

## 5. Transportation

- 5.1 As reported in **Chapter 1** of this ES, a planning application for the entire former Airbase (i.e. the Site and the Flying Field to the north) was submitted in 2007 and was granted permission in January 2010. The planning application was accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) prepared by Ove Arup & Partners Ltd in August 2007 (hereafter referred to as 'the TA').
- 5.2 Consultation with the Transport Development Control Manager at OCC has established that the TA (which includes junction capacity assessments and accident analysis) remains valid for the current application. This is because the on-Site traffic generation would remain within the acceptable daily variation of the traffic levels predicted in the TA. This is explained below.
- 5.3 In the TA the development content was divided into 'Assessed Land Uses' (C3, B1, B2, B8, Heritage Centre & Conference Centre) and 'Non-Trip Generating Land Uses'.
- 5.4 The TA included in its 'Assessed Land uses' the following:
- Residential – up to 1,075 dwellings;
  - B1 Office – 15,658m<sup>2</sup>;
  - B2 Office – 17,996m<sup>2</sup>;
  - B8 Storage – 86,113m<sup>2</sup>;
  - Heritage Centre – 4,195m<sup>2</sup>; and
  - Conference Centre – 4,150m<sup>2</sup>.
- 5.5 The TA also discussed a number of other land uses for which it stated that no trips were included in the assessment (because it was assumed that for these uses the trips would either be internal or pass-by). These land uses that were deemed to be non trip-generating were:
- Retail – 743m<sup>2</sup>;
  - Church – 680m<sup>2</sup>;
  - Community Centre – 580m<sup>2</sup>;
  - Bar / Restaurant – 340m<sup>2</sup>;
  - Nursery – 224m<sup>2</sup>; and
  - Primary School – no area specified.
- 5.6 The main changes between the proposed Development and the consented development are that approximately 300 existing bungalow dwellings would be retained, rather than demolished and rebuilt. In addition, the area of B1 Office use has been reduced by over 40% and the areas of A1 Retail use and C1/C2 uses have increased.
- 5.7 **Tables 5.1** and **5.2** summarise the building schedule within the Settlement Area only for the consented development compared with the proposed Development, together with the associated traffic generation. Where available, trip rates from the TA are used, but in the case of retail where no trip rates were quoted, trip rates have been used from TRICS version 2010(b)v6.6.2 for 'local shops on weekdays'.

Table 5.1: AM Peak Trip Generation Comparison Between the Consented Development and the Proposed Development

		Retail	B1	C1/C2
Accommodation Quantum	Consented Development (m <sup>2</sup> )	743	10333	4020
	Proposed Development (m <sup>2</sup> )	1400	5821	5682
	Difference (m <sup>2</sup> )	<b>657</b>	<b>-4512</b>	<b>1662</b>
Trip Rates (AM)	Arrivals	0.05836	0.0181	0.01
	Departures	0.05468	0.0028	0.006111
	Total	0.11304	0.0209	0.016111
Difference in Trips (AM)	Arrivals	38	-82	17
	Departures	38	-13	10
	Total	77	-94	27
<b>NET TOTAL (AM)</b>		<b>9</b>		

Table 5.2: PM Peak Trip Generation Comparison Between the Consented Development and the Proposed Development

		Retail	B1	C1/C2
Accommodation Quantum	Consented Development (m <sup>2</sup> )	743	10333	4020
	Proposed Development (m <sup>2</sup> )	1400	5821	5682
	Difference (m <sup>2</sup> )	<b>657</b>	<b>-4512</b>	<b>1662</b>
Trip Rates (PM)	Arrivals	0.06709	0.0042	0.006111
	Departures	0.06617	0.0162	0.006667
	Total	0.13326	0.0204	0.012778
Difference in Trips (PM)	Arrivals	44	-19	10
	Departures	43	-73	11
	Total	88	-92	21
<b>NET TOTAL (PM)</b>		<b>17</b>		

- 5.8 **Tables 5.1** and **5.2** show that the increase in traffic generated by the additional retail and C1/C2 accommodation is offset by the reduction in traffic associated with the lower amount of B1 accommodation. This results in an overall increase of 9 additional trips in the AM peak and an additional 17 in the PM peak. This equates to a maximum of one additional vehicle every 4 minutes and is less than the typical daily variation in traffic volume. It is therefore concluded that the junction capacity analysis within the TA remains robust.
- 5.9 Other proposed transport infrastructure measures, such as the principle of retaining Camp Road as a principal vehicular route to serve the proposed development; the principle of facilitating HGV access arrangements to the Flying Field towards the east of the Site; and the principle of the introduction of a bus route looping through the residential areas to the south of Camp Road, are all unchanged from that previously approved in January 2010 and assessed within the TA. The retention of the bungalows to the south of Camp Road does not have a material effect upon these transport infrastructure principles, nor upon the validity of the TA.
- 5.10 The above conclusion has been discussed with OCC and they have confirmed that the TA remains valid for the proposed Development. The transport impact assessment as set out in the 2007 ES (Roger Evans Ltd) also therefore remains valid for the proposed Development. Please therefore refer to **Appendix 5.1** of this ES which contains relevant extracts of the 2007 ES and contains the transport impact assessment for the proposed Development. The TA is contained in **Appendix 5.2**.