

27th September 2023

Giles Howard
Senior Planning Officer (Development Management)
Prosperity and Development
Sardis House
Sardis Road
Pontypridd
Mid Glamorgan
CF37 1DU

Dear Giles,

Application 22/1149/10 - Forest Wood Quarry – Updated Transport Assessment & additional information.

Following on from our recent discussions, the Transport Assessment has now been updated. Additionally, we have had an addendum to the Air Quality assessment prepared to reflect the latest revisions.

In response to your email on 24.07.2023, in which you highlighted the transport-related issues, we have provided our response below.

For clarity, our responses are embedded in the text from your original email and categorised under appropriate headings.

Comments from Residents:

1. ATC Failures:

“On Sunday 12th February 2023 at 13:38pm, a resident of Talygarn emailed you to inform you the traffic monitoring devices had been tampered with outside of the quarry, he also provided images. I have looked at the traffic monitoring data for both the south and north bound activity and it seems that the devices were still counting vehicles?”

- Your thoughts on how the devices (which from the pictures had the tubes pulled out) were still accurately counting vehicles throughout the day?*
- How long had they actually been disconnected for whilst still recording data?*
- When were the company who owned/installed the devices informed they had been damaged ?*
- When did the company who owned/installed the devices reinstate them? “*

Both ATCs on the Cowbridge Road either side of the quarry entrance stopped logging at some point after the last recorded vehicle passed at 1.25am on Sunday 12th February 2023. As indicated by the resident, the nature of the failure suggests they were tampered with. The Applicant was made aware of the issue on Monday 13th February 2023 and the two ATCs were reinstalled on Wednesday 15th February 2023. They suffered no further failures/tampering.

As a result of this investigation, our Transport Consultant and their ATC installation contractor have identified an error in the datalogs that were originally supplied and have subsequently been reproduced in Appendix C of the Transport Assessment. Unfortunately, the failure and replacement of the ATCs was not picked up by the technician compiling the data. Consequently, the datalogs sent to our Transport Consultant, showed the traffic counts to have taken place on 7 sequential days starting on 9th February. This is incorrect and the dates of the traffic counts presented in the TA are 9th – 11th February and 19th – 22nd February inclusive. Unfortunately, our Transport

Consultant had not been made aware of the break in the assessment by their ATC installation contractor, so did not know the dates were incorrect when finalising the Transport Assessment.

Only the dates, rather than the data are incorrect, and the logs cover a full week of traffic counts. This is considered a valid data set for the purpose of the assessment.

Section 5.16 – 5.19 of the Transport Assessment have been updated accordingly to address and clarify the above.

2. Fatal Collision on Cowbridge Road, May 2023:

“With regard to the fatal crash involving and HGV – was the HGV anything to do with Forest Wood?”

The fatal crash on the A4222 Cowbridge Road on Tuesday 23rd May, this year, was unrelated to any operations within Forest Wood Quarry and happened some distance from the quarry itself. We understand that at least one objector to the proposed development attempted to link the quarry to this tragic accident, with the apparent intent of increasing any highways concerns of local communities and encouraging further objections. This is something the Applicant and ourselves find particularly distasteful.

3. Delivery Loads:

“I have had a copy of the local BUDDY magazine posted through my door, on page 17 there is an advert for Aggregates express, Forest Wood Quarry.

Within the text it states “Aggregates can be collected at our quarry or delivered in a quantity suitable to your requirements”. I have also attached an image of the advert.

In the agents covering letter you asked the question below and the agent provided a response which I have highlighted in red.

- *What proportion of deliveries of aggregates currently leave without a full load?*

It is not commercially viable to transport partial loads of aggregates. Vehicles leave the site fully loaded.

As you can see these are two contradictory statements, HGVs not leaving full would significantly increase the number of HGV movements per hour, can you please clarify with the agent;

1. How many HGVs carrying aggregates currently leave the quarry not fully laden over an average week?

2. How many non HGV vehicles, are currently accessing the site to collect smaller quantities? For example an open bed truck or smaller tipper vehicles.

