

**From:** [DfT Official]  
**Sent:** 12 March 2018 12:06  
**To:** [WSP] [HCC Official]  
**Cc:** [DfT Officials]  
**Subject:** RE: South Wye Transport Package

Hi all,

Please see below my comments on the OAR, ORR, survey data report and LMVR. I am happy to discuss or provide clarity on any of my points if that would be helpful.

Option Assessment Report (version Feb 2018):

- (1) Thanks for addressing my previous comments. The description of the current situation in the revised report is more clearly articulated.
- (2) Select Link Analysis is presented for A465 Belmont Rd, Walnut Tree Ave and Ross Road for AM and PM peak. The flows on Walnut Tree Ave seem to indicate the East-West movement is not significant as expected. It would be really useful to show the turning flow diagrams (including HGVs) for the key junctions, particularly the turning flows from A465 to A49(T) for the AM peak.
- (3) Para 4.2.33 - which are the four selected route for journey time survey analysis?
- (4) Traffic congestion and JT unreliability have been identified as one of the problems due to the constrained highway capacity particularly at junction of the A49(T) and A465. It is rather strange not to include congestion relief as one of the South Wye Area Specific Objectives and Targets.
- (5) Based on the network delay diagrams in Appendix C, it seems the congestion on Greyfriars Bridge is more a concern than the EW movement. It would be useful to undertake some travel demand analysis to demonstrate the need for Southern Link Road, for example the level of demand from A465 (south) to HEZ/Rotherwas Industrial Estate.

Option Refinement Report (Feb 2018):

- (6) Chapter 6 presents the Low Cost Alternative Option very briefly. If the LCA is not properly tested there is increased risk of legal challenge and/or a scheme being rejected at planning inquiry and hence this increases the deliverability risks. It is important to clearly describe the junction proposals with scheme drawings, present the junction capacity improvement study results and provide clear explanation why this is discarded (e.g. not meeting the South Wye Area objectives).

Report of Highway Surveys (Sept 2017):

- (7) Table 4-5 - Can you explain why there is a large difference between the ATC and MCJC for RSI site 2?
- (8) Section 5.2 - Can you add a summary table to show the number of parking spaces available at each site? And present the parking occupancy rates?
- (9) Table 6.2 and 6.3 - last column is missing.

LMVR (Sept 2017):

- (10) Inner cordon is a validation screenline based on independent data. Is the screenline the only validation data?
- (11) Section 6.5 routing validation - 8 OD pairs were considered. It would be useful if you could check the routing between origin (say Wormbridge, south of A465) and destination at HEZ.

- (12) More clarity is needed for the RSI and car interview data merging process, particularly the 3rd paragraph on page 47 and 2nd paragraph on page 48.
- (13) Why there are less IP trip data in Table 4-12 when compared to those in Table 4-11?
- (14) Paragraph 4.2.41 said 'If an interview for home based work is recorded in the evening period the probability that the "outward" journey was in the morning period is 39.3%.' - this doesn't seem correct.
- (15) Please provide more details on the RSI and CPS data expansion and other adjustments for each site in line with TAG M1.2 para. 3.3.26.
- (16) Also provide more details on the synthetic matrix development process, although I remember the process based on previous email correspondences about this topic.
- (17) Please provide the modelled and observed flow comparison for individual sites in each screenline based on the prior matrices, in addition to Table 5-1. According to TAG M3.1 para 8.2.1, 'the need for either matrix estimation or other adjustments to the prior trip matrices is clearly established before any such processes are carried out. The prior trip matrices should therefore be validated by comparing total screenline and cordon modelled flows and counts by vehicle type and time period'.
- (18) Paragraph 6.2.2 & 6.4.5 - It mentioned that 'The modelled flows across the inbound inner cordon do not combine to less than a 5% deviation against the observed flows.' - Suggest to rephrase this.
- (19) Table 6-1 indicates the AM inbound modelled flow is twice than the observed at the ATC site 20 (A456 Belmont Road). Table 6-8 shows the PM outbound modelled flow is 30% higher than the observed at site 28 (A49 Ross Road). Given that these key routes are the most relevant to SLR, please could you explain why these validation results are acceptable.

Could you please send me the VDM note? When you send me the revised reports, please use tracked changes or highlight the changes.

Regards,

xxxxxxxxxx

xxxxxxxxxx | Head of Local Transport Modelling, Economics of Regional and Local Transport,  
Department for Transport  
2/13 GMH | | xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

**From:** [WSP]

**Sent:** 07 March 2018 15:04

**To:** [DfT Official]

**Cc:** [DfT Official; HCC Officials]

**Subject:** RE: South Wye Transport Package

xxxxxxx

During our discussion last week I recall you saying that you had a set of comments which you were going to share with us. Would it be possible to send those comments through to me? I have follow up meeting with [HCC Official] and [HCC Official] planned for next Wednesday at which we plan to pick up how to respond to your comments and queries.

Thank you

xxxxxxxxxx

xxxxxxxxxx

T+ xxxxxxxxxxxx

M+ xxxxxxxxxxxx

[wsp.com](https://wsp.com)