and sets out the detailed work which has taken place including since the exploratory meeting on those infrastructure requirements that are the responsibility of the County Council, in particular on education and transport.

2. Infrastructure and Community Infrastructure Levy

2.1 *Community Infrastructure Levy*

2.1.1 Further to our October 2011 statement (U27 - section 2), the County Community Infrastructure Levy group comprising the Borough and District Councils in East Sussex, the County Council, Brighton and Hove City Council and South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) has developed the brief for the Countywide viability assessment study to inform preparation of necessary charging schedules.

2.1.2 The study brief will be out to tender in January 2012, and a consultant will be appointed in February 2012 with this initial study to be completed by July 2012 as per the timetable set out in our October 2011 statement. Wealden District Council will be also commissioning parallel work to the countywide study for the development of a preliminary draft CIL charging schedule for consultation in July 2012. Further information on Wealden's progress in developing a CIL charging schedule is set out in their response on Matter 15 to the Inspector.

2.1.3 Therefore, it is considered that the levels of growth proposed in Wealden's strategy, coupled with the ongoing work at a countywide level and at a district level on adopting a CIL charging regime, will enable a programme and funding schedule to be in place to support the provision of the necessary infrastructure in a timely fashion.

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council
16 December 2011

2.2 *Infrastructure Delivery Plans*

2.2.1 The County Council is working with the Borough and District Councils to develop a common framework for the Infrastructure Delivery Plans for their respective Local Development Frameworks. The framework sets out a common approach being used amongst all the Borough and District Councils to characterise critical, important and desirable infrastructure in relation to supporting development identified within emerging Core Strategies and defining risk and impact to delivering the Core Strategy. This revised framework will be used by all the authorities to also assist the work in developing a CIL charging schedule as outlined in section 2.1 above.

3. Transport

3.1 South Wealden and Eastbourne Transport Study

3.11 Further to our October 2011 statement (U27, section 3.2, pages 5 -7) we have provided the Highways Agency with further information to address their concerns on the robustness of the South Wealden and Eastbourne transport model (SWETS) as an evidence base for testing the impact of the proposed Strategic Development Allocations (SDAs) set out in the Core Strategy submitted by Wealden District and the South Downs National Park Authority, and the identification of potential mitigation measures.

3.1.2 In a letter received by Wealden District Council from the Highways Agency on 11 November 2011, attached at Appendix 1 to this statement, they highlight that following the additional information provided by Wealden District Council and East Sussex County Council they have more confidence in the robustness of the modelling and that they are broadly content that SWETS provides an acceptable assessment of the LDF development on the Strategic Road Network (SRN), subject to clarification on how the SATURN network has been adjusted for the SRN. This clarification has been provided to the Highways Agency and they have indicated they will respond on this information by mid January 2012.

3.1.3 We have reviewed the South Wealden and Eastbourne Saturn model to update our evidence base and take account of the changes in TEMPRO[1] from version 5.4 to version 6.2. The overall impact on the model outputs from the TEMPRO changes were confirmed as not significant and a report into the impact of changes in TEMPRO from v5.4 to v6.2 in relation to the SWETS model is attached at Appendix 2. Therefore the capacity creating transport interventions originally identified in SWETS and set out in paragraph 3.2.1 of our October 2011 (U27) statement are still valid and required to accommodate locally derived traffic movements associated with the levels of development proposed in the Core Strategy

3.1.4 There will be an expectation that these transport interventions, which are identified as critical infrastructure in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanying the Wealden Core Strategy, will be significantly funded through Community Infrastructure Levy monies and/or delivered from the strategic housing allocations in the south Wealden area.

3.1.5 In conclusion, since our statement in October 2011, we have provided further information to the Highways Agency on the modelling work undertaken to test the impact of development in the south Wealden area to help address their concerns on the soundness of the Core Strategy. In their response, they have indicated they are more confident on the robustness of the modelling and, subject to clarification on how the SATURN network has been adjusted for each of the Strategic Road Network interventions, that SWETS provides an acceptable assessment of the impact of development on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

3.16 Notwithstanding, we consider there is reasonable certainty that the necessary transport interventions will be delivered within the timeframe of the plan.

3.2 Hailsham

3.2.1 Since October, further work has been undertaken in taking forward the Hailsham Masterplan referred to in of our October 2011 statement U27 - section 3.3, pages 7-9).