On the face of it the agents answer does not seem to be a genuine reflection of current operations”

It appears that the operation of the existing quarry and the operation of the proposed development are being combined, rather than assessed individually. Transporting partial loads is not commercially viable using the company's fleet, hence only full loads are dispatched from the quarry. Each of the company's HGV tippers has an onboard weighing system that allows a partial load to be delivered to multiple sites. Large civil engineering works, which represent the bulk of the company's work, very rarely request partial loads. The volumes involved mean that any excess in a final load is insignificant and simply incorporated into the works.

The company markets the ability for customers to collect aggregates, although few do and in general only for smaller, short duration local works. Based on transport data provided by the Applicant for August 2023, 31 smaller vehicles collected stone from the quarry. There is no overall impact on the Transport Assessment from these existing movements as these loads are already accounted for in the ATC data provided in Appendix C of the Transport Assessment. These vehicles are generally 3.5T GVW HGVs collecting loads of around 1.1 tonnes, 7.5T GVW HGVs collecting loads around 3.5 tonnes and 12T GVW HGVs carrying around 5 tonnes. Even for these smaller vehicles, the cost of collecting the material (staff, fuel, etc.) adds a significant cost, so these too generally leave the site full to minimise the effective cost per tonne.

In terms of the proposed development, and as is the case for the quarry operation, company vehicles dispatched from the aggregates recovery facility would also carry full loads. Although there may be a small number of

collections of recycled aggregates by smaller vehicles, these are likely to be at similar levels to those of the existing quarry. As the overall impact from the development is not considered significant, the additional movements are also not significant.

Your Question Regarding Backhauling:

Para 5.10 of the TA notes that 30% of backhauling would be necessary for economic reasons and a reduction has therefore been applied to the projected loads by multiplying the number of movements by 0.7. Consequently, this reduces the hourly HGV single trips from approx. 9.5 per hour to 6.65 per hour in the worst-case scenarios. However, I think there is an error –

I see the figures for the worst-case scenario with no backhauling as such:

200,000 tpa with an average vehicle load size of 24.7t = 8097 loads, which would require the following HGV movements:

8097 trips out empty to collect waste
8097 trips in with full load of collected waste
8097 trips out to deliver recycled aggregate
8097 trips in empty returning from delivery

= 32,389 single HGV movements per annum, 623 per week, or 9.44 per hour (based on a 66 hour week)

With backhauling of 30% applied to the HGVs involved in the collection of waste:

5668 trips out empty to collect waste
5668 trips in with full load of collected waste
8097 trips out to deliver recycled aggregate
8097 trips in empty returning from delivery

= 27,530 single HGV movements per annum, 529 per week, or 8 per hour.

To get a figure of around 6.65 per hour it appears to me that the TA incorrectly applies a 30% reduction for backhauling to both HGVs bringing imported material coming into site and those delivering recycled aggregate and returning, which cannot be right?

If the TA is incorrect, as I suspect, I guess this would have a consequence for all of the other tables which consider predicted traffic movements, and perhaps the TA needs to be revised throughout?

Following a review of the Transport Assessment, it has been identified that the assessment in fact presented incorrect figures, with 60% backhauling being applied. This has now been amended and updated accordingly to represent a backhauling of 30%. For clarification purposes, a 30% reduction has been applied to movements back to the site, to take account of 30% of vehicles will arrive back to the site with a load of material to be recycled, rather than all coming back empty. The calculation for this is therefore set out below:

- 5,668 trips out empty to collect waste;
- 5,668 trips in with full load of collected waste;
- 8,097 trips out to deliver recycled aggregate; and
- 8,097 trips in returning from delivery with waste.

27,530 HGV movements per annum, 529 per week, or 8 per hour.

All of the tables affected by this change have been revised and updated accordingly in the revised Transport Assessment.

The change in movements also impacts the Air Quality Assessment submitted in support of the application. Consequently, an addendum has been produced to reflect the revision of the development traffic trips associated with the proposed development and should be read in conjunction with the existing Air Quality Assessment. The

overall conclusions of the assessment remain the same, with the air quality impact remaining as negligible for the assessed pollutants.

I trust that that this additional information, along with the accompanying documents, adequately addresses the issues that have been raised. I look forward to hearing from you in due course and our now being able to progress this application towards determination.

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Watcham
On behalf of Ryan Jones Group (the Applicant)

cc. Ceiri Rowlands, Senior Planner, Vale of Glamorgan Council