

Speaking Note for Inglewood Public Inquiry. (P. Dijkshoorn MSc.)

Thank you Inspector for giving me the opportunity to speak today.

1. Introduction

My name is Pieter Dijkshoorn. I am a retired senior traffic and transport engineer; a resident of Galmpton and a member of the Galmpton Residents Association Committee. In preparation for my verbal submission, focus was placed on the traffic and transport effects that the development of Inglewood will entail.

This focus has been purposefully chosen. In order to provide a professional input on these aspects.

For the many other aspects on which the development of Inglewood has influence (eg environment and landscape, etc.) it is certain that other experts (whether or not represented by their legal advisers) will provide a professional and satisfactory contribution.

2. What preceded

In the first instance I have already submitted a number of objections before. Such as on November 22nd., 2017; on April 1st., 2018 and on December 1st., 2020.

In preparing this verbal submission during the past weeks, I have found that there are important additional issues for an assessment of the application. On the one hand, because my objections were already submitted in 2017 and 2018 and, on the other hand, because the objection submitted in December 2020 only focused on Windy Corner.

This verbal submission therefore does not overlap with previously submitted objections.

3. My submission in this inquiry

For this occasion, a number of previously published papers were carefully studied and analyzed once more. More specifically, I have looked again at:

- a) PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF ROGER KEY BSc(Hons) CEng FICE FCIHT ON TRANSPORT MATTERS; Dated DECEMBER 2020.
- b) STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND ON TRANSPORT ISSUES; Dated MARCH 2020; **Version 7.0 as agreed by TORBAY COUNCIL (Adam Luscombe).**
- c) Technical Note 8 Windy Corner Junction - Proposed Improvements and Traffic Capacity Analysis by Key Transport Consultants (KTC); Dated NOVEMBER 2019; **Version 1.1. as checked and reviewed by Roger Key.**

3.1. About the Proof of Evidence on Transport Matters

About the Main Conclusion.

In terms of content, there has been a relative improvement of the existing situation. But this does not mean, that this existing situation can be qualified as justified and acceptable. However, for whether or not to approve the application, an accepted; valid and correct starting (reference) situation is essential and necessary. This is ignored in the assessment against the policy (NPPF 108c 109; Torbay Local Plan 2012-2030 and Brixham Peninsular

Neighbourhood Plan 2012-2030). This is a very serious rejectable policy-analytical- and procedural omission.

In other words, there is the big question: should the S-106 agreement solve it all? With an S-106 agreement, however, only mitigating measures are guaranteed. Substantive traffic problems in themselves are not prevented by this and can still occur. In other words: only contemptuous measures are necessary; but not enough to meet the concerns and to deliver acceptable standards in the near future!

This shows the following as a (future) risk:

- 1) It is not certain that the resulting mitigation effects will reach a sufficient extent in practice.
- 2) In fact and in principle the Council places the implementation of mitigating measures in the hands of the applicant.
- 3) The effects of the improvement of walking and cycling infrastructure as well as a bus service on (external) traffic flow and road safety are not secured at forehand. Indeed, it cannot be quantified in the preparatory planning process, because of its general and abstract nature.

About the package of mitigating measures

Taking all this into account, it has been established that in a relative sense there are qualitative effects of the package of measures. But do they have sufficient quantitative resolving power to change the situation from bad to good in an absolute sense? This question has not been answered explicitly. Apart from the omission observed in the policy-analytical and procedural review, there are also other - and poorly - or even unpredictable parameters that were not taken into account. For example, the choice of transport mode, behavior of road users, etc. In other words: the process has not been conducted in an integrated manner and this is a (major) obstacle to the absolute approval of the application. The measures have insufficient resolving power, to shift the current problems (without Inglewood) "from bad to good"; or at least the status quo is more or less maintained.

When assessing the entire development process, it appears that "Windy Corner" had to be added at the last minute. Why is not clear. The fact that the Council itself first implemented improvements in 2019 turned out to be a pure coincidence. Which is separate from the development of Inglewood and was also not relevant for this. This is not a sign of thorough, integral planning in advance.

The adaptations of Windy Corner confirm that they mean "preservation of misery". In other words, there will never be an acceptable, sustainable traffic situation (including Inglewood). Not in terms of traffic flow and to a lesser extent not in terms of road safety as well! This will be discussed in more detail at the end of my submission today. (section 3.3.).

The bus stop infrastructure is located at the new roundabout in Brixham Road (drawing 0734-057). This is on the very edge of the new residential location. The actual use of the bus services by new residents, will therefore remain low. Only with a relatively high bus frequency and good access throughout the entire new residential area the promotion of more sustainable mobility and a model shift can be achieved, in accordance with the (policy) goals in the various plans of the Council.

