



Response to NCC comments on Mouchel Transport Assessment for proposed Tesco foodstore at Beeston, Nottinghamshire.

Comments received on the above Transport Assessment are summarised in bold font, with Mouchel's response in italics.

GFA used for TA (8,130m²) differs from that indicated on planning application (9,185m²)

As stated within the TA, the figure of 8,130m² excludes the unit shops, atrium and lobby/circulation space.

Trip rates for the proposed store have been extracted from the TRICS database. The comparable sites within TRICS are all at-grade stores which have no need for atrium or circulation space as the proposed store at Beeston does. These elements of the proposal are considered not to generate any trips and have, therefore, been excluded from the floorspace figure for the purpose of the TA.

It is considered that all trips to the unit shops would be linked with trips to either the foodstore or the town centre, as stated in section 3.2.1 of the Transport Assessment. This element of the proposal is therefore considered not to generate any new vehicular trips on the local highway network.

There is an understandable concern that the highway authority does not want to recommend approval for a 9,185m² GFA foodstore when highway impact for only 8,130m² GFA has been assessed. In order to address this concern, we would draw your attention to the retail Statement that confirms the retail trading areas as; unit shops 255m² gross (for units of this scale we would expect a net to gross ratio of approximately 85%.) with a net sales area of approximately 220m². The Tesco store will have a net sales area of 5,770m² (comprising 4,013m² net of convenience sales and 1,757m² of comparison sales). The residual floor area would be dedicated to storage, travellers and customer circulation outside the sales area.

Left-turn into car park from Station Road should give priority to those entering in order to prevent queues forming back onto the highway.

Accompanying this paper is an amended site layout plan (drawing TSK30'K') which shows a proposed arrangement for the car park. This was agreed with the Architect and Broxtowe council in the meeting on Friday and is considered to provide sufficient priority to vehicles entering from Station Road.

Details of Tactile Paving at Station Road access point required

A drawing was tabled in the Highways meeting on 14/11/08 which demonstrated that adequate tactile paving provision could be accommodated within the adopted highway under the proposals.

Parking Provision

Accompanying this paper are the results of a traffic survey of the Tesco Extra store in Hucknall (2007.286 HucknallResults.xls). The foodstore is of a comparable size to that proposed at Beeston; however it has an on-site PFS and is not in a town centre location which means the Hucknall store would attract a considerably higher number of trips.

The traffic survey included a count of the number of vehicles in the store car park at the beginning of each survey, and from this the car park accumulation has been calculated for the Friday pm and Saturday peak periods. As can be seen from the results attached, the maximum occupancy calculated during the survey is 416 vehicles on Saturday. We would expect the car park for the Beeston store to have a maximum demand lower than this due to the town centre location, greater propensity for linked trips, and readily available public transport facilities.

The parking ratio for the proposed store of 8,130m² GFA (excluding disabled spaces) is 1:19.1. This is in accordance with the maximum parking ratio of 1:14 set out in PPG13, and the proposed provision of 446 parking spaces is therefore to be appropriate for this development.

Cycle Stands should be covered

It was agreed in the meeting on 14/11/08 that some of the cycle stands would be relocated under the car park deck, close to the store entrance. Some cycle racks would remain in the location previously proposed in order to give cyclists a choice of where to leave their bicycle. The relocated cycle racks will be shown on the final proposed site layout plan.

Marvin Road would require stopping up

Marvin Road has been stopped up under the consented scheme.

Access to Garages on Union Street, and details of footway

Access to the garages would be provided as per the consented scheme, and will be shown on the final proposed site layout plan. The footway in this location would be 2m wide, and the approximately 4m wide space between back of footway and adopted highway boundary would be suitably landscaped.

Tram Reservation should be topsoiled and seeded

We can confirm that Tesco would be willing to do this.

Is access roundabout needed? Corners need to be smoothed out

As discussed in the meeting on 14/11/08, the access mini-roundabout was included in the consented scheme in order to overcome visibility problems, and has been included in this latest proposal for the same reason. Corners around the roundabout would be smoothed out as requested in order to remove crime and disorder concerns. This will be shown on the final proposed site layout.

