

---

<b>Project:</b>	Rossendale Local Plan		
<b>Our reference:</b>	391034	<b>Your reference:</b>	N/A
<b>Prepared by:</b>	JK/RS	<b>Date:</b>	12.01.18
<b>Approved by:</b>	RS	<b>Checked by:</b>	CS
<b>Subject:</b>	Operational Analysis		

---

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Mott Macdonald have been commissioned by Rossendale Borough Council to undertake a Highway Capacity Analysis in relation to the draft Rossendale Local Plan. The analysis has been undertaken to inform both the allocations process and to provide appropriate commitment to the formal Duty to Cooperate process.

A detailed report outlining the assessment approach and methodology will be produced by Mott Macdonald, however the purpose of this short technical note is to provide a point of reference for stakeholder discussion regarding the operational assessments undertaken to date.

Operational analysis has been carried out for the following assessment years and scenarios;

- 2019 Baseline,
- 2024 Reference Case,
- 2024 Local Plan,
- 2034 Reference Case, and
- 2034 Local Plan.

The 2019 assessment year represents the assumed year for adoption of the plan, 2024 represents 5-year build out within the plan and 2034 represents the ultimate life of the plan. Local Plan traffic impacts can be isolated by comparing the Reference Case scenario with the Local Plan scenario. The difference between these two scenarios is the principal measures by which we will measure impact and assess the need for subsequent mitigation

Derivation of the assessment scenarios has been undertaken through a combination of adjusted Temprow growth factors, application of committed development traffic volumes and determination of housing and employment allocation traffic volumes using 2011 Census Journey to Work data, TRICS analysis, Transport Assessments for committed developments and GIS fastest route analysis.

Surveyed traffic flows for each of the junctions have been supplied by Lancashire County Council and were undertaken in 2017 in neutral periods outside school holidays.

The operational analysis relates to a series of individual junction assessments, using LinSig, Arcady and Picady as well as DMRB Merge/Diverge tests for the A56 mainline operation. The method of analysis has been

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

agreed with Lancashire Highways and Highways England, the two principal stakeholders who are responsible for maintaining and operating the local road and trunk road network respectively. The exception is the Bacup, St James Square junction has recently been modelled by Lancashire County Council using the Aimsun software and this model has been supplied to Mott Macdonald.

The following junctions, listed in **Table 1** overleaf, have been assessed as part of this analysis, as well as the merges and diverges listed subsequently in **Table 2**.

**Table 1. Junctions Assessed**

Junction Number	Description	SRN / Local	Latitude	Longitude
1	The Gyratory, Rawtenstall	Local	53.699789°	-2.289610°
2	Mini-roundabout by Hardman's Mill, Rawtenstall	Local	53.697475°	-2.297938°
3	Junction of St Mary's Way, Bank Street and Asda, Rawtenstall	Local	53.701931°	-2.286668°
4	Tup Bridge Junction, St Mary's Way, Rawtenstall	Local	53.704607°	-2.285882°
5a	Haslingden Road/Tesco roundabout, Haslingden	SRN/Local	53.695174°	-2.315709°
5b	A56 Haslingden Roundabout	SRN/Local	53.413805°	-2.184915°
6	Rising Bridge roundabout, A56	SRN/Local	53.723421°	-2.326739°
7	Todd Hall Road access	SRN/Local	53.706076°	-2.331073°
8	Grane Road/Holcombe Road junction	Local	53.698447°	-2.335038°
9a	Grane Road/A56 junctions (A56 off-slip)	SRN/Local	53.699681°	-2.331588°
9b	Grane Road/A56 junctions (Waterside Rd Access Rd A56 on-slip Road)	Local	53.699681°	-2.331588°
10	A56 / M66 'Junction 0' at Edenfield	SRN/Local	53.663579°	-2.309594°
11	Rochdale Road/Market St roundabout, Edenfield	Local	53.668806°	-2.304304°
12	Bacup St James Square (recently modelled by Lancashire CC)	Local	53.703389°	-2.200542°
13	Waterfoot roundabout	Local	53.692402°	-2.252515°
14	Toll Bar Roundabout, Stacksteads	Local	53.692867°	-2.220467°
15	Market St/Shawclough Road, Whitworth	Local	53.639837°	-2.178169°