The changes to the transverse and longitudinal profile of the Brixham Road north of the new roundabout is mainly for the improvement of road safety. It also includes a relocation of the maximum speed limit of 30 mph. (see drawing 0734-045 B). All this hardly affects the capacity of this road section. In section 6.3. The SoCGTI states (and I quote): *“It is agreed that the proposed development satisfies the transport policy requirements of the adopted Torbay Local Plan 2012-2030 because: the development supports strategic improvements to the Western Corridor (SS6.2)”*.

However, the proposed technical modifications to the Brixham Road detract from this policy. In practice, there is a regret of partial reversal of the project impacts carried out by means of large-scale modification works by the Council on the Western Corridor, between 2012 and 2019 (among others: capacity increase at Tweenaways Crossing and widening to 4 lanes elsewhere).

The planned toucan crosswalk north of the new roundabout in Brixham Road is a traffic light secured crossing, that will be used by both cyclists and pedestrians (drawing 0734-023 B). Although the crossing movements take place on the basis of a green light request, this crossing has a negative effect on the quality of the traffic flow. And is not durable safe as a level crossing, given two important school routes as well. Following policy for durable roadsafety; a bicycle/pedestrian tunnel should be the preferable solution here.

A second - and also new non traffic light secured crossing over Brixham Road to/from the future residential area is planned more south. (drawing 0734-029 A). For policy reasons, this part of the package of measures should not be implemented in this form. After all, this is certainly contrary to the Council's sustainable safety policy.

A connection for cyclists/pedestrians that is completely free from the main road between White Rock 1 and Inglewood is a principle that in itself is a good element in a sustainably safe traffic network (drawing 0734-055). Based on the urban structure of Paignton, it is quite likely, that the main orientation of the new residents in Inglewood is more west-east than south-north. Therefore it raises the question; of whether investment should be made in a separate south-north route or prioritised in safer crossing facilities west-east over/under Brixham Road. See also the comments above.

My objection about the adaptations of the Windy Corner intersection has already submitted in December 2020. In addition to this objection, my submission today provides extra comments. In paragraphs 3.4 to 3.18, KTC A lot of attention has been rightly devoted to the Windy Corner intersection. Additional effects on the capacity (and safety) of the intersection can only be properly assessed by consulting the underlying documents. For which I must kindly refer to the end of my submission today.

The non-traffic light pedestrian crossing over Brixham Road will not be resolved. This only refers to a detour by crossing twice over Dartmouth Road from/to Hookhills and further afield to/from Inglewood! This is unacceptable because it will not work in practice. In this context, the Letter of Representation submitted by the Head of Churston Grammer School - dated January 5, 2021 - is also of great importance.

Maintaining the overall conclusion is inadequate and not acceptable either! Regarding the last part of it, I refer in detail again at the end of this submission.

About measures to improve sustainable travel modes

The necessary comments/remarks have already been made about the quality of these measures. In particular the bus-infrastructure, and both crossings over Brixham Road. And

with regard to the continuation of pedestrian/cycling facilities, these are absent along Brixham Road near Windy Corner. Due to the presence of (among other things) the former toll house and a number of bungalows west of Brixham Road.

About meeting the transportation policy requirements

The development does not meet the policy requirements. On the one hand, it has become clear in the foregoing that various parts of the package of mitigating measures have a significant negative effect on road safety. Moreover, there are also cumulative effects in terms of traffic flow on the road network. The weakest link of the Western Corridor will be subject to an additional burden by the development with 2,795 motor vehicles per day. This is discussed in more detail, specifically with regard to Windy Corner at the end of my submission.

Only a relative reference is made for the assessment. But the point is that a judgement in an absolute sense remains absent. It appears that the current very bad traffic situation is not improving and that there is only "preservation of misery". This is underlined by the fact, that the effects of major investments made by the Council on the Western Corridor are partly lost again with the arrival of the new residential location. The essential local economy of Brixham as an important fishing port is increasingly deteriorating. Due to decreasing accessibility. For all these reasons, there are therefore very serious objections to the "Summary of Agreement". **And there are reasonable grounds from a traffic - or transport point of view not to grant permission for the application.**

About additional traffic as a shortcut through Galmpton Village

It is a well-known fact, that simulated route choices are by no means always a reliable prediction for the actual choices made by road users (often psychologically moreover). It seems plausible, that the response could indeed exclude traffic generated in Inglewood here. But it ignores an indirect effect resulting from the development. A so-called secondary effect will probably occur. Namely; that traffic to and from the Brixham Peninsular will choose the route via Waddeton Road and Stoke Gabriel Road, due to the expectation of poor traffic flow on the A roads. However, the mentioned roads are completely unsuitable for this.