[1] TEMPRO is the Integrated Transport and Economics and Appraisal developed by the Department for Transport (DfT).
TEMPRO stands for the **T**rip **E**nd **M**odel **P**resentation P**ro**gram. It is designed to allow detailed analysis of pre-processed trip-end, journey mileage, car ownership and population/workforce planning data. The pre-processed data is itself the output from a series of models developed and run by the DfT.

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council
16 December 2011

3.2.2 Additional traffic surveys have been undertaken in October 2011 in and around Hailsham to revalidate the existing transport model (paragraph 3.3.6 of U27) for the town. This will ensure that there is a robust and up to date tool and data to assess the impact of development in Hailsham.

3.2.2 Further to the programme set out in paragraph 3.3.8 of our October 2011 statement (U27), the County Council is about to appoint consultants to undertake the development and design of potential schemes to mitigate the impact of development in the town arising from the growth proposed at SDA2 and SDA3 within the Core Strategy . This work is programmed to be completed by the end of February 2012 and these options will then be tested in the updated model in Spring 2012. These designs will be further developed during Summer 2012 and a public consultation on the overall Masterplan will be undertaken in Autumn 2012. This work will enable us to input into the consultation on the District Council's Strategic Sites Development Plan Document (SS DPD).

3.2.3 As also referred to in paragraph 3.3.7 of our October 2011 statement (U27), the update of the model and the design work for the transport interventions required to accommodate development is being funded in part by a number of the developers and landowners involved in potential Strategic Development Areas identified in the Core Strategy for Hailsham. This approach means that there is an appropriate and agreed tool available to all landowners / developers involved in these Strategic Development areas for testing the impact of their development on the local transport network and for the identification of potential capacity creating transport interventions attributable to their sites. This early engagement is a good example of close partnership working with the development industry and a commitment to deliver these sites as they come forward as well as the Core Strategy as a whole.

3.2.4 In conclusion, the further work outlined above on the growth identified for the town and Hailsham Masterplan demonstrates that the County Council is continuing to progress the identification of transport interventions required to support development in the area and that this will come forward in a timely manner. The engagement with the development industry also demonstrates that the County Council is committed to help the delivery of the overall Core Strategy.

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council
16 December 2011

3.3 Uckfield

3.3.1 We re-affirm the content on our October 2011 statement regarding infrastructure in Uckfield (U27 - section 3.4, pages 9-11) in particular the County's recently agreed approach and action plan for the development and implementation of traffic management solutions for Uckfield town centre.

3.3.2 Since our October 2011 statement, a variety of options for addressing the traffic management issues in the town centre have been identified by the Uckfield Town Centre Steering Group, which comprises East Sussex County Council, Wealden District Council, Uckfield Town Council and East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service. These options range from demand management, relocating parking south of the town centre to providing new highway infrastructure. Appraisal of these options will consider a range of criteria including the economic, environmental, and social impacts of each option as well as the effect of each on the potential reinstatement of the Lewes – Uckfield railway line.

3.3.3 Consultants have been commissioned to undertake the design of the traffic management options for the town centre (Option Development is in the timetable in paragraph 3.4.6 on our October 2011 statement). The consultants will be reporting back to the Steering Group on the design options in late January 2012 and public consultation on these options will be undertaken locally in late February/early March 2012. The Steering Group will then identify its preferred option for implementation in summer 2012.

3.3.4 Initial discussions have been held with the landowners of the potential allocated site (SDA1 within the Core Strategy) in the south west quadrant of Uckfield. We have agreed with the landowners that the primary access to the site will be off the A22 Uckfield bypass with a secondary access off Lewes Road.

3.3.5 In summary, considerable progress has been made to take forward the Uckfield town centre action plan to ensure that the town centre infrastructure will be put in place to accommodate the development in the town and that this will be delivered in a timely manner. In addition, access arrangements have been agreed with the landowners of the SDA identified in Uckfield and this work will be reflected in Wealden's emerging Strategic Sites Development Plan Document (SS DPD).