Zebra crossing should be included on Acacia Walk

This was omitted from the application drawing in error and will be included on the final proposed site layout.

Pedestrian crossing on Station Road should be signalled and linked to adjacent junctions

This is included in the Section 278 Agreement for the consented scheme, and will be included in the Section 278 Agreement for this latest proposal.

Part of Acacia Walk will require stopping up

As discussed in the meeting on 14/11/08, this remaining section of road is required to provide access to statutory undertakers equipment. However, collapsible bollards can be installed to allow access only by statutory undertakers vehicles.

It should also be noted that this area of highway is needed to accommodate the proposed tram works. This will be more straightforward if the land remains as highway. If stopped up, the land ownership would revert to Tesco and require CPO.

Traffic Engineering Comments

Station Road/Middle Street Junction

Layout unacceptable due to poor alignment of ahead lane

Accompanying this paper is drawing SK01 181108 which shows how the proposed alignment of Station Road (N) could be amended to provide an alignment for ahead traffic which is no worse than that currently consented.

Linsig model shows junction to operate over capacity

Following receipt of these comments, we have revisited the assumptions in our Transport Assessment and compared them with those in the previously consented TA. Two differences were noted:

- 1. Zero traffic growth was modelled in the consented TA, while growth factors were included in the latest TA.*
- 2. The latest TA assumed a wider extent of pass-by trips than the consented TA.*

With respect to the first point, survey data for 1999 and 2007 show similar levels of peak hour traffic using the junction during the Friday peak hour (2268pcu for the 1999 survey, 2232 pcu for the 2007 survey). We therefore consider that modelling of traffic growth was overly robust and have recalculated traffic flows based on zero growth, in line with the methodology adopted for the consented scheme.

On point 2, we have amended the trip assignment spreadsheet (which accompanies this paper) to show 'pass-by' trips originating only from traffic movements which pass Union Street and the Station Road access. We consider this to be appropriate as it is based on the same principles as the consented Transport Assessment. These amendments therefore model a 'most likely' traffic scenario, similar to that modelled in the consented TA.

Finally, we have amended lane lengths in the Linsig model as per Nottinghamshire's comments and added a separate ahead lane to reflect the amendments to the alignment shown on SK01 181108. Having reviewed the layout of Station Road (S) shown in the current Section 278 Agreement drawings we consider that the length of the left-turn lane could be increased to 5pcu in the model.

A copy of the amended Linsig report for this junction accompanies this paper (Station Rd~Middle St 181108.lsg) and demonstrates that the proposed layout of the Station Road/Middle Street junction would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the traffic flows generated by the proposed foodstore.

Middle Street/Union Street junction

Consistent layout and model should be provided for the junction

An amended Linsig model has been forwarded to Nottinghamshire highways for review, and a report of this model accompanies this paper (Middle St~Union St 191108.lsg).

NET Comments

Error in design flows for left turn into Union St from Middle St

This was due to an error in calculation of pass-by trips and has now been corrected. An amended trip assignment spreadsheet accompanies this paper as noted above.

PM peak should be modelled

The Linsig report included within the TA does model the pm peak, however a default assessment period of 08.00-09.00 is shown with the report. An updated Linsig model which reflects the above changes to the trip assignment accompanies this paper (Station Rd-Middle St NET Layout.lsg).

Saturday 2013 has not been modelled

It is understood that the Saturday 2013 peak has not been modelled as part of the NET scheme, hence only the pm peak being modelled within our Transport Assessment. It is considered that this is sufficient given that the Friday peak is shown to be busiest for the 'without tram' scenario.

PCU value of 6 should be adopted for trams

This has been incorporated in the above amended linsig model.

No drawings within the TA to reflect which junction layout has been modelled for 'with NET' scenario

Figure 7 of the TA shows the proposed junction layout under the NET proposals, however it is understood that this document appears to be missing from the electronic version of the TA. A copy of Figure 7 therefore accompanies this document.