**Table 2. Merge / Diverge Assessments**

Merge / Diverge No.	Description
1	A56 / Grane Road SB Merge
2	A56 / Grane Road NB Diverge
3	A56 / Tesco Haslingden SB Diverge
4	A56 / Haslingden Roundabout NB Merge
5	A56 / Haslingden Roundabout NB Diverge
6	A56 / Tesco Haslingden SB Merge
7	A56 / Junction '0' Edenfield SB Diverge
8	A56 / Junction '0' Edenfield NB Merge

## 2 Junction Operational Analysis

### 2.1 Preamble

The operational analysis results for each junction are summarised in the attached spreadsheets to this Technical Note. The text below each junction header below summarises Mott Macdonald's considerations in relation to the operation of the junction specific to the Local Plan development / progression. For the purposes of these operational assessment, Ratio Flow to Capacity indices (RFC's) and Degree of Saturation (DoS) have been used. Standard industry thresholds have been defined with respect to identifying impact:-

0 to 0.85 (RFC) and 0 to 0.9 (DoS) – The arm of the junction is generally operating within capacity, with minimal queues and delays

0.85 to 1 (RFC) and 0.9 to 1 (DoS) – The junction is approaching design capacity. Under this scenario, flow breakdown is more common, journey time reliability starts to deteriorate and there may be some queuing. However, across a typical week this will vary.

Greater than 1 – The junction is at or above design capacity. Under this scenario, queues and flow breakdown are commonplace at peak periods and journey time reliability is poor. These conditions would be expected to occur on most occasions.

### 2.2 Junctions 1, 3 and 4 – Rawtenstall Gyratory - St Mary's Way/Asda - St Mary's Way/Tup Bridge

Junctions 1, 3 and 4 have been assessed within a linked LinSig model because of the close proximity of these junctions and because the operational performance of each junction is impacted by its neighbour. Linking the junctions has enabled Mott MacDonald to examine the performance of the corridor as a whole.

The results demonstrate that some notable operational issues are expected to occur at the junction in the 2019 baseline position. These issues are exacerbated by local traffic growth in 2024, in both the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios.

By 2034 some very significant operational issues are expected to occur ( $DoS > 1$ ), which are notably exacerbated in the Local Plan scenario compared to the 2034 Reference Case.

This corridor of junctions is likely to be able to accommodate the first 5 years of Local Plan Growth up to 2024 with only minimal intervention required such as the reconfiguration of signals. Beyond this period and within the lifetime of the Local Plan, a more comprehensive intervention(s) will be required which could require the remodelling of some or all the junctions. Given the proximity of these junctions to the town centre such interventions will also need to be able to cater for pedestrians and cyclists in order to mitigate any severance impacts. The scheme would also need to take account of any proposed town centre renewal initiatives and any operational impacts on the fire station would also need to be considered.

### 2.3 Junction 2 – Mini-Roundabout by Hardman's Mill, Rawtenstall

Junction 2 has been assessed using the Arcady software.

The junction demonstrates no operational issues for any of the five scenarios assessed.

It is expected that this junction can accommodate the full build out of the Local Plan and no further assessment is required.

## 2.4 Junction 5a – Haslingden Road, Tesco Roundabout

Junction 5a has been assessed using the Arcady software.

The junction demonstrates some operational issues at the 2019 baseline scenario.

These issues are exacerbated in the 2024 assessment year, with some notable poor performance on certain arms of the junction resulting in Level of Service [LOS] F being derived. However, the performance of the junction remains consistent between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios suggesting that existing geometric issues have a greater impact on the junction than additional local plan traffic.

At the 2034 scenario there are again some very poorly performing arms of the junction, which result in LOS F being derived. It is noted that there is a noted worsening of performance between the 2034 Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios, even though the LOS F remains consistent.