3.4 Crowborough

3.4.1 Further to our October 2011 statement (U27, section 3.5), initial discussions have been held with the landowners of the south-east Crowborough allocation (SDA10) regarding the potential transport/ traffic mitigation measures required for Western Road. We are working through the design for these mitigation measures to test a variety of options with the developer and thus confirm that an appropriate solution can be delivered. We can confirm that there is no objection in principle, from a Highway perspective, to growth in this sector of the town

3.5 Transport – conclusions

3.5.1 We consider that the work set out in our October 2011 statement (U27) and that described in this statement demonstrates that there is ongoing work with Wealden District Council, Eastbourne Borough Council, the development industry and the Highways Agency to identify, develop and fund the range of transport interventions required to support proposed growth proposed within the Core strategy in south Wealden, Uckfield and Crowborough. We confirm that we consider that these can and will be delivered in timely fashion.

4. Education

4.1 Hailsham

4.1.1 We reaffirm our position on education provision in Hailsham as set out in our October 2011 statement (U27, section 4.2).

4.1.2 At this stage it is very difficult to give a clear indication of when and how additional school places would be established as this will, in part, be driven by the availability, location and suitability of land. Our pupil forecasts predict that shortfalls in Reception year places and other year groups could be felt as early as 2013/14 or 2014/15. In the short term at least we would be required to provide those additional places through the use of temporary accommodation at existing schools until we have more certainty over the land availability.

4.1.3 In the meantime we will undertake a review of school places in Hailsham to consider options for delivering the additional places required both in the immediate future and the longer term. When more is known about land availability for additional school places, the County

Council will begin to consider the statutory procedures required to establish new school places and how the provision of those places could be phased in a way that reflects the timing and availability of new homes being built.

4.2 Uckfield

4.2.1 We reaffirm our position on education provision in Uckfield as set out in our October 2011 statement (U27, section 4.3). A review of school places will be undertaken over the coming years to ensure we are in a position to react to the predicted requirement for additional places in the town from the early part of the next decade.

4.3 Polegate/Willingdon/Stone Cross

4.3.1 We reaffirm our position on education provision in Polegate/Willingdon/ Stone Cross as set out in our October 2011 statement (U27, section 4.4).

4.3.2 At this stage it is very difficult to give a clear indication of when and how additional school places would be established as this will, in part, be driven by the availability, location and suitability of land. Our pupil forecasts predict that shortfalls in Reception year places and other year groups could be felt as early as 2013/14. In the short term at least we would be required to provide those additional places through the use of temporary accommodation at existing schools until we have more certainty over the land availability.

4.3.3 In the meantime we will begin to undertake feasibility studies at existing schools to consider options for delivering the additional places required if land is not available. When more is known about land availability for additional school places, the County Council will begin to consider the statutory procedures required to establish the additional school places and how the provision of those places could be phased in a way that reflects the timing and availability of new homes being built.

4.4 Buxted/Maresfield

4.4.1 We reaffirm our position on education provision in Buxted/Maresfield as set out in our October 2011 statement (U27, section 4.5). We are undertaking feasibility studies during 2011/12 academic year to investigate options for providing additional permanent places in the

future. In the meantime we are considering providing temporary classrooms at one or both schools from 2012/13.

4.5 Frant

4.5.1 We reaffirm our position on education provision in Frant as set out in our October 2011 statement (U27, section 4.6). New housing later in the LDF period is likely to give rise to the need for an additional 5 places per year group (35 in total), and the new school building was designed in such a way that an additional classroom could be added in the future if required.

5. Conclusion

5.1 This statement provides an update on the further work that has been led and commissioned by the County Council, in partnership with other stakeholders to the Core Strategy, since the Examination in Public exploratory meeting in October 2011. The outcomes of this work will inform the subsequent development stages of the Local Development Framework, in particular the Strategic Sites DPD and the continual updating of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The County Council will continue to work closely with the Planning Authorities on the implementation and delivery of their Strategy.

5.2 In response to the Highways Agency's previous concerns on the soundness of the Core Strategy, we have provided further information on the modelling work undertaken to test the impact of development in the south Wealden area They have indicated that they are more confident on the robustness of the modelling and, subject to clarification on how the SATURN network has been adjusted for each of the Strategic Road Network interventions, that SWETS provides an acceptable assessment of the impact of development on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). This information has been provided to the Highways Agency who has advised that they will respond back to Wealden District Council and East Sussex County Council in mid January 2012.

5.3 While the County Council recognises that further detailed work is required on the infrastructure required to support the level and broad distribution of development proposed in the Core Strategy, in particular on transport and education, we consider there is reasonable certainty that the necessary transport interventions will be delivered within the timeframe of the plan.

