

OCC Transport Development Control

Key points for Appeal Statement

1. Five reasons for objection:

- I. The site is in an unsustainable location for walking and cycling.
- II. The proximity of the access roundabout to M40 Junction 11 is likely to lead to severe congestion and potential safety issues arising from queuing on the M40 off slip.
- III. Any further development around Junction 11 of the M40 will add to the severe congestion and air quality problems on the A422, particularly along Hennef Way – this development does not demonstrate how it would mitigate its impact on these issues through adequate sustainable travel connections or by highway improvements.
- IV. Safe and suitable operation of affected highway junctions has not been demonstrated by the use of a suitable analysis tool.
- V. It has not been demonstrated that a signalised crossing of the A361 for pedestrians and cyclists may be incorporated at a safe and suitable location, and the associated access into the site has not been indicated.

Re. reason IV, the suitable analysis tool is VISSIM. It is agreed by all parties that microsimulation modelling (such as VISSIM) is required to accurately represent the flow of vehicles at all the primary local junctions and the interaction between them. Analysis using VISSIM has not yet started.

2. Junction 11 has been analysed using LinSig. Results are inconclusive as:

- i. The model does not entirely correspond to the proposed layout drawing.
- ii. Traffic flows associated with another nearby development proposal (21/02467/F) have been erroneously included.
- iii. LinSig is considered to have limitations that mean it is not suitable to predict the future operation of the local network with sufficient confidence (see above).

3. Proposed modifications to Junction 11 to mitigate for increased traffic will involve extensive civil engineering works and it has not been demonstrated that these works are feasible. The main changes involve:

- a. Realigning and widening the A361 entry on to the gyratory. This will entail the removal of trees and significant build-up of the embankment.
- b. Widening of the southern overbridge to accommodate an additional lane. This will also require tree removal and embankment works, and possibly the replacement of the entire bridge.

4. OCC believe it will not be possible to conclude that any mitigation scheme is sufficient to adequately mitigate against the impact of development on the local highway network.
5. Should the appeal be upheld, OCC require S106 contributions to mitigate the impacts as far as possible. Details will be in the R122 Statement.