It is considered that this junction can accommodate the build out of the plan within the first five years, however consideration for upgrade may need to be considered for the later years of the plan to 2034.

## 2.5 Junction 5b – A56 Haslingden Roundabout

Junction 5b has been assessed using the Arcady software.

The junction demonstrates no operational issues at either the 2019 or 2024 scenarios.

At 2034 there is one instance of an LOS F (0.95 RFC) being recorded on the B6527 Manchester Rd S approach in the morning peak, which is a noted increase when compared to the 2034 Reference Case results.

It is expected that this junction can accommodate the build out of the Local Plan within the first five years to 2024, with further consideration to whether any minor alterations need to occur to accommodate the final years of the plan to 2034.

## 2.6 Junction 6 – A56 Rising Bridge Roundabout

Junction 6 has been assessed using the LinSig software.

The junction demonstrates relatively minimal operational issues at the 2019 scenario.

At 2024 there are some issues of poor performance recorded, however there is no discernible difference between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios.

At 2034 there are a number of operational issues recorded, particularly within the morning peak. These issues occur in both the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios, however two arms of the junction do show notable increases between these scenarios at 2034.

It is considered that this junction can accommodate the build out of the Local Plan within the first five years to 2024. At 2034 there are some notable operational issues, which are exacerbated slightly by the Local Plan build out. It is considered that discussion with Highways England regarding their long-term aspirations for the A56 should take place, which may determine how best to deal with increases in delay at this junction.

This junction is the only remaining at-grade junction on the A56 – M66, and Highways England have considered the potential for Expressway upgrade for the A56, although no firm commitment exists.

## 2.7 Junction 7 – Todd Hall Road Access

Junction 7 has been assessed using the Picady software.

No operational issues are recorded at this junction in any scenario assessed.

It is considered that this junction can accommodate the build out of the plan up to 2034 and no further assessment is warranted.

## **2.8 Junction 8 – Grane Road / Holcombe Road**

Junction 8 has been assessed using the Picady software.

Operational issues are expected at this junction at 2019. These issues are exacerbated by 2024, however there is a very similar performance between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios.

By 2034 there is further exacerbation of the existing issues and a notable worsening in performance on additional arms which were not noted in 2019 or 2024. Performance overall between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios is considered to be consistent, however some large increases in delay are noticed, even if the LOS remains constant at F.

It is considered that this junction can accommodate the first five years of the Local Plan to 2024. However, the performance of the junction to 2034 (although notably poor in both scenarios) suggests that further consideration might be warranted.

## **2.9 Junction 9a – Grane Road/A56 junctions (A56 off-slip)**

Junction 9a has been assessed using the Picady software.

This junction shows some very poor operational performance at 2019, which is exacerbated through to 2024 and 2034. This would appear to run counter intuitive to existing conditions on the network where queuing and delay is minimal. It is recommended that a further analysis of this junction and cross reference with TRADS data is undertaken

The difference between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios is considered irrelevant given the length of queues recorded, which show blocking back to the A56 in all scenarios.

The junction results show that the Local Plan would struggle to be accommodated at either 2024 or 2034 at this junction, however this is not as a result of the Local Plan allocations, but rather traffic increases in general as well as a seemingly existing issue. The observed traffic flows for this junction, which when grown to 2024 and 2034, result in significant operational concerns. As such, Mott MacDonald have a query regarding the supplied traffic data for this junction.

## **2.10 Junction 9b – Grane Road/A56 junctions (Waterside Rd Access Rd A56 on-slip Road)**

Junction 9b has been assessed using the Picady software.

This junction shows some very poor operational performance at 2019, which is exacerbated through to 2024 and 2034.

It should be noted that there is no 2024 Local Plan test undertaken for this junction, as no Local Plan related traffic from the first five years of the plan was assigned through the junction.

The difference between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios is considered irrelevant given the length of queues recorded, which show blocking back to the A56 in all scenarios.