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council
16 December 2011

5.4 The continuing work of the County CIL Working Group in commissioning a Countywide viability assessment study to support the preparation of CIL Charging Schedules provides assurance that there is a reasonable prospect of a CIL charging regime being promoted and adopted by the Planning Authorities in parallel with the Strategic Sites DPD. Wealden District Council are also commissioning parallel work to the countywide study for the development of a preliminary draft CIL charging schedule for consultation in July 2012.

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council – Appendix 1
16 December 2011

Appendix 1

Letter from Highways Agency to Wealden District Council dated 11 November 2011

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council - Appendix 1
16 December 2011

Safe roads, Reliable journeys, Informed travellers

HIGHWAYS AGENCY

Our ref: HA/3/2/512
Your ref:

Marina Brigginshaw
Wealden District Council
Pine Grove
Crowborough
East Sussex
TN6 1DH

Elizabeth Cleaver
1B
Federated House
London Road
Dorking RH4 1SZ

Direct Line: 01306 878605

11 November 2011

Dear Ms Brigginshaw

WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL – SOUTH WEALDEN AND EASTBOURNE TRANSPORT STUDY

Thank you for your email of 7 October 2011 responding to our comments on the South Wealden and Eastbourne Transport Study (SWETS) LDF assessment.

The Highways Agency, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, is responsible for managing and operating a safe and efficient Strategic Road Network (SRN) i.e. the Trunk Road and Motorway network, in England as laid down in Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 02/2007 (*Planning and The Strategic Road Network.*)

SWETS forms an integral part of the Wealden Core Strategy evidence base and helps demonstrate deliverability in transport terms. Our initial review of the modelling, undertaken in July 2010, identified several areas where we required clarification in order to determine the robustness of the modelling exercise. We have the following response to the points made in your email.

1. Transport interventions

Thank you for clarifying the different transport interventions. However we would like further explanation on precisely how the SATURN network was adjusted for each of the SRN interventions; namely the Cophall roundabout, A27/A2270 and A27/A22 Dittons Road junction. This could perhaps be achieved by submitting screen captures of the SATURN network to supplement explanatory text. We recognise that some of the interventions are based on concept designs. Our purpose here is to confirm that the adjustments made are realistic. It is therefore necessary for us to review and be satisfied with how the interventions have been modelled.

Department for Transport

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council - Appendix 1
16 December 2011

2. Growth scenarios

Following your explanation we are now content with the growth scenarios used within the modelling.

3. TEMPRO growth factors

Thank you for confirming the version of TEMPRO used. We welcome the TEMPRO 6.2 sensitivity test and would like to view the results when they are available.

4. TRICS outputs

Thank you for providing further information on the use of TRICS data to determine development trip rates. We are now broadly content with the rates and methodology employed but for the sake of clarity would appreciate the opportunity to review the site selection criteria for the school and retail land uses. Therefore please could you provide the TRICS output files?

5. Attributable effects

Following your clarification, we are now content with the explanation of how the 'attributable effects' were calculated within the modelling.

SWETS concludes that, providing junction improvements are carried out on the Cophall roundabout, A27/A2270 and A27/A22 Dittons Road junction, the development outlined in the Core Strategy could be delivered albeit with some detrimental impacts on the operation of the SRN.

Following your email we now have more confidence in the robustness of the modelling and assuming that point 1 above is satisfactorily resolved we can be broadly content that SWETS provides an acceptable assessment of the impacts of LDF development on the SRN.

I hope the above information is useful, please feel free to contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Cleaver
NDD Asset Development Team - Area 4
Email: elizabeth.cleaver@highways.gsi.gov.uk

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council - Appendix 2
16 December 2011

Appendix 2

South Wealden and Eastbourne Transport Study (SWETS) – Tempro Sensitivity Testing

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council - Appendix 2
16 December 2011

1 Background

1.1 The SWETS transport model has developed over the period since its initial development during 2010. A common feature of all phases has been the use of TEMPRO during forecasting work.

1.2 TEMPRO is the Integrated Transport and Economics and Appraisal model developed by the Department for Transport (DfT). TEMPRO stands for the Trip End Model Presentation Program. It is designed to allow detailed analysis of pre-processed trip end, journey mileage, car ownership and population / workforce planning data. The pre-processed data is itself the output from a series of models developed and run by the DfT.

