

## QUESTIONS – Fontwell Event 3<sup>rd</sup> Feb 2022

### Topic 42 % more traffic through The Street

1. Why is Mill Lane not closing – I understand it was previously going to be closed? Is this to allow a release valve for Fontwell roundabouts as the 1300 extra vehicles would make the time saving far worse and so the benefits even less significant? **Neither Alan nor Drew knew what I was talking about – looked blank.** Question – is the rumour true? **Even if it was closed traffic would probably route down from Whiteways to Arundel and back along A27.**

2. Do you need the 1300 to rat run – what would happen to the Fontwell calculations if the rat run was stopped? **Not modelled. The Rate Run came up late in the day when the consulation event had already been organised. Alan said they had to be open about it but had not yet found a solution. If he had it would have made his life over the last couple of weeks a lot easier. The model does not allow them to ‘turn off ‘ the Rate Run to see what it does to the Fontwell junctions. (I pressed him on this as surely the model can be changed to include new traffic calming etc). I think (logically) that it can be but I’m guessing its not a quick process so not done yet. When pressed on what this would do to the Fontwell predicted queues he did not know but “it would make it worse”. It still seems that they will not want to solve the rat running as it will ruin any benefit cost ratio they have identified see 3. Below.**

3. Where will the A27 at Fontwell queue back to at peak times? What is the vehicles queue number? Adding 1300 is ok? **At first he was vague (didn’t have the information to hand) then eventually he said as far as he recalled the queue was between the 2 Fontwell roundabouts.** I countered that it must be longer if its preventing the A29 traffic getting out as a29 has right of way over the west bound A27 traffic. So surely for the A29 traffic to want to Rat Run the model must be showing that the A27 traffic will be so heavy that it will block the roundabout so only allowing one car at a time (if they are brave enough) to cross the oncoming eastbound traffic and wait on the actual roundabout. **He didn’t disagree or agree. BUT he admitted as there is a known problem with the capacity at Fontwell west and “ANY single additional vehicle was therefore a problem”. Eventually he said that about 2000-2500 vehicles per hour would be going through Fontwell queues at peak times and if the 1300 were to stay on the A29/A27 then that would add 300-400 vehicles per hour!** By my calcs this would add 12% -20% per hour to a junction which already has known problems and which the fixed demand model will cause delays of 3 minutes. Add the 12%-20% plus the extra 10-15% they recognise will be added using the variable demand model. Question - is there going to be a true time saving at all especially if they add back the 1300 vehicles onto A27 at Fontwell.

4. Some of the 1300 comes along the old A27? **Yes, don’t know its origins. Could be coming from Arundel or down to Arundel from Whiteways.** I wish I had pressed him for the percentages/proportions along A27/A29.

5. 1300 extra per day means - 3090 total east and west over 24 hours. **Yes. The 1300 is also 24 hours.** Ok but mainly at the peak pm. **Yes.** Peak pm not accurate surely they peak is more likely 3:30-6:30pm. **I got the impression he didn’t disagree but he said he had to use the standard time slots used by the model which are am peak, mid and evening peak (which is 4-7pm)** What will be the real peak rat running times?

6. Is the 1300 over peak hours only? What hours? over 3 hours = one every 8.3 seconds for 3 hours! **We calculate it as one every 15 seconds.** So you must be using different data? Not evenly spread? **I don’t recall how he answered this, but he didn’t expand further. Maybe we need to get to the bottom of this at another meeting? Its interesting that he had a figure for it! With either figure I**

said I doubted people even cross the road with the traffic that heavy. **Response: Segregation is something we have to take into account.**

7. What is the % increase on other lanes? Why are they still not shown on the documents? **Can't show all roads and too much information- it would get confusing.** People living on these lanes have no idea that the bypass will have any effect on them – **this is not consultation and will be open to challenge.....**I don't recall exactly how he responded- I think he didn't but he generally referred to trying to keep the map uncluttered etc etc. **Key Points:**