Similar to Junction 9a, the junction results show that the Local Plan would struggle to be accommodated at either 2024 or 2034 at this junction, however this is not as a result of the Local Plan allocations, but rather traffic increases in general as well as a seemingly existing issue.

The observed traffic flows for this junction, which when growthed to 2024 and 2034, result in significant operational concerns. As such, Mott MacDonald have a query regarding the supplied traffic data for this junction.

### **2.11 Junction 10 – A56 / M66 ‘Junction 0’ at Edenfield**

Junction 10 has been assessed using the Arcady software.

There are no noted operational issues at this junction in either the 2019, 2024 or 2034 assessment years and scenarios.

It is considered that this junction can accommodate the build out of the Local Plan up to 2034.

### **2.12 Junction 11 – Rochdale Road/Market St roundabout, Edenfield**

Junction 11 has been assessed using the Arcady software.

There are no significant operational issues experienced at this junction at either 2019 or 2024, in both the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios. As such, it is considered that this junction can accommodate the build out of the Local Plan up to 2024.

At 2034 there is a noted worsening of performance in the morning peak at the Local Plan scenario when compared to the Reference Case.

It is considered therefore that discussion with LCC should take place as to whether an intervention is required at this junction due to the Local Plan build out to 2034. It should be noted however that the existing configuration of the junction and the general nature of the surrounding built up area, may prohibit the development of a scheme within the existing highway boundary.

### **2.13 Junction 12 – Bacup St James Square (recently modelled by Lancashire CC)**

Junction 12 has been assessed using the Aimsun software.

The results for this operational assessment are pending, due to arrangement of an Aimsun licence to use the existing LCC model.

### **2.14 Junction 13 – Waterfoot Roundabout**

Junction 13 has been assessed using the Arcady software.

The junction results show a notable poor performance in the 2019 baseline scenario.

The operational issues noted are exacerbated through the 2024 and 2034 scenarios. Whereas it could be argued that it is not the Local Plan allocations which are the cause of these notable operational issues, it is considered that discussion should take place with LCC as to the poor performance recorded.

### **2.15 Junction 14 – Toll Bar Roundabout, Stacksteads**

Junction 14 has been assessed using the Arcady software.

There are some notable operational issues recorded at the junction in the evening peak at 2019.

By 2024 the performance of the junction has worsened significantly, although the difference between the Reference Case and the Local Plan scenario is considered relatively marginal.

The 2034 Reference Case scenario shows very poor operational performance which is exacerbated by the addition of the Local Plan traffic volumes. It could again be argued that the failings in performance at the

junction are not a direct result of the Local Plan allocations, however it is recommended that discussion should take place with LCC as to the poor performance recorded.

The existing junction is noted to already have a sub-standard layout, with respect to alignment and safety issues, which may need to be addressed if any scheme were considered for this junction within the life of the plan.

## 2.16 Junction 15 – Market St / Shawclough Road, Whitworth

Junction 15 has been assessed using the Picady software.

No operational issues are recorded at 2019 or 2024, and it is considered that the first five years of the plan can be accommodated by the junction.

Some minor operational issues are noted at 2034 when comparing the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios, however the LOS remains below F on all arms, as such it is considered that this junction can accommodate the full build out of the plan also.

## 2.17 Junction Assessment Summary

**Table 3** below summarises Mott Macdonald's findings as to whether each junction should be considered for further analysis as part of this study, in order to derive an outline infrastructure upgrade option.