1.3 SWETS uses TEMPRO to forecast growth throughout the study area and beyond to establish a 'Reference Case' for any forecast year. When the effects of specific development scenarios are being considered, TEMPRO is used for external growth but the detailed scale and broad locations of new development in that scenario is used for all internal areas. Details of the procedures used are included in the main SWETS report.

1.4 Phase 1 SWETS used the then current TEMPRO v5.4. During the course of subsequent phases of the study, newer versions of TEMPRO became available (v6.1 as an interim release and v6.2 as the latest release approved for use in studies of this type).

1.5 Phase 2 of SWETS focussed on the transport impacts of revised broad development scale and locations in the south Wealden area. This phase used TEMPRO v6.1, and also incorporated updates to the scale and location of Committed Development in the area, an extension of the forecasting period to 2027 from 2026, and a small extension of the Hailsham modelled area.

1.6 The results of and conclusions from SWETS 1 and 2 are reported in the main SWETS report.

1.7 More recently, work has been carried out incorporating into the model the approved TEMPRO v6.2.

1.8 TEMPRO v6.1 was characterised by a generally lower forecast growth than v5.4. TEMPRO v6.2 embedded similar lower forecasts in the now approved version.

Wealden District Council and South Downs National Park Authority
Core Strategy Examination
Supplementary Statement from East Sussex County Council - Appendix 2
16 December 2011

1.9 This report presents the results of a comparison of relevant tests carried out to determine the sensitivity of the broad SWETS conclusions to the changes in TEMPRO from v5.4 to v6.2.

1.10 Sensitivity was determined by considering the scale of change in network performance, and its significance. Network performance is defined here as the maximum ratio of flow to capacity on any arm of a set of junctions identified for this purpose in the main SWETS report.

2. Results

2.1 The attached table shows the comparisons of network performance for a relevant selection of options including the various versions of TEMPRO. Because of the other associated changes (para 1.5 above) direct comparisons will not reflect only the effects of the change in TEMPRO version used.

2.2 'Reference Case' columns in the comparison table provide the best estimate of changes due to the change in TEMPRO alone in Polegate, Pevensey and Willingdon, but are less reliable in Hailsham where the other modelling changes incorporated have had a more significant effect.

2.3 Columns headed 'SWETS 2 LDF' includes the SWETS2 broad development locations for internal south Wealden zones, as shown on the attached Plan. The scale of change between Reference Case and SWETS2 LDF represents the impacts of the specific development assumptions compared to the more general TEMPRO growth.

3 Discussion

3.1 In the Polegate, Willingdon and Pevensey areas, the latest tests using TEMPRO v6.2 have generally indicated similar impacts on local network performance to those identified in SWETS 1 using TEMPRO v5.4.

3.2 Reflecting their role as providers for through traffic, and therefore likely to be most influenced by lower TEMPRO forecasts, most junctions on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) are shown to have lower levels of impact in one or both peaks in Reference Case tests using either TEMPRO v6.1 or v6.2 instead of v5.4. The scale of change can appear substantial, particularly at the signalised junction of A22/A2270 and its adjacent (non-SRN) A2270/Wannock Road junction. At those junctions this is a result of a junction modelling variation adopted in SWETS2 work (signal optimisation) that would not affect route choice

but would represent the junctions in a way that understated the actual capacity limitations of each junction and their linked operation.

3.3 A clearer indication of the changes between TEMPRO v5.4 and v6.2 is given by the results for the most critical junction (Cophall roundabout). The results show that at that key junction network performance is very similar regardless of the version of TEMPRO used, with the junction always operating at or over capacity in both AM and PM peaks. SWETS 2 LDF tests demonstrate deterioration in network performance as a result of specific development.

3.4 In the Hailsham area, the change in TEMPRO has clearly had a less substantial impact than the other modelling changes.

3.5 In all parts of the SWETS area there is a general deterioration in network performance when specific site developments are included rather than general TEMPRO growth, regardless of the version of TEMPRO used.

4 Conclusion

4.1 The overall impact on the model outputs from the TEMPRO changes were not significant and therefore the capacity creating transport interventions originally identified in SWETS are still required to accommodate locally derived traffic movements associated with development.

R New 14/12/11