**Underassigning of local roads -modelling term. Strategic Roads more accurate. They know the existing traffic in The Street is higher than the model shows (under assigned).** Need to check if I got this right as recent traffic count shows their base figure is about right. Re omission of Lake Lane, Ford Lane and Barnham Lane etc Lorries from Rudford Ind estate, how is traffic data is collected (does it include types of traffic- do you know about the lorries) How will Tye Lane junction work with HGV's. **Model won't plan for HGV turning in meeting large delivery existing Tye Lane (3 houses – domestic traffic only (and I think he said LGV) only.** How far back up Yapton Lane will the 1300 vehicles queue as they have to give way to oncoming traffic through the village due to cars mostly being parked on the south side of the street. **The model doesn't have the information to take account of such things. It just has the capacity of the road and assumes free flow. No queues therefore shown up in the model. They don't know.** NB Queueing traffic will make pollution even worse.

8. At what point is a % increase (or what do the numbers have to reach) for it to be unacceptable from a highways point of view on these lanes. **Aim to get it to 0%. Might look at traffic calming in Mill Road.** But if you prevent the rat running and keep the traffic on the strategic network will Storrington traffic be relieved? If that is a key objective (of the MP) then are you really looking for a solution? As its not even been modelled you can see how it looks like you are not seriously looking at solving this issue. **It came up late in the process.** Why can't the scheme be extended to cover Fontwell West? **Drew – that can't be done. Alan, will be pressing NH to get Fontwell into next road programme.** Great! so the solution is we live with the problem for 20 years plus! **Alan, I (and I got the impression he meant no one) would want to go to the Inquiry with 42% increase.....**I got the impression he would get a tough time at Inquiry if he did and wouldn't be able to defend it. BUT how can they get traffic back onto A27 and still keep their time saving to make it a

9. Mitigation – banks planting? Why so little? Does planting not absorb pollution? **Yes CO2 but not all pollution. NO PLANTING has been added to improve air quality.** Why not? Cost? **No not limited by cost – purely done to keep the landscape open as in the landscape designation .** So (me getting sarcastic and exasperated now) we get the noise and the pollution just because its judged that we and the bats etc need to see, hear and smell a scar on the landscape and appreciate the traffic and lorries going along it!!!!

10. **Noise** fig 11-2, 11-3, 11-4 (>5DB) explain please why traffic reduces on A29 but noise level increases. Why is it as noisy in The Street as adjacent to the bypass!!! **Couldn't as noise expert not there. Need to go to Yapton or Slindon (Saturdays). They phoned for help. The answer given was that Fig 11-4 takes account of 50mph but not the noise bunds or 'quieter' surface. (This is still tarmac but a finer grade) 2-3 DB increase is perceptible (Matt). Planting doesn't mitigate for noise. Few people will do 50mph. Has the true speed at 70mph been modelled for noise. Yes that's why the speed has been reduced to 50mph.** We know that's not the real reason but it made me concerned that noise could be a secondary reason. How bad are the noise maps at 70mph which is more realistic– “Can we see that modelling” ? **You would have to do a FOI request! Helpful !!!!**

12. How do exhaust fumes spread, up? Sideways? Like a nuclear plume? **Blank faces!** What is being done to stop pollution of Binsted Rife from hydrocarbon runoff. Ponds adjacent. Sampled existing water quality? **A lot of waffle and guesswork – they didn't know and then referred me to Chapter 13 of PIER.** After a long time a more knowledgeable chap turned up and gave me the information. EA say Binsted Rife suffers from lack of water which leads to poor water quality. They want water directed to the Rife (via culverts from the proposed storage ponds.) Rate of runoff limited to greenfield rate and water quality controlled in the licence from the EA that is why they have given themselves a large red dashed area around the Binsted attenuation pond so that if they need reed beds etc to control quality they can do this. Water table issues ongoing. May not be able to do the 8 metre cutting at Avisford Grange. I got the impression that they are finding the water table is much higher than they thought. We could have told them that! The water table is much higher than 8 Metres and I suspect even a 4 metre cutting will require significant water control measures and cost!!