3.2. About the Statement of Common Ground Transport Issues

Common Grounds on Transport Issues do provide a good overview of the process conducted for the application.

It is rightly noted, that the situation at Windy Corner is complex. More specifically, since the junction is tightly constrained by built development and common land, and telecommunications equipment further constrains the scope for improvement of the layout. The conclusion is, that the capacity analysis presented in the Traffic Assessment demonstrated that the further improvement would provide sufficient additional capacity to mitigate the impact of Inglewood development traffic. The current capacity shortage will be reduced from - 11.1% to - 5.1% (evening rush hour in 2024). But there is still a shortage and this is policy wise not - or insufficient.

After all, on page 72 of the Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 it is stated (I quote): "*The impacts of planned housing, retail and employment growth on the transport network will be addressed during the plan, especially on the Torbay Ring Road. The schemes anticipated in the Mayoral Vision will require localized junction improvements*". That is therefore something different from insufficiently mitigating existing congestion.

For the same reason, the conclusion in Common Grounds on Transport Issues (included in paragraph 6.3) is objectionable. There it says (I quote again): “It is agreed; that the proposed development satisfies the transport policy requirements of the adopted Torbay Local Plan 2012-2030 because:

- the development supports strategic improvements to the Western Corridor (SS6.2)”.

3.3. About the situation at Windy Corner and on Brixham Road.

The document provides a complete picture of the capacity analyses performed for Windy Corner.

Over the past week, I have checked the calculations by random sampling. It turned out that in itself, the calculations regarding the aforementioned capacity shortage of - 11.1% and - 5.1% respectively (evening rush hour 2024) turn out to be correct.

However, there are objections to the input data used for the calculations.

As a result, the calculation results are too low in absolute terms.

- (Sections 3.6 and 3.7 of the Statement of) Common Grounds for Transport Issues suggest that traffic data from May 2017 were used as input for the calculations. These have been increased with additional data for the development of Inglewood (expected to be completed in 2024). This means; that the intensities used in the model calculations are assumed to be too low. As a result, the calculated capacity shortages of -11.1% and -5.1% at Windy Corner will therefore become higher in absolute terms.
- The outflow capacity used for the various lanes has been tested against the existing theory, in relation to the actual proposed design of Windy Corner. This shows that various values are assumed to be too high, as part of the input data used.
- The calculated queue lengths on the various access roads at Windy Corner mean that, in some places and at some times, the traffic cannot make optimal use of the traffic lanes offered. This is particularly the case on Dartmouth Road North and on Brixham Road. This “blocking back effect” lowers the level of traffic flow there.
- Finally, the calculation model in Appendix F assumes, that the double lanes on Dartmouth Road South in the direction of Brixham are "endless". In practice, however, the dual traffic flow must merge into 1 traffic lane at a fairly short distance downstream of the intersection. This reduces the calculated capacity.

These four objections to the input data mean that the analysis results as presented in absolute sense are (considerably) less favorable in reality, than currently calculated. The presented numerical results can therefore only be used for mutual comparison. But are unsuitable for an absolute assessment. As a result, the real effects will be less favorable than currently proposed. And the final main conclusion is detracted.

Finally allow me to draw a picture of Brixham Road itself.

Analyses of the traffic intensities used in Appendix F show that in the morning rush hour and in the evening rush hour (2024) a total amount of traffic of respectively 62 and 53 (passenger) vehicle units pass Windy Corner. This corresponds approximately to 600 to 700 vehicles on a 24-hour basis. This is 20 to 25% of the total traffic generated by Inglewood

(defined as 2795 pcu/day). This does not seem implausible; given the existing urban development structure of Torbay.

This will make the road section of Brixham Road north of the new roundabout the busiest of all. The future traffic intensity there should then become between 20,750 and 22,850 pcu/day.

Given the road and traffic characteristics on this road section, whether or not to realize Inglewood, means the difference between so called level of service D and E. Due to the realization of Inglewood, the quality level for this road section will drop by the lower limit of level of service D. This means that there will be a chance of delay greater than 75%. And platooning becomes intense, when slower vehicles or other interruptions are encountered. During the evening rush hour, a load level is reached on the road section, that is more than 80% of the maximum capacity. This is certainly not a situation that belongs on the Western Corridor.

Without development of Inglewood, level of service D is just still possible. Average platoon size of 5 to 10 vehicles is then usual. Turning vehicles to adjacent homes and/or roadside distractions cause major shockwaves in the traffic stream. The stated load level is then about 10% lower.

With all this, I hope to have proven that also from a traffic and transport point of view, not to grant permission for the application to develop Inglewood.

Thank you for listening Inspector.