**Table 3. Assessment Summary**

Junction Number	Description	Can accommodate first five years of plan?	Can accommodate full fifteen years of plan?	Considered for further analysis as part of this study?
1	The Gyratory, Rawtenstall	✓	✗	Yes
2	Mini-roundabout by Hardman's Mill, Rawtenstall	✓	✓	No
3	Junction of St Mary's Way, Bank Street and Asda, Rawtenstall	✓	✗*	Yes
4	Tup Bridge Junction, St Mary's Way, Rawtenstall	✓	✗*	Yes
5a	Haslingden Road/Tesco roundabout, Haslingden	✓	✗	Yes
5b	A56 Haslingden Roundabout	✓	✓	No
6	Rising Bridge roundabout, A56	✓	✓	No
7	Todd Hall Road access	✓	✓	No
8	Grane Road/Holcombe Road junction	✓	✗^	?
9a	Grane Road/A56 junctions (A56 off-slip)	✓^	✗^	?
9b	Grane Road/A56 junctions (Waterside Rd Access Rd A56 on-slip Road)	✓^	✗^	?
10	A56 / M66 'Junction 0' at Edenfield	✓	✓	No
11	Rochdale Road/Market St roundabout, Edenfield	✓	✗^	?
12	Bacup St James Square (recently modelled by Lancashire CC)	pending	pending	pending
13	Waterfoot roundabout	✓^	✗^	?
14	Toll Bar Roundabout, Stacksteads	✓^	✗^	?
15	Market St/Shawclough Road, Whitworth	✓	✓	No

\* junctions 3 and 4 may be able to accommodate full extent of plan in isolation, however their performance is controlled by their proximity to the Rawtenstall gyratory and will need to be considered alongside those junctions.

^ operational performance at these junctions is notably poor in both the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios at 2024 and 2034. The poor performance is not necessarily a result of the Local Plan allocations, it is considered however that the views of LCC should be sought nonetheless.

## 2.18 A56 Merge / Diverge Assessments

A series of A56 DMRB Merge-Diverge assessments have also been undertaken for the locations identified in **Table 2** of this Technical Note. The results are summarised in **Table 4** below.

The Merge / Diverge analysis is attached to this Technical Note in spreadsheet format.

**Table 4. Assessment Summary**

Merge / Diverge No.	Description	2024 Ref Case		2024 Local Plan		2034 Ref Case		2034 Local Plan		Further Consideration within this study?
		Merge / Diverge Type								
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	
1	A56 / Grane Road SB Merge	C	C	C	C	C	A	C	A	No
2	A56 / Grane Road NB Diverge	A/D	B	A/D	B	B	E	B	E	No
3	A56 / Tesco Haslingden SB Diverge	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	C	?*
4	A56 / Haslingden Roundabout NB Merge	A/D	E	A/D	E	B	E	B	E	No
5	A56 / Haslingden Roundabout NB Diverge	A	A	A	A	A	C	A	C	No
6	A56 / Tesco Haslingden SB Merge	A/D	A/D	A/D	A/D	A/D	A/D	A/D	A/D	No
7	A56 / Junction 'O' Edenfield SB Diverge	C	C	C	C	A	C	A	C	No
8	A56 / Junction 'O' Edenfield NB Merge	B	A/D	B	A/D	E	A/D	E	A/D	No

\* at 2034 the analysis shows a change in the required diverge type between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios.

The analysis presented in **Table 4** above demonstrates that the required Merge / Diverge type does not alter between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios for all locations barring the A56 – Tesco Haslingden SB Diverge, which alters from a Type A to Type C in both the AM and PM analysis.

Whereas the results of the analysis do show differing Merge / Diverge Types being required between AM and PM tests, as well as between 2024 and 2034, It is only the 2034 Tesco Haslingden SB Diverge which shows a change in provision between the Reference Case and Local Plan scenarios.

The analysis indicates that the first five years of the plan can be accommodated to 2024.

The 2034 analysis demonstrates that there might need to be alterations to Merge/Diverge provision considered alongside any A56 upgrade that Highways England wish to promote. Upgrade to Expressway has been considered, however no firm commitment exists at this stage.

With regards to the one location from the analysis does indicate a potential impact from the Local Plan at 2034, the section of carriageway between this Diverge and the downstream Merge is very short, at only 300m. As such, it is considered that discussion with Highways England should take place, as an isolated Diverge upgrade may not be a suitable solution and would need to be considered alongside any aspirations held by Highways England for the A56